

The CONSIDER Intervention Fidelity Framework for Complex Interventions in Healthcare: A “Best-Fit” Framework Synthesis

Arsenio Páez^{1,2}, David Nunan^{1,2}, Peter McCulloch³, David Beard⁴

1. Nuffield Department for Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK
2. Centre for Evidence-based Medicine, University of Oxford, UK
3. Nuffield Department for Surgical Sciences, University of Oxford, UK
4. Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology, and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Abstract

Background: The focus of clinical trials is typically interventions' efficacy, or whether they attain their desired outcomes. Comparatively less attention is focused on understanding how or why interventions succeed, or fail to attain, those outcomes. This may be particularly important in trials of complex interventions such as surgery or physiotherapy, which are multifaceted and often tailored to individual participants, providers, or settings, increasing the potential for variations in intervention delivery and effects. The correspondence between the intervention that was planned and what was actually delivered in a trial is the intervention's fidelity. Several benefits for high levels of intervention fidelity have been proposed. However, a lack of a uniform definition for fidelity and its key components may hinder intervention delivery in clinical trials and the translation of evidence-based interventions to clinical practice.

Methods: In this study, we undertook systematic review, and "Best-fit" framework synthesis to develop an empirically-based intervention fidelity framework for complex interventions in rehabilitation.

Results: The resulting **CONSIDER (Complex iNterventionS Design dElivery Recept)** framework is first integrated fidelity framework developed specifically for clinical trials of for complex interventions rehabilitation. CONSIDER consists of three main components, Design, Delivery and Recept and the factors moderating them. Design encompasses the core elements of the intervention and the protocol for the clinical trial to evaluate its effectiveness. Delivery encompasses the actual implementation of the protocol and treatment integrity. It is focused

primarily on the actions of the intervention providers. Receipt addresses the exposure of the trial participants to the intervention and their response to it.

Conclusions: This fidelity framework is the first designed suit the unique complexities and challenges presented by physical complex interventions. It can help promote transparency and reproducibility and helps researchers design clinical trials that reduce waste, enable uptake into clinical practice, and benefit the practice and evidencing of physiotherapy, surgery and other physical complex interventions.

Keywords: intervention fidelity, adherence, compliance, integrity, framework, complex interventions, rehabilitation

BACKGROUND

Outside of safety, the focus of clinical trials is typically intervention efficacy, or whether or not interventions attain their desired outcomes. By comparison, less attention is focused on understanding how or why interventions succeed, or fail to attain, their target outcomes.^{1,2} This may be of particular importance in trials of complex interventions.³⁻⁷ The term “complex intervention” can be used to describe a number of multifaceted interventions in healthcare and other domains influencing health and well-being.⁵ These include interventions in psychology, mental and behavioural health, nursing, education, public health, social or public policy, among others. The focus of this paper is on complex interventions in physical domains in healthcare, specifically surgery and rehabilitation, defined here as physiotherapy, occupational and speech-language therapies, and exercise or physical activity interventions.^{8,9}

Complex interventions, such as such as surgery and physiotherapy, involve a number of components which may act independently and interdependently to achieve some desired end.^{5,7,10,11} Practitioner skill and experience, learning curves, provider-patient expectations, differences in individual patient characteristics, biopsychosocial factors, and other factors can contribute to the outcome of complex interventions,⁵⁻⁷ sometimes antagonistically.¹² For example, the effectiveness of surgical interventions may be enhanced, or degraded, by surgeons’ experience with the procedure, the degree to which procedure components have been defined, patients’ expectations, and the quality of perioperative supportive care.¹³

Intervention fidelity generally refers to the faithfulness of the intervention delivered in a clinical trial to the intervention that was intended in the trial protocol. Several benefits from high levels of intervention fidelity and negative consequences arising from poor intervention fidelity have been proposed. High levels of intervention fidelity can reduce random and unintended variability arising from poor intervention delivery, limiting potential confounding from extraneous variables, supporting internal validity¹⁴ and decrease the likelihood of type I and II errors.¹⁴⁻¹⁸ Attention to fidelity also decreases the likelihood of Type III error, or a null finding arising from poor quality intervention delivery rather than a null finding arising from intervention ineffectiveness.¹⁹

If treatment fidelity is poor or has not been evaluated, one may not be sure that studies' significant results are attributable to the treatment, rather than other, unknown factors, creating in Type I error. If the results are not significant, one can't assume that the poor results are attributable to the treatment rather than addition or omission of other factors, leading to Type II error.^{15,20} The addition of unplanned, extraneous components or omission of key intervention ingredients can make it difficult to attribute observed effects to the action of the intervention.^{13,21} Poor intervention delivery (fidelity) can lead to nonsignificant outcomes resulting from poor intervention delivery, rather than an actual lack of intervention effectiveness, raising the risk of Type III error.^{22,23}

The degree of intervention fidelity achieved in a study may be of equal clinical value with quantitative changes when interpreting the results of clinical trials in complex interventions.²⁴

However, a number of overlapping terms and constructs are used to describe and operationalise intervention fidelity, hampering efforts to support and monitor it in clinical trials.^{25–27} A variety of frameworks have been developed to understand and monitor intervention fidelity in complex clinical trials, but these vary in content and focus. There is also little consensus on how best to define intervention fidelity or categorize its key components, further complicating efforts to enhance or monitor intervention fidelity.^{25,26,28–30} Those who develop, implement and study complex interventions have no common language by which they can make assessments and develop robust methods to support intervention fidelity.^{25,29,31,32}

Updates to the CONSORT³³ reporting guidelines (2010), The Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT)³⁴ statement (2013), Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) Checklist³⁵ (2014), and the Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template (CERT)³⁶ (2016) were developed to improve intervention reporting and include items related to fidelity. However, they provide limited guidance for reporting strategies to maintain participants adherence to their assigned intervention or document modifications to intervention allocation, and no guidance on strategies to monitor or support the quality of intervention delivery. These checklists also only provide guidance on what should be reported and were not intended to offer researchers a practical guide on how to approach intervention fidelity in study design or conduct.³⁷ What was *not* done in a trial cannot be reported.

Treatment effects observed in trials will not be reproducible unless well-described procedures

facilitate and maintain intervention fidelity in clinical trials.^{13,38,39} Published fidelity frameworks have been developed for use in behavioural medicine, public health and education, but evidence-based guidance for fidelity monitoring in clinical trials of physical complex interventions such as surgery, physiotherapy, and rehabilitation is rare.^{29,31,40,41} A comprehensive fidelity framework for clinical trials in domains involving physical complex interventions, such as physiotherapy and rehabilitation (physical medicine and rehabilitation, broadly defined) is needed as a framework from which to investigate intervention fidelity in this complex interventions in rehabilitation.

A conceptual intervention fidelity framework is made up of a set of guidelines or recommendations detailing a combination of strategies and methods to assess, enhance and evaluate intervention fidelity at different stages of an intervention's implementation during a clinical trial.⁴² In this chapter, the development of the **COM**plex **iN**terventions trials **FID**elity **fR**amework (CONSIDER) framework, a conceptual framework for intervention fidelity in clinical trials of complex interventions in the physical domain, is described. Further development of this framework through broader input from a wider range of stakeholders could support the design and conduct of more robust complex intervention clinical trials.^{1,32,43}

Objectives

1. To provide a description of fidelity constructs, models, frameworks reporting the delivery of complex interventions in controlled trials in physical domains of health care: physiotherapy, surgery, physical medicine, rehabilitation, occupational therapy, speech and language therapy,

2. exercise, and physical activity promotion.
3. To conduct a best-fit framework synthesis of fidelity constructs to inform a conceptual fidelity
4. framework from which to investigate fidelity in trials of complex interventions in physical domains.
5. To produce an integrated, empirically based definition of intervention fidelity for use in clinical trials of complex interventions in healthcare.

METHODS

Reporting standards

The systematic review and framework analysis are reported along the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) ⁴⁴ and **EN**hancing Transparency in **RE**porting the synthesis of **Q**ualitative research (ENTREQ) statement guidelines. ⁴⁵

Registration

The protocol was registered on PROSPERO, ⁴⁶ (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42019135957) following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses for Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines. ⁴⁴

Systematic Review Design

The review followed a Best-fit Framework Synthesis (BFFS) approach to develop a comprehensive fidelity framework based on existing evidence (Fig. 2.1).⁴⁷ Best-fit framework

syntheses use initially-identified conceptual models found in published literature to serve as a platform from which a new framework can be developed through thematic synthesis of evidence from empirical studies.⁴⁷⁻⁵⁰ The approach is augmentative and deductive, building iteratively on the existing models.⁵⁰ We chose to create a new intervention fidelity framework through BFFS as, to the best of our knowledge, no intervention fidelity frameworks had previously been developed to guide fidelity in clinical trials of complex interventions in the physical domain.

Very detailed academic methodology was needed to construct the framework (part one). To enable it to be useful, it also had to be distilled into useful portions, headings, and silos that can be easily illustrated and recalled. The review is therefore divided into two stages (figure 2.1).




Figure 2.1: Stages of the review and best-fit framework synthesis

Stage 1: Create the platform (“Best-fit” framework) on which to build the new framework

Once the research question or aim was determined, the creation of the *a priori*, best-fit

framework (a platform from which to build a new framework) was conducted in parallel with systematic searches for papers to be included in the review and synthesis. These two “strands” then joined at the framework synthesis stage (stage 2).

Stage 2: Build on the platform with empirical evidence to make a new framework

In stage 2, fidelity frameworks, theories, models and concepts identified in stage 1 were thematically synthesized and reciprocally translated through BFFS (figure 2.2)^{47,50} to develop an integrated, conceptual fidelity framework for complex interventions in the physical domain. This new framework can subsequently be honed and validated in future empirical research.

Stage I: Systematic review

Search Strategy

As we were searching for theoretical frameworks, the search strategy was informed by the BeHEMoth (Behaviour of interest, health context, exclusions, and models or theories) method.^{48,51 49}

Be: Treatment or intervention fidelity, adherence, integrity, compliance, concordance, implementation, and related concepts.

H: Complex interventions in the physical domain in healthcare: physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech-language therapy, exercise or physical activity interventions, surgery.

E: Statistical or economic models, models of care. Non-healthcare interventions.

MoTh: Model, theory, theories, framework, concept, conceptual, construct or strategy.

Keywords and MeSH terms related to fidelity (table 2.1) were used in Pubmed, Embase, CINHAL, Scopus and Google Scholar (appendix figure 2.1). PROSPERO was searched for ongoing or recently completed systematic reviews. Searches were limited to papers published from 2005, a year after the publication of the NIH Behaviour Change Consortium (NIH BCC) recommendations for conceptualizing and enhancing treatment fidelity.⁵² No language limits were imposed on searches. To optimize coverage and ensure literature saturation, grey literature searching was conducted on Scopus, Google Scholar, and PROSPERO. Grey literature includes a wide range of data sources not typically captured in searches for commercially published literature, including clinical trial and protocol registers such as clinicaltrials.gov⁵³, conference proceedings, government reports, not-for-profit or non-governmental agency reports, international bodies' reports or position papers (e.g., the World Health Organisation).⁵⁴ The reference lists were also searched for additional papers. Study protocols or trial registrations were also searched for and reviewed when they were available.

Fidelity: Key words and related terms
Treatment, intervention, procedure, trial, according, adherence, agree, agreement, conceptual, concordance, consistent, compliance, delivery, delivered, directions, enactment, evaluation, fidelity, framework, implementation, Indicators, integrity, intended, instructions, manual, manualized, model, monitored, monitoring, process, protocol, similar, similarity, specified, standard, strategy

Table 2.1: Fidelity keywords and related terms

Inclusion criteria

The aim of the systematic review was to identify as many relevant studies as possible and reduce the risk of missing potentially eligible studies, maximizing sensitivity rather than precision.

Eligible papers were complex interventions empirical research, review, or theoretical papers including terms related to fidelity anywhere in the paper, either as a main focus or component (for example, as an analysis within a trial or process evaluation).

Exclusion criteria

Papers not describing fidelity, or a related term, were excluded (table 2.1). Papers investigating fidelity outside of complex interventions in the physical domain in healthcare were ineligible. These included papers for public-health interventions, such as smoking cessation or reproductive health interventions, interventions in education, such as reading proficiency, or in psychology, such as interventions for compulsive behaviour or depression.

Study selection

Potentially relevant citations, their abstracts and full-texts were screened against the review's inclusion-exclusion criteria independently by the first author (AP) and a second author (DH). Disagreements were resolved by consensus. As the BFFS aimed for conceptual saturation and generalizability, rather than statistical generalizability, we aimed for study selection that was purposive rather than exhaustive.^{55,56} A criterion-sampling approach to purposive sampling was used to select papers from the systematic review for framework synthesis.^{56,57}

Data Collection and Extraction Process

Citations, abstracts, and full text articles were managed digitally with Mendeley. A tailored, electronic data extraction form was created and calibrated for this review. We extracted papers' bibliographic information, field, professional discipline or context, study design or paper format

(e.g., methodological paper), descriptions or definitions of fidelity, fidelity monitoring or support methods, and fidelity model or framework if reported (Appendix table 2.1).

Quality assessment

Little consensus exists for the feasibility and utility of quality assessment in framework analysis or qualitative synthesis.⁵⁸ As this systematic review sought to synthesize fidelity frameworks and models, rather than the outcomes or effects of processes or procedures in empirical work, no quality assessment of papers was performed in this review.

Data Synthesis

Objective 1: The results of the systematic review were described narratively and with simple descriptive statistics. No quantitative synthesis was undertaken.

Objective 2: Fidelity models or frameworks selected through purposive sampling were thematically synthesized with NVivo12 software.^{47,50}

Stage II. Build on the platform to make a new framework (Best-Fit Framework Synthesis)

With the results of the systematic review, the “Best-fit Framework Synthesis (BFFS)^{47,50}” method was used following a series of predetermined steps (Figure 2.2).⁵⁹ As an overview, once an initial “platform” best-fit framework was constructed, fidelity data (fidelity descriptions, definitions, monitoring and enhancement) extracted from papers identified in the systematic review was thematically analysed and coded against the best-fit framework to expand or reduce it with the data to creating a new fidelity framework.^{47–50}

Thematic analysis followed the guidance and recommended steps of Saldana's (2016) Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers, and the Streamlined Codes-to Theory Model for qualitative inquiry.⁶⁰ First-cycle coding followed a descriptive (topic) coding method, generating a categorized inventory of codes identified and themed through careful reading and reflection on the data.⁶¹ In second-cycle coding, pattern coding was used to reanalyse and reconfigure the first-cycle codes categorically, thematically, and conceptually into a smaller number of themes (pattern codes) to develop an understanding of the corpus of data and relationships between its components.⁶²



Figure 2.2: Best-Fit Framework Analysis' Steps: Adapted from Booth, et al, 2014⁵⁹

Best-fit framework: steps

Step 1: Identify the review question or aim.

Aim: to synthesize a conceptual framework for intervention fidelity in clinical trials of complex interventions in the physical domain (physiotherapy, surgery, rehabilitation).

Step 2: Systematically identify relevant research and “best-fit” frameworks, models, or theories.

Comprehensive, systematic searches were conducted to identify as many relevant publications addressing the question as was feasible (Stage I). In a parallel process, these papers were reviewed to identify a best-fit “platform” fidelity models (Step 2b).⁵⁹

Step 3: Generate the *a priori* framework from identified publications through thematic analysis.

This *a priori* “best-fit” framework serves as a platform or starting point that will be built on with fidelity data from eligible papers to synthesise a new fidelity framework in the next steps.

Step 4: Code evidence from included studies against the best-fit framework.

Once the BFF was constructed, passages describing fidelity in eligible papers were extracted as direct quotations and imported into NVivo12. These quotations were systematically reviewed against the fidelity concepts categorised in the BFF, feeding them into the BFF theme they best represented.⁶³ This “thematic coding” was performed and critically reviewed by two reviewers (AP and DH) and any discrepancies or disagreements were resolved by consensus.

Step 5: Create new themes.

When fidelity data from the extracted quotations did not translate well into any of the BFF concepts (themes) or were applicable to more than one, new themes were created through interpretive, inductive secondary thematic analysis^{47,64} and reciprocal translation (Step 5).⁶⁵ The criterion for forming a theme was that at least two quotations addressing the same concept were identified, and they did not correspond to an existing fidelity theme. The BFF was expanded upon, reduced, or added to iteratively as successive studies were analysed and data was coded, ultimately creating a revised fidelity framework (Step 6).^{47,50,66}

Step 6: Produce a new framework composed of *a priori* and new themes.

Consensus was sought among the reviewers (authors) on which of the BFF fidelity themes were supported, and whether quotations extracted from eligible papers mapped onto a pre-existing theme, or themes mapped onto each other (could be collapsed) through reciprocal translation. This, and steps 4-5 resulted in a new framework, included some fidelity themes from the BFF and new themes derived from fidelity data extracted from the results of the systematic review.

Step 7: Revisit evidence to explore the relationship between fidelity themes or concepts.

The resulting finalized list of fidelity themes was used to create a new, integrated fidelity framework for physical complex interventions. An interpretation of the content of the fidelity themes, and relationships between them, is presented in the results section.

RESULTS: Systematic Review

Searches produced 2857 records, 361 of which were screened for eligibility by full text (figure 2.3). Of these, 269 met inclusion criteria in the systematic review. One hundred forty-one papers defined or described fidelity, fidelity components or a fidelity framework, meeting criteria for informing the framework synthesis.




Figure 2.3: PRISMA flow chart

OBJECTIVE 1: Fidelity in complex interventions

The greatest number of eligible papers (73) came from physiotherapy literature (table 2.2). The least represented specialty was surgery, with 16 papers, including three randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of a surgical procedure⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹, two surgical trial protocols^{70,71}, one pilot⁷², three trials of peri-operative surgical care or procedures⁷³⁻⁷⁵, two systematic reviews of methodological reporting in surgical placebo-controlled trials^{76,77}, two guidelines on the conduct of surgical trials^{13,78}, two methodological papers^{76,79}, and one set of reporting standards.⁸⁰

Clinical discipline	Eligible papers	Study design or type of paper	Eligible papers
Physical Therapy	73	Protocol paper	51
Physical activity interventions	66	Randomized, parallel group trials	47
Rehabilitation (multidisciplinary)	37	Feasibility studies and trials	35
Occupational Therapy	35	Fidelity/Implementation studies, process evaluations	33
Speech Language Pathology	25	Literature or narrative reviews	28
Cardiopulmonary Rehabilitation	17	Methodological papers	27
Surgery and surgical care	16	Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses	23
		Case and pilot studies	19
		Uncontrolled studies	6
Total	269	Total	269

Table 2.2: Included studies according to discipline and study design/type




OBJECTIVE 2: A best-fit framework synthesis

BFFS Steps 1-3: Fidelity frameworks:

Steps 1-2b identified 28 fidelity frameworks or constructs across 108 papers. The two most frequently cited or applied fidelity frameworks were the National Institutes of Health Behaviour Change Consortium (NIH-BCC) Comprehensive Treatment Fidelity Framework⁸¹ as described by

Bellg⁵² or Borelli⁸¹ (60 papers cited or applied), and the Comprehensive Intervention Fidelity Guide developed by Gearing²⁹ (23 papers cited or applied (table 2.3). The next most cited (19 papers) was the Implementation Fidelity Framework by Carroll et al (2007)². The NIH-BCC and Gearing frameworks were thematically analysed to identify commonalities and differences between them and generate fidelity themes supported with examples extracted from the original paper (Table 2.3). These themes generated the best-fit framework (BFF) that served as a starting point, or platform, from which to build a new fidelity framework with fidelity data extracted from eligible papers (Step 4).^{47,50,59,66}

The BFF was comprised of five fidelity themes (table 2.3).³¹ Each theme was supported with a definition and supporting exemplars from the original papers. Fidelity data extracted from eligible papers was later coded against these themes in step 4.⁴⁷ The resulting BFF described fidelity on both a theoretical and an operational level (table 2.4).³¹ The theoretical level addresses construct fidelity, or interventions' faithfulness to their underlying theoretical basis. Similar to Meehl and Cronbach's⁸² concept of "construct validity," encompassing relations between hypothesized entities and processes and observed effects, the theoretical level encompasses interventions' design, proposed mechanisms of action, and their relation to the interventions' core effects.^{29,83} The operational level encompasses interventions' fidelity in terms of the quality of intervention delivery, receipt (dosage) of interventions, participant engagement, and participant enactment, or whether participants apply intervention skills in their daily lives outside of treatment sessions.²⁹

NIH-BCC Comprehensive Fidelity Framework ⁸¹	Comprehensive Fidelity Guide by Gearing et al, 2011 ²⁹	Themes for Best-fit framework (sample sources) and exemplar text
		
<p>Study design</p> <p>Does study adequately test its hypotheses in relation to underlying theoretical and clinical processes? Are interventions' active ingredients fully operationalized?</p>	<p>Intervention design</p> <p>Intervention's framework and elements essential to the design of a trial, its evaluation or replication. Includes a programme model, treatment manual.</p>	<p>Intervention and study design^{2,14,90-93,27,29,84-89}</p> <p>Treatment theory and mechanism of action, identification of active ingredients, differentiation from control or comparator interventions.</p> <p>Identification of elements of the design of the trial investigating the intervention, including the trial's programme model and development of study procedures and/or treatment manuals.</p> <p>Exemplars</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Conceptualization of a theoretical framework underpinnings treatment allows the key components that underlie the intervention to be measured and reported.⁸⁴" 2. "Active ingredients: These active ingredients may be based largely on theory, or they may be based on empirical evidence. Active ingredients most typically include specific treatment targets, the therapeutic techniques, and the requirements for dosage (e.g., highly concentrated exposures several times per week). In combination, the active ingredients describe how and why the intervention brings about predicted outcomes.⁸⁶" 3. "To achieve treatment fidelity, both the degree of integrity and differentiation are critical. Treatment differentiation requires that the experimental intervention and the intervention comprising the control condition differ in the intended manner. Treatment differentiation is determined by trial design and defined <i>a priori</i> by the investigators.⁸⁷" 4. "Study design focuses on the methodological processes that ensure the study adequately assesses the proposed hypotheses in relation to a theoretical framework.⁹⁴"
<p>Provider Training</p> <p>Is there standardizing training between providers, ensuring providers are trained to criterion, and is there monitoring and maintaining of provider skills over time?</p>	<p>Intervention training</p> <p>Intervention fidelity requires adequate training and supervision of interventionists. Training elements include interventionist differences, such as levels of skills, education, experience, and implementation styles.</p>	<p>Interventionist training^{2,27,91-93,95-98}</p> <p>Interventionists' training and skill with delivering the intervention during the clinical trial, and their competence to deliver the intervention.</p> <p>Exemplars</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Treatment fidelity related to the training of interventionists assures that those implementing the intervention were adequately prepared to do so and implemented all aspects of the treatment as intended.⁹⁵" 2. "A specific intervention cannot be delivered until those delivering it have learned to do so in a standardized way.⁹⁹" 3. "Thus, a team that has multiple protocol violations would be said to have low training fidelity, which would increase variability with which the protocol is administered.¹⁰⁰"
<p>Treatment Delivery</p> <p>Is there differentiation</p>	<p>Intervention delivery</p> <p>Adherence to and integrity of</p>	<p>Intervention delivery</p> <p>^{2,15,94,95,97,101-107,27,108-117,29,118-127,68,128-137,73,138,84,86,91,93}</p>

<p>(providers only deliver the target treatment and not other treatments), treatment competency (providers maintain skills learned in training) and treatment adherence (delivery of treatment components as intended)?</p>	<p>treatment. Measures may include frequency counts, logs, records of how many times a behaviour or technique occur. Includes whether prescribed behaviours have taken place, dose of programme content delivered to and received by participant.</p>	<p>Closeness of the intervention delivered in the trial to the intervention in the study protocol, or the quality of intervention delivery during the trial. This includes any tailoring or adaptation of the intervention, whether pre-conceived and defined, or ad hoc, that takes place during the clinical trial.</p> <p>Exemplars</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “Compliance with the New Start intervention will be monitored throughout the trial via observations and regular collection of activity records to assess adherence, to understand whether the facilitators deliver the intervention in accordance with training and ‘as intended’.¹⁰¹” 2. “Treatment fidelity pertaining to treatment delivery includes ensuring that the content and dose are consistent as well as adherence to the manual.⁹⁴” 3. “In what ways, if any, did the teachers amend the programme? What were the reasons for any amendments?¹⁰²” 4. “Surgeons were allowed to apply their own techniques within limitations of the protocol.”⁶⁸
<p>Treatment Receipt</p> <p>Was the treatment delivered to the participant actually “received,” or understood accurately by participants? Did participants demonstrate knowledge of, and ability to use, the skills or recommendations learned in treatment.</p>	<p>Intervention receipt</p> <p>Elements that focus on whether participants received the treatment, and whether essential elements were provided in the treatment.</p>	<p>Intervention Receipt^{94,121,134,138–143}</p> <p>Trial participants’ exposure to the intervention and its active ingredients, or dosage received, their understanding of the intervention or skills, and whether they can perform the intervention related skills <i>during the trial</i>.</p> <p>“Receipt relates to skill use in the intervention setting (e.g., learning goal-setting), and enactment relates to skill use outside the intervention (e.g., planning for PA sessions).¹⁴⁴”</p> <p>Exemplars</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “whether the treatment that was delivered to the participant was actually “received” by the participant.¹³⁹” 2. “Receipt of treatment focuses on exposure of the participant to the intervention and their ability to understand the skills and perform the treatment-related behaviour skills during treatment delivery.¹³⁴” 3. “Dose is either defined as ‘dose delivered’, i.e. the number of components of the intervention delivered, or as ‘dose received’, i.e. the extent to which the participants used the components of the intervention as intended.^{140,141}”
<p>Treatment Enactment</p> <p>Can participants perform treatment related behavioural skills and cognitive strategies in relevant real-life settings? Are skills implemented in appropriate situations and time to have the intended effect on clinical and research outcomes?</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Participant enactment of treatment skills^{2,14,15,29,94,103,138,145,146}</p> <p>Participants’ implement the skills in daily life, or real-world settings.</p> <p>Exemplars</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “Enactment of treatment skills assesses the participants’ ability to perform the intervention skill in real-world settings?¹⁵” 2. “Enactment assessment and monitoring of participant behaviour outside of the intervention.⁹⁴” 3. “Treatment enactment, which has to do with whether the participant actually uses the learned strategies in day-to-day life, is more challenging to measure but could be ascertained using self-report and proxy report instruments given at some point after the trial.¹⁴⁶”

Table 2.3: NIH-BCC, Gearing’s Comprehensive Intervention Fidelity Guide Fidelity, and Best-fit framework Frameworks

BFFS Step 4: Coding of the data

The first review of fidelity data (quotations) extracted from eligible papers resulted in 14 fidelity concepts derived from fidelity definitions, descriptions, components, or processes supporting, maintaining, or monitoring fidelity (table 2.4). These were then collapsed through thematic analysis into overarching fidelity themes, supported by exemplars (direct quotations) from included papers, and fed into the BFF framework in the steps 5 and 6.

BFFS Steps 5 and 6: Thematic analysis and synthesis

Some fidelity themes created in step 4 were collapsed into each other and into an existing BFF category (table 2.4). For example, themes for “intervention design,” “intervention differentiation,” “study design,” “study protocol,” and “development of study manuals or guidance materials” were collapsed into the BFF’s “intervention and study design” theme. This theme includes elements related to the design of both an intervention and the study assessing its effects.

Similarly, themes for “participant engagement with interventions” and “participant enactment of intervention skills” were collapsed into the BFF’s “participants enactment of treatment skills (table 2.4).” Engagement has been described as an umbrella term that includes both skill enactment and intervention acceptability.^{52,144,147} Reviewing quotations supporting both enactment and engagement, enactment was often used synonymously with participant

engagement to describe a range of behaviours and perspectives influencing how participants interact with therapeutic interventions.¹⁴⁸

Secondary thematic analysis and synthesis of the BFF themes and supporting quotations (exemplars) was undertaken to refine the framework further. The “intervention and study design” and “interventionist training” themes were expanded based on exemplars emphasizing the need to include interventionist training strategies and skill monitoring in the design phase of a trial and monitor drift of provider skills during intervention delivery (table 2.4). Similarly, the “tailoring and adaptation” BFF theme was expanded to accommodate differentiation of allowable interventions tailoring or adaptation prespecified in a study protocol from unintended modifications made to interventions during a trial.^{75,149}

After secondary thematic analysis and discussion among researcher-reviewers, fidelity data extracted from the included studies supported all but one concept in the best-fit framework. Enactment was removed from the finalised fidelity framework. Enactment was the least frequently addressed component of intervention fidelity in studies assessing the reporting of intervention fidelity in physical complex intervention literature.^{84,98,150} Thirty-one of 36 papers enacted as a component of fidelity described it encompassing participants’ behaviour *outside* of the clinical trial or intervention, differentiating it from receipt, or participants’ use of intervention skills during the intervention itself.^{29,81,144,151,152}

A trial participant may receive a treatment delivered with perfect fidelity, and yet be unwilling or unable to apply it in daily life.^{2,144} This may be influenced by a variety of factors not related to the degree of fidelity with which the intervention was delivered during the trial, such as participants forgetting to do it, lacking a suitable setting, not seeing the intervention as being relevant to them, or losing interest in the intervention.^{2,14} Enactment may reflect intervention acceptability, or participants' affective attitude or responses to the intervention, rather than the fidelity with which it was administered in the trial.^{144,153} Enactment may relate to treatment effectiveness in influencing participants' behaviour, rather than the fidelity with which treatments were delivered during a trial.^{27,29,154,155}

While it is possible to ascertain if participants or their caregivers have understood what an intervention is meant to achieve or can perform intervention activities in the trial (both aspects captured in Receipt), participant enactment during trials may not be measurable if an intervention does not involve participants learning a set of measurable skills.^{156,157}

Measurement of enactment may also be impractical due to difficulty defining what it constitutes and how to capture and analyse data for it.^{29,152} It is also unclear how enactment differs from other concepts describing participant behaviours frequently used in rehabilitation literature, such as participant engagement or equipoise.^{52,147} Consequently, treatment enactment was removed from our model of clinical trial intervention fidelity. The remaining fidelity themes formed the new fidelity framework, described in step 7.

Fidelity concepts derived from eligible papers and number of quotations (n)	Fidelity themes created through thematic analysis and an exemplar.	Best-fit framework theme that served as a platform against which to consider the fidelity themes.	New concepts or fidelity themes created through secondary analyses and reciprocal translation	Final fidelity themes forming the new framework and its key points
<p>Intervention design (32)</p> <p>Intervention specification (intervention details) (27)</p>	<p>Intervention design</p> <p>“Defining the active ingredients: using theory or past research to delineate the intervention’s active ingredients in clear operational terms, which should be guided by beliefs explaining why they should be successful.¹⁵⁸”</p> <p>“Conceptualization of a theoretical framework underpinning a treatment allows the key components that underlie the intervention to be measured and reported.⁸⁴”</p> <p>“A protocol review group should ensure that the intervention reflects the theoretical model or hypothesis.¹⁵”</p>	<p>Intervention and study design^{2,14,90–93,27,29,84–89}</p> <p>Treatment theory and mechanism of action, identification of active ingredients, differentiation from control or comparator interventions.</p> <p>Identification of elements of the design of the trial investigating the intervention, including the trial’s programme model and development of study procedures and/or treatment manuals.</p>		<p>Design: The core elements of the intervention and the protocol for the clinical trial to evaluate its efficacy or effectiveness.</p> <p>Detailed description of the intervention: Describes what intervention procedures, processes, or activities providers carry out. Describes what the experimental intervention(s) looks like, includes, or how performed.</p>
<p>Intervention differentiation: experimental vs control, comparison, or other interventions (26)</p>	<p>Intervention differentiation</p> <p>“Treatment differentiation requires that the experimental intervention and the intervention comprising the control condition differ in the intended manner.⁸⁷”</p> <p>“Finally, program differentiation refers to how the intervention being delivered is different and distinguishable from other interventions.¹²¹”</p> <p>“treatment differentiation, that is, ensuring that the experimental intervention condition differs from a control condition (i.e., showing much higher adherence and competence to the treatment model).¹²²”</p>	<p>Intervention and study design</p>		<p>Design</p>
<p>Study protocol or design of the trial (36)</p>	<p>Study design</p> <p>“Treatment fidelity practices relating to design ensure that a study adequately tests its</p>	<p>Intervention and study design</p>	<p>Interventionist training needs to be built into the design of the trial.</p>	<p>Design: The elements of a study protocol to test the efficacy or effectiveness of an</p>

	<p>hypothesis in relation to its underlying theoretical and clinical processes¹³⁹”</p> <p>“Study design should be based upon a theoretical model or hypothesis and all objective measures should reflect this.¹⁵”</p> <p>“Fidelity practices related to study design help investigators discern whether the study will adequately achieve the aims and test the hypotheses that have been set forth.¹⁰⁰”</p>		<p>15,84,104,124,128,129,159,160</p> <p>“Identify key elements of provider briefing regarding conduct of trial. Develop trainer materials, quality standards and minimum experience levels¹⁶⁰”</p> <p>“Identify key elements of provider briefing regarding conduct of trial. Develop trainer materials, quality standards and minimum experience levels¹⁶⁰”</p>	<p>intervention are clearly described to ensure fidelity.</p> <p>Includes a provider training plan: How providers will become proficient with intervention/study procedures to support fidelity.</p>
<p>Intervention or study manuals or guidance for providers (22)</p>	<p>Development of study manuals or guidance materials</p> <p>“The content, frequency, duration and quality of the intervention can be delivered as set out in the intervention delivery manual.¹⁶¹”</p> <p>“To ensure the same treatment within condition a detailed treatment manual and a treatment protocol/ checklist is used for each patient separately manual has also been developed to guarantee that the treatment will be unchanged during the course of the study.¹⁶²”</p> <p>“development of a treatment manual that includes information about treatment dose (length and number of contacts) and the specific content of each contact, standardization of therapist training, monitoring of the intervention with fidelity checklists, and inclusion of strategies to measure the client’s comprehension and enactment of the intervention principles addressed.¹⁶³”</p>	<p>Intervention and study design</p> <p>“The manual of procedures (MOP; described later in this article) is a carefully constructed book that details the operating procedures for the study and procedures for training personnel in the administration of outcome measures and interventions. For example, our MOPs detail the ways in which each assessment will be administered, including the point at which it is given, by whom, in what environment, and using which equipment.¹⁰⁰”</p>		<p>Design: Describes physical or informational materials or methods used to train intervention providers in study methods or intervention delivery, or to train or help participants in carrying out intervention activities. E.g.: Intervention manuals, videos or instructional aids, exercise sheets, etc.</p>
<p>Specification of trial procedures to evaluate</p>	<p>Study protocol</p> <p>“Study design: was the guideline or protocol used to guide the study</p>	<p>Intervention and study design</p>		<p>Design</p>

<p>intervention (17)</p>	<p>published and was it clearly identified? were standardized or validated tools used to measure patient reported outcomes?¹¹⁸</p> <p>“The degree to which a therapist implements an intervention under research conditions (treatment fidelity) is dependent upon the extent and operationalization of the intervention and skill level of the therapist.¹⁵⁹”</p>			
<p>Interventionist training with intervention or trial procedures (56)</p>	<p>Interventionist training</p> <p>“Training was designed to ensure satisfactory delivery of the intervention to study participants. Trainings were tailored to account for different backgrounds and past training experiences of the FHPs.⁹⁴”</p> <p>“Provider training: strategies that address preparation for uniform delivery of treatment by providers/coaches. Standardized training ensures that training is conducted similarly for all providers. Another goal of provider training is minimizing drift in provider skills.”</p> <p>“The PIPT program was designed to promote treatment fidelity by providing quality training that impacted key provider factors and that could be replicated. Thus, we incorporated quality improvement strategies and measures (physical therapist attitudes, beliefs and confidence) to enhance treatment quality and the impact of training.¹⁶⁴”</p>	<p>Interventionist training^{2,27,91–93,95–98}</p> <p>Interventionists’ training and skill with delivering the intervention during the clinical trial, and their competence to deliver the intervention.</p>	<p>Interventionist training and skill maintenance needed throughout trial. ^{15,84,104,124,128,129,159,160}</p> <p>“Fidelity of treatment delivery focuses on ensuring the intervention is delivered as intended. Many of the concerns within delivery of treatment overlap with strategies for training and study design, including controlling for provider differences¹⁰⁴”</p> <p>“Provider training attempts to standardize the treatment protocol and minimize its fluctuation by assessing knowledge during and post-treatment.¹⁵”</p>	<p>Design and Delivery</p> <p>Describes provider qualifications, background, expertise, and any training given in the intervention or study procedures as part of the trial. Also includes any strategies to monitor drift in provider skills with the intervention during the trial.</p>
<p>Interventionist competence or characteristics (44)</p>	<p>Provider competence</p> <p>“Intervention fidelity also requires that the appropriate background and experience level of the study therapists is identified and ensured.¹⁵⁹”</p> <p>“accurate delivery is highly dependent on the skill, experience,</p>	<p>Interventionist training</p>	<p>Build in methods to prevent interventionist skill drift. ^{15,84,104,124,128,129,159,160}</p> <p>“Provider Training involves standardizing</p>	<p>Design and Delivery</p>

	<p>and knowledge of the interventionist.⁸⁷</p> <p>“a specific intervention cannot be delivered until those delivering it have learned to do so in a standardized way.⁹⁹”</p>		<p>training between providers and ensuring they are trained to clear criteria and monitored over time.¹²⁴”</p>	
<p>Intervention fidelity, Integrity, or quality of treatment delivery (103)</p>	<p>Intervention integrity (fidelity)</p> <p>“Treatment fidelity pertaining to treatment delivery includes ensuring that the content and dose are consistent as well as adherence to the manual.⁹⁴”</p> <p>“The intervention was implemented with all the planned components. ...the treatment dose was equivalent and within the stipulated range within and across conditions.¹⁶⁵”</p> <p>“Treatment fidelity has four components. Integrity: was the treatment delivered as intended? Another domain of treatment fidelity, integrity (how consistently the information was delivered)...¹⁰⁷”</p> <p>“Ensuring fidelity through treatment delivery is focused on processes that ensure the treatment is delivered as designed and focus on standardizing and improving delivery as well as assessing adherence.¹³⁸”</p>	<p>Intervention delivery 2,15,94,95,97,101–107,27,108–117,29,118–127,68,128–137,73,138,84,86,91,93</p> <p>Closeness of the intervention delivered in the trial to the intervention in the study protocol, or the quality of intervention delivery during the trial. This includes any tailoring or adaptation of the intervention, whether pre-conceived and defined, or ad hoc, that takes place during the clinical trial.</p>	<p>Delivery (fidelity) refers to actions of the interventionist</p> <p>“Delivery: intervention is delivered as intended. It refers mainly to actions of the interventionist.¹⁴²”</p> <p>“Treatment fidelity related to delivery of treatment considers that the interventionist delivers the intervention as intended.¹³⁴”</p> <p>“The degree to which a therapist implements an intervention under research conditions (treatment fidelity).¹⁵⁹”</p>	<p>Delivery</p> <p>Describes strategies planned or used to monitor, maintain, or improve intervention compliance (treatments delivered or performed as intended in study protocol) or the quality of intervention delivery. May include terms such as treatment or intervention fidelity, integrity, compliance, per protocol.</p> <p>Describes how these are monitored. Example: fidelity checklists, audit of session notes, video or audio recording of intervention sessions, supervision during intervention, participant logs, diaries, worksheets, etc.</p>
<p>Tailoring and adaptation of interventions to individuals or settings (14)</p>	<p>Tailoring, adaptation, modifications</p> <p>“In what ways, if any, did the teachers amend the programme? What were the reasons for any amendments?¹⁰²”</p> <p>“The standard elements of the treatment were then tailored, such that each participant’s clinical presentation (e.g., strength, pain</p>	<p>Intervention delivery</p>	<p>Allowable tailoring or adaptation of interventions prespecified, in protocol or vs unintended modification during trial</p> <p>“In order to accurately evaluate</p>	<p>Design:</p> <p>If intervention was planned to be, or allowed to be, personalised, titrated or adapted during the trial: why, when, or how this was to be done. What</p>

	<p>severity, swelling) as well as the presence of co-morbidities (e.g., back and hip pain or pathology) were taken into consideration, and exercises were chosen and progressed by the physiotherapist based on each participant’s response to exercise load.”¹⁶⁶</p> <p>“Some specifications of interventions allow for local adaptation. Even if they do not explicitly do this, local adaptations may be made to improve the fit of the intervention within the local context.”²⁹</p>		<p>fidelity of both the interventional bundle and implementation process it will be important to distinguish between non-compliance and purposive adaptations.⁷⁵”</p> <p>“At the design level, adaptability is often essential in ensuring that interventions can fit within different contexts.”⁷⁴”</p> <p>“interveners were expected to adhere to a set of theoretically grounded, overarching principles related to pressure ulcer risk when tailoring the sessions to be participant- and situation-specific.”¹⁴⁹”</p>	<p>adaptations may be made?</p> <p>Delivery: What modifications were made to the intervention delivered in the trial? Was the intervention modified during the trial, or were deviations from protocol reported, including changes to interventions, unintended participant cross-over between groups/interventions?</p>
<p>Participant exposure to intervention (51)</p>	<p>Intervention receipt</p> <p>“Exposure refers to the number, length, or frequency of intervention sessions or the frequency with which intervention techniques are implemented.”¹²¹”</p> <p>“Exposure refers to the extent to which the participant is in contact with the intervention’s content. Exposure is often documented as the number of intervention sessions attended and duration of each session.”³¹”</p> <p>Treatment fidelity of receipt of treatment focuses on exposure of the participant to the intervention and their ability to understand the skills and perform the treatment-related behaviour skills during treatment delivery</p> <p>“Processes of treatment receipt involve monitoring and optimizing</p>	<p>Intervention Receipt^{94,121,134,138–143}</p> <p>Trial participants’ exposure to the intervention and its active ingredients, or dosage received, their understanding of the intervention or skills, and whether they can perform the intervention related skills <i>during the trial</i>.</p> <p>“Receipt relates to skill use in the intervention setting (e.g., learning goal-setting), and enactment relates to skill use outside the intervention (e.g., planning for PA sessions).”¹⁴⁴”</p>		<p>Receipt: Participants’ exposure to the intervention and intervention components, including participant adherence to the number of sessions or activities prescribed in the study protocol (dosage received).</p> <p>Receipt: Includes participants’ understanding of intervention skills and ability to perform intervention related skills <i>during</i> the trial.</p>

	<p>participant understanding and performance of intervention skills during treatment delivery.¹³⁴”</p>			<p>“(receipt) ... addresses whether the participant can perform a new behaviour and therefore expands beyond just exposure or delivery of the intervention to the individual.⁹⁵”</p>
<p>Intervention doses and dosage (23)</p>	<p>Intervention dosage</p> <p>“Dose is either defined as ‘dose delivered’, i.e. the number of components of the intervention delivered, or as ‘dose received’, i.e. the extent to which the participants used the components of the intervention as intended.¹⁴⁰”</p> <p>“Dosage may include (a) the number of times the interventionist addresses a target or uses a technique during a given treatment session (e.g., 30 models in 30 min), (b) how long a treatment session should last, (c) how often treatment should be delivered throughout a week or month (e.g., 1 hr/week), and (d) the total length of required intervention across time (e.g., 9 months.)⁸⁶”</p>	<p>Intervention Receipt</p>		<p>Delivery and Receipt</p> <p>Schedule, duration, intensity, or dose: Report the number of times the intervention was delivered, or meant to be, and over what period of time. Was intervention(s) performed individually or in a group, supervised or not, and where performed (e.g.: home, community, clinic...)?</p> <p>“To what extent were the participants completing the prescribed activities?¹¹⁶”</p>
<p>Participant enactment of intervention or skills (36)</p>	<p>Participant acceptance and uptake of interventions</p> <p>“Enactment: assessment and monitoring of participant behaviour outside of the intervention.⁹⁴”</p> <p>“treatment enactment focus on ensuring that cognitive and behavioural intervention elements are applied in relevant daily life situations.¹³⁸”</p> <p>“the behavioural changes that a participant makes outside a therapy session as a result of an intervention.¹⁴”</p>	<p>Participant enactment of treatment skills^{2,14,15,29,94,103,138,145,146}</p> <p>Participants’ implement the skills in daily life, or real-world settings.</p> <p>Participants</p>	<p>Participant enactment measures what participants do outside of the trial.^{2,14,15,29,94,103,138,145,146}</p> <p>46</p> <p>“Treatment enactment, which has to do with whether the participant actually uses the learned strategies in day-to-day life, is more challenging to measure but could</p>	<p>(Enactment removed from final framework)</p> <p>“Because neither adoption nor enactment measures how well the intervention was delivered as conceived and planned, they are not included as components of intervention fidelity.¹¹²”</p>

	<p>“The uptake of a new intervention depends on its acceptance by and acceptability to those receiving it.”²”</p>		<p>be ascertained using self-report and proxy report instruments given at some point after the trial.¹⁴⁶”</p> <p>“Treatment Enactment. Ensuring treatment enactment is the third component of treatment fidelity. This component refers to the behavioural changes that a participant makes outside a therapy session as a result of an intervention.”</p>	
<p>Participant engagement with intervention (18)</p>	<p>Participant engagement with interventions or responsiveness</p> <p>“In this review, the term ‘participant engagement’ is used as an umbrella term to encapsulate constructs of fidelity that relate to participants’ engagement with intervention content. This includes whether participants understand the intervention, whether they can perform the skills required by the intervention, and whether they use these skills in daily life (‘intervention enactment’).¹⁴⁷”</p> <p>“It may evaluate how far participants fully accept the responsibilities required by an intervention, how far they perceive the intervention to be useful, and, more broadly, how responsive the environment is into which an intervention is introduced. In this sense, “enactment” may be considered a potential element of participant responsiveness.²”</p>	<p>Participant enactment of treatment skills.</p>	<p>”</p>	<p>Removed from final framework</p>

Table 2.4: Coding of fidelity data

BFFS Steps 7: The CONSIDER Framework

The resulting fidelity framework, the **Complex Interventions Design, Delivery, Receipt** (CONSIDER) framework (Figure 2.4), is a multidimensional construct consisting of three main components: Design, Delivery and Receipt. These encompass most of the life cycle of a complex intervention clinical trial, from study design through the clinical trial and process evaluation, with fidelity processes playing a key role in each. Their components were specified and supported with examples and direct quotations from empirical papers identified in the systematic searches in stage 1 and used to create a CONSIDER checklist to facilitate their identification in complex intervention trial papers. The checklist is described later in this chapter. Its reliability was assessed and is described in the following chapter.




Figure 2.4: The Consider Framework

The CONSIDER Framework: Design

In the design category, the essential elements of the intervention and fidelity processes in the clinical trial to evaluate it are specified.^{2,146,167} It includes intervention definition, intervention or programme theory, trial design, and the provider training plan for the clinical trial.

Fifty-five papers in the thematic synthesis addressed components of intervention and study design and 34 addressed aspects of provider training. These items closely correspond to the TIDieR checklist's items; 1 (Intervention name or description), 2 "Why" (rationale, theory, or goal of the elements essential to the Intervention), 3 "What" (Materials: physical or informational materials used in the intervention, delivery or in training of intervention providers), 4. (Procedures: activities, and/or processes used in the intervention, including any enabling or support activities, 5 "Who provided" (intervention provider, expertise, and any specific training given), 6 "How" (modes of delivery of the intervention).³⁵ They also align with Items 11a–d in the SPRIT checklist, relating to trial protocols providing information about "each group with sufficient detail to allow replication' and 'procedures for monitoring adherence to intervention protocols."³⁴

Elements of "Design"

Intervention definition is the specification of an intervention's active ingredients and components and forms the foundation for fidelity.^{167–170} Active ingredients are the treatment elements hypothesized to produce intervention effects.¹⁷¹ They are the essential components influencing the physiological and behavioural effects that the intervention is designed to deliver (object of treatment).^{2,29,146,167,172} Examples include mechanical force applied by a brace to a

joint, lysis of intra-abdominal adhesions during laparoscopy, or learning that modifies a pattern of behaviour. Identifying interventions' active ingredients is vital for differentiation between the experimental and control interventions, ensuring that they do not overlap or provide the same therapeutic elements, confounding attribution of treatment effects to the investigated intervention.^{2,87,107,109,132,146,167,173}

Intervention definition also describes the intervention's **treatment theory**¹⁷⁴, or how particular ingredients directly alter specific aspects of functioning and what actions interventionists take to deliver them to influence the object of treatment.^{2,29,84,104,146,167,172} An intervention may be designed to influence the object of treatment directly or to produce effects distal to the object of treatment.^{89,175,176} For example, endovascular thrombectomy (surgical intervention) with mechanical clot removal (active ingredient) may be designed to achieve vascular reperfusion (direct object of treatment). Progressive resistive exercises (active ingredient) may be prescribed to improve muscle strength as a direct object of treatment object, or as a component in a programme to improve stair climbing, a more distal outcome in which the treatment mechanism does not directly act on the outcome. Treatment theory can help ensure that interventions are targeting appropriate outcomes. More extensive use of treatment-theory has been associated with greater effectiveness and statistically significant increases in effect sizes.^{177,178}

Treatment theory can help delineate interventions' key active ingredients when there are several potential ingredients present.^{2,29,84,104,146,167,172} This can facilitate identification of core and flexible components of an intervention and setting of allowable parameters within which

tailoring or adaptation can take place while ensuring interventions remaining faithful to their underlying theory of action.^{2,29,84,104,146,167,172} This corresponds with TIDieR³⁵ checklist items 9 “Tailoring” (if the intervention is planned to be personalized, titrated or adapted, then describe what, why, when, and how) and CERT³⁶ items 14a and 14b (tailoring and adaption, including detailed description of how exercises are tailored to the individual).

Complex interventions often require **tailoring and adaptation** of interventions to individual participants and contexts.^{6,7,179} This requires identification of contextual factors and participant characteristics that may necessitate intervention adaptation.¹⁷⁹ Some complex interventions, such as surgical procedures, may require adaptation and tailoring that is unforeseeable during protocol planning, and strict adherence to every element of very detailed processes for these interventions may be unsafe or unfeasible. In such cases, it becomes important to determine, *a priori*, which active ingredients or components of the surgical intervention are essential for patient safety as well as intervention integrity and monitor fidelity to those while allowing necessary flexibility for the surgical provider and maintaining essential intervention fidelity.^{13,180} Consideration of the limits of acceptable tailoring and pre-determining allowable parameters for in-trial intervention adaptation are also important when interventions are being evaluated against an active control or standard of care, ensuring that interventions do not deliver the same active ingredients and there is no carryover between groups, maintaining intervention differentiation.^{2,29,95,181}

CONSIDER’s Design category also supports key elements of trials to test the effectiveness of an

intervention. These include the trial's **programme theory**, or how interventions should be structured or administered to achieve a therapeutic outcome and goals that define the structure, process, and outcomes of a clinical trial.¹⁸² Other key elements include best-practice methods for trial protocols and clinical trials following appropriate recommendations such as SCARE¹⁸³, PROCESS¹⁸⁴, CONSORT¹⁸⁵, SPIRIT³⁴, TIDieR³⁵, etc. These include selection of an appropriate study design, experimental and control intervention dosages, and delivery methods, etc. It also supporting the guidance of the Rehabilitation Treatment Specification System (RTSS),^{167,170} and recommendations for surgical trials developed by Blencowe, et al,⁸⁰ by recommending explicit documentation of interventions' hypothesized active ingredients, treatment theory and targets of treatment in the design stage and in study protocols.

Monitoring and reporting elements of Design

CONSIDER emphasizes pre-determining mechanisms for monitoring and reporting of intervention fidelity and ensuring interventionists can deliver the intervention competently and with high fidelity during the trial.^{29,84,98,186,187} These correspond with: CERT³⁶ checklist item 2 (who: qualifications, expertise, or training undertaken by the exercise instructor); 5 (detailed description of how adherence to exercise is measured and reported); items 13 (when and how much, or dosage); and items 16a (describe how adherence or fidelity were measured). Accurate intervention delivery is highly dependent on the skill, experience, and knowledge of the interventionist.^{29,87} Study protocols should include mechanisms to assess for ongoing supervision of intervention delivery throughout the trial to ensure delivery consistency across providers and settings, minimizing provider drift from the protocol over time.^{104,118,130,146}

These mechanisms should be determined, *a priori*, and may include interventionist training in the study protocol with well-defined and study procedures,^{99,188} manualisation of the intervention,^{15,29,122,123} review of the manual with interventionists,^{104,122} interventionist supervision, support and audit of delivery during the trial.^{29,104,160} Provider training may also be enhanced by use of case scenarios and group learning experiences to help support different training needs among intervention providers.¹⁸⁹ Consideration of barriers to successful interventionist training such as intervention complexity, the number of treatment components and the specificity of each should also inform the interventionist training plan.^{29,104,181}

Intervention manuals may contain key details about the trial design, procedures, and programme. They often include an overview of the intervention and the intervention theory, detailed descriptions or depictions of intervention activities, equipment and materials needed, mode of delivery, intervention goals and strategies, and the role and responsibilities of interventionists.^{29,161} They may also provide important guidance for allowable tailoring and adaptation of interventions for individual participants and addressing problems that may arise in the intervention.^{18,29,52,92} Review of intervention manuals that describe intervention and study procedures and assessments with detailed written and photographic descriptions, visual aids, exemplars or decision-making aids and can enhance provider training and intervention fidelity.^{2,87,104,122,190}

Delivery

Delivery encompasses the provision of interventions to participants as specified in the study protocol.^{2,29,106} It focuses mostly on a trial's independent variables and the actions of the provider. Intervention delivery is the most frequently addressed component of fidelity in complex interventions literature.^{27,92} In thematic synthesis, 60 papers described adherence to protocols, 83 addressed aspects of intervention delivery, 29 papers describing maintenance of interventions' integrity, 6 describing intervention tailoring and adaption to individual patients or providers, and 37 describing aspects of provider competence and training in the intervention to ensure fidelity to protocols or treatment integrity.

Elements of Delivery

Key themes in "Delivery" include maintenance of intervention delivery fidelity, also often referred to as treatment integrity or procedural fidelity (was the intervention delivered as intended?) in included papers; quality of intervention delivery; adherence to treatment protocols, tailoring and adaptation of interventions within prespecified limits; ensuring providers are trained and competent to deliver interventions, and controlling for provider differences.¹⁰⁴ This category corresponds with TIDieR³⁵ checklist items 10 "Modifications" (if modified during delivery, what, why, when, and how), and items 11 and 12 "How well (intervention fidelity and adherence and assessment).³⁵ It also corresponds with CERT³⁶ item 5 (detailed description of how adherence to exercise is measured and reported), items 16a and 16b (describe how adherence or fidelity were measured, and extent to which the intervention was delivered as

planned) and The SPIRIT³⁴ item 11c (strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence).

Aspects of Delivery may overlap with, but proceed from, components of Design. For example, adhering to intervention protocols during a trial requires that interventions be operationalized in detail in the Design phase.²⁹ **Intervention delivery fidelity** describes whether intervention components and interventionist behaviours are delivered as intended, ensuring the interventions' delivery of active ingredients.^{130,169} Monitoring of intervention delivery fidelity, preserving interventions' integrity is essential for maintaining differentiation between interventions during a clinical trial. Differentiation minimizes contamination of the intervention under investigation with elements of other interventions or mixing of active ingredients between the control and experimental interventions.^{123,125,129,131,189,191}

Interventionist adherence to study protocols was the most frequently identified component of fidelity of delivery in the thematic analysis, identified in 60 of the 130 papers. While adherence to study protocols supports intervention integrity,^{124,125,127,128} intervention fidelity may not necessarily require strict adherence to every component of the protocol, as discussed previously in the "Design" section, and may be supported by having prespecified allowable tailoring and adaptation of interventions to individual participants or contexts in the design stage. In highly pragmatic trials, however, it may be necessary to prioritise fidelity to treatment theory or the trial's programme theory (theoretical fidelity) to maintain fidelity to interventions' underlying causal processes and reflect real-world clinical practice conditions, rather than fidelity to specific

procedures during intervention delivery (content fidelity).^{21,182,192} This is explored with real-time data gathered prospectively in an ongoing pragmatic trial (ACL-SNNAP¹⁹³) in chapter V.

An important theme identified in thematic analysis was the importance of **provider competence** (trained interventionists) for maintaining fidelity during intervention delivery, corresponding to TIDieR³⁵ item 5, “who provided (describe their expertise, background and any specific training given) and 3 “what (describe physical or informational materials used in training of intervention providers.” Competence captures practitioners’ skill in delivering the intervention and ability to comply with proscribed behaviours and avoid contaminating the intervention with prohibited components or behaviours. This may be influenced by provider training built into a trial at the design stage and providers’ ability to maintain skill in delivering the intervention throughout the trial.^{29,52,194} The influence of provider training and competence extends beyond intervention delivery, also encompassing non-specific treatment effects such as interventionist ability to engage with participants, warmth, and communication skills.^{29,81}

Provider competence during the trial can be supported by ensuring providers are familiar with the intervention manual and can access it as a source of guidance or support, and have supervision to prevent deviation from the intervention protocol or provide guidance when unforeseen modifications are required.^{29,109} Methods designed to enhance and support provider competence should control for provider differences in education, and experience with intervention delivery and monitor whether interventionists maintained the skill set learned in training throughout the clinical trial.^{130,139}

Monitoring of elements of Delivery

Delivery can be monitored by video recording and assessment of patient sessions with a fidelity checklist to ensure the intervention is delivered as specified in the protocol and intervention integrity is maintained.¹⁰⁶ Other assessment options include assessment of randomly sampled audio or video recorded treatment sessions,¹⁹⁵ observation of treatment sessions,^{196,197} interviewing of participants,^{198,199} provider self-assessments,^{85,155} review of provider treatment notes or adherence logbooks^{200,201} with comparison to the protocol or intervention manual,^{29,87,202} and process evaluation to assess protocol adherence and treatment integrity.^{101,106} Many of these actions can also facilitate monitoring provider competence and maintenance of skills learned in training throughout the clinical trial.^{130,139}

Receipt

While Delivery focuses mostly on the actions of intervention providers, Receipt mostly focuses on the actions of the intervention recipients.^{2,15,98,203} It was most often referred to as participant adherence in the eligible papers^{2,4,29,140,204,205} and partially corresponds to CERT³⁶ item 13, SPIRIT³⁴ item 11c and TIDieR³⁵ item 8-“when and how much (number of times the intervention was delivered, when, how much, intensity and dosage) and 11 “how well.”

Elements of Receipt

Intervention Receipt was identified in 42 papers as participants’ exposure to the intervention or its active ingredients (dose), their adherence to the frequency of the intervention or attendance in interventions sessions or appointments (adherence), degree to which they followed clinic

and/or home-based components of the treatment, understanding of intervention skills, and ability to perform intervention-related skills during treatment in the trial.^{28,52,206,81,95,107,130,134,146,165,194} In complex interventions literature, less focus has been placed on monitoring and reporting of intervention receipt than intervention delivery, interventionist training, or other aspects of fidelity.^{28,29,84,152} Nevertheless, key components of receipt such as intervention dose, participant session attendance, comprehension and performance of intervention related skills can greatly influence intervention fidelity and intervention outcomes.^{28,52}

Participants' **exposure to interventions** and their active ingredients can be represented by participants' acceptance and initiation of their allocation intervention (**participant adherence**), the frequency and intensity with which interventions are delivered (dose); the degree of participants' attendance in treatment sessions and performance of intervention activities (adherence).²⁰⁷

Intervention dose can be further classified as either the intervention dose delivered-the number, frequency or intensity with which intervention components are delivered by interventionists, or as the intervention 'dose received', or the extent to which the participants performed the components of the intervention or attended intervention sessions as intended.^{28,52,81,86,95,130,134,165} Measures of the number of treatment sessions or units of an active ingredient participants received can be used to indicate if a treatment met its prescribed dose.^{73,208} For example, dosage may be measured by the number of times the interventionist

addresses a target or uses a technique during a given treatment session, the number of times or duration with which a participant achieves a desired physiological state (e.g. amount of time spent exercising at a desired percentage of maximal heart rate during the intervention), the number of treatment sessions a participant attended or number of time a participant performed an intervention activity (for example, twice weekly over six weeks).^{73,86,143,208,94,121,134,138–142} Dose can be monitored with instruments measuring participants' exposure to the intervention, such as interventionist or participant logs, intervention notes, checklists, or attendance records.¹⁸

Receipt also includes ensuring participants' ability to perform intervention skills during the trial.^{73,86,143,208,94,121,134,138–142} This assesses not just whether (or how much) participants performed intervention activities, but also how well they did so.²⁰⁹ Participants' ability to perform intervention related skills during the trial is important for supporting their exposure to the interventions' active ingredients. This is particularly important for maintaining fidelity in interventions relying on participant-generated movement, such as physiotherapeutic exercise or rehabilitation interventions.¹³⁰ Participants' ability to perform intervention-related skills may also be influenced by moderating factors such as intervention complexity and interventionists' skill in communicating with participants.^{2,29,81,181} CONSIDER's emphasizes manualizing intervention components, and ensuring provider competence in delivering interventions, supporting Receipt.

Monitoring Receipt

Receipt has been operationalized and monitored in a variety of ways in complex interventions literature.²⁸ These include assessment of records from intervention sessions or treatment logs,

participant attendance logs, participant-completed checklists or activity logs, field notes, website monitoring or monitoring of completion of online intervention modules, and qualitative interviews with participants. Other examples included participants being contacted by trialists or receive informational material, DVDs weblinks, emails, texts or other contacts and resources to ensure their understanding of the intervention instructions and enhance intervention receipt. Assessments of participant receipt based on attendance logs, treatment session notes, field notes, daily journals, completion of practice logs, logins/website monitoring, were generally collected during the intervention period.

Moderating factors for intervention fidelity

The Medical Research Council's (MRC) guidance on process evaluations describes the term *context* as including, "anything external to the intervention that may act as a barrier or facilitator to its implementation, or its effects."²¹⁰ Several such potential moderating factors for intervention fidelity were identified during the BFFS and may also need consideration when monitoring fidelity in clinical trials.^{2,29} Factors outside of the intervention, such as scheduling and difficulty accessing the intervention site may influence participant receipt and engagement with interventions. Comorbid conditions reducing participants' ability to perform the intervention, or participation affected by poor interactions with the intervention or interventionist, may also reduce both intervention delivery and intervention receipt in a trial.^{2,29} Providers' prior expertise with an intervention and can also influence participants' receipt and engagement and should be considered when evaluating factors influencing intervention effectiveness.¹³⁹ The acceptability of interventions to providers and provider or participant

equipoise may also influence their delivery of the intervention and participants' receipt.^{143,186,207,211} While these and other factors external to the intervention lie somewhat outside of the core aims of this framework synthesis, they should also be considered as part of a trial's intervention implementation plan or process evaluation.^{2,206}

OBJECTIVE 3: Definitions of Fidelity

Ninety-five descriptions or definitions of intervention fidelity were identified in the systematic review's eligible papers. Multiple terms, such as: adherence, integrity, compliance, concordance, fidelity, or specification were used, often interchangeably, to describe concepts or processes related to intervention fidelity. Researchers conceptualised or discussed fidelity in terms of interventionists' adherence to a study protocol or treatment manual; the extent to which the intervention delivered resembled the intervention that was intended; the extent to which intervention was delivered as planned²¹²; protocol adherence and acceptability; adherence and provider competence²¹³; and, methodological practices used to ensure that a research study reliably and validly tests a clinical intervention (table 2.5).⁸⁸

Term	Example definitions
Adherence	<p>“Although often confused with adherence, which is concerned with participants’ behaviours, fidelity refers to the extent to which the study team complies with the study protocol. A participant who follows the program that his or her randomization or grouping mandates would be considered to be adhering in an occupational therapy clinical trial.¹⁰⁰”</p> <p>“The extent to which patients follow the instructions they are given for prescribed treatments.²¹⁴” “The extent to which an individual corresponds with the quantity and quality of exercise, as prescribed by their healthcare professional.²¹⁵”</p>
Concordance	<p>“The process of enlightened communication between the person and the healthcare professional leading to an agreed treatment and ongoing assessment of this as the optimal course”</p> <p>“measurement of concordance of patient and provider understanding of the problem and/or treatment recommendations^{118.}”</p>
Compliance	<p>“Patients’ obedience to recommendations with prescribed treatments.²¹⁴”</p> <p>“Individual therapist behaviours as compliant/not compliant with the treatment manual. This very stringent procedure showed that there were deviations from the protocol, e.g. because cues prescribed in the manual were omitted or augmented.¹³⁵”</p> <p>“How far those responsible for delivering an intervention actually adhere to the intervention as it is outlined by its designers.²¹⁶”</p>
Fidelity	<p>“Fidelity: Adherence to the intervention protocol, delivery as per manual.²¹⁷”</p> <p>“Fidelity (degree to which the protocol was implemented as planned), the extent to which the intervention has been received by the audience.¹⁵⁸”</p> <p>Fidelity includes quality of delivery and dose.²¹⁸</p> <p>“Delivered as intended; adherence; integrity; quality of program delivery.²¹⁹”</p>
Implementation fidelity	<p>“Whether a program service or intervention is being delivered as it was designed or written.²”</p>
Intervention fidelity	<p>“Intervention fidelity refers to the extent an experimental manipulation has been implemented as intended in a comparable manner to all participants.⁷³”</p> <p>Therapists’ adherence to the intervention protocol.²²⁰</p> <p>“Intervention fidelity (i.e., adherence, compliance, integrity). degree of which the intervention was delivered as originally planned.²²¹”</p> <p>“Ongoing assessment, monitoring, and enhancement of the reliability and internal validity of an intervention or treatment.²⁸”</p>
Treatment fidelity	<p>“All sessions were rated as compliant adherent to manual/treatment intent.¹¹⁷”</p> <p>“The treatment fidelity: the dose, the protocol process adherence and content of treatment delivered compared to the protocol. The extent to which the intended intervention was provided by therapists.”</p> <p>“Treatment fidelity, i.e. if the treatment was delivered as intended. ^{222,223}”</p>
Treatment integrity	<p>“Treatment fidelity is comprised of two components. The first is treatment integrity, the extent to which interventions are implemented as intended for the duration of a study (i.e., each participant receives the intended treatment).¹⁹¹”</p> <p>“Integrity; was the treatment delivered as intended?¹⁰⁵”</p> <p>“treatment integrity, that is, demonstrating that therapists carry out the intervention with adequate levels of adherence and competence to the treatment model or protocol.¹²²”</p> <p>“Treatment integrity typically involves two processes, adherence or fidelity to the manual, protocol, or treatment model, and competence or level of skill with which therapists deliver specified treatments.²²⁴”</p> <p>“Treatment integrity, or procedural fidelity... ¹⁰⁵”</p>
Treatment quality	<p>“Assessment of treatment quality captures the manner in which a treatment is delivered. This component of fidelity assessment seeks to differentiate between treatments implemented well versus interventions implemented poorly.⁸⁶”</p>

Table 2.5: Terms and definitions for fidelity

The words most frequently used when describing or defining fidelity were fidelity (n = 260), delivery (131), training (97) adherence (93), compliance (86) protocol (84), delivered (84) intended (71) and receipt (67) (Figure 2.5).



Figure 2.5: Fidelity terms word cloud

Fidelity and adherence

Within these definitions and descriptions, two distinct concepts emerged: Fidelity and adherence. **Fidelity** (intervention, treatment, or implementation) most often referred to the action of interventionists and the quality of their intervention delivery during the trial. Operational constructs defined fidelity in procedural terms related to the administration of a therapeutic intervention, including the integrity of treatment delivery, or the closeness or concordance of the intervention delivered to the intervention intended in the trial protocol or manual. Definitions focused on construct fidelity referred to the extent to which interventions

delivered in the trial were faithful to their underlying theoretical basis, active ingredients or clinical guidelines.¹⁷³

The other concept, **adherence**, most often referred to action of participants, or the extent to which participants complied (compliance) with, performed, were exposed to or received the intervention in the trial.¹⁰⁰ For example, adherence was exemplified by participants following their randomised group allocation and not crossing over to the comparison condition in surgical or rehabilitation trials,^{2,4,34,78} and attending the prescribed number or therapy sessions or fully performing the required number of home exercises or activities in rehabilitation trials.^{2,4}

Participants who are either underexposed to the intervention because they did not attend intervention sessions or failed to perform intervention activities, or were overexposed to the intervention because they received greater intervention dosage or greater number of intervention sessions than prescribed in the study protocol would be considered non-adherent.¹⁰⁰

Integrated definition of intervention fidelity

Through thematic analysis, we also derived an integrated definition of intervention fidelity in which intervention fidelity is an umbrella concept encompassing two distinct but related and interacting components: intervention fidelity and participant adherence. Both are essential for a clinical trial to be faithful to its protocol, and both can influence study outcomes, individually or together.^{3,225–227}

1. **Intervention delivery fidelity (fidelity)** focuses mainly on the actions of the interventionist.

It encompasses the quality of intervention delivery or performance within the trial, and reflects the correspondence of interventions delivered in the trial with the intervention specified in the study protocol, or in accordance with study procedures, treatment manuals, etc.

2. **Participant adherence (adherence)** focuses mainly on the actions of the participant.

Adherence encompasses both whether participants accept and initiate the intervention allocated, and how well they comply with the prescribed, allocated intervention. For example, this could be represented by measuring whether participants attended the required number of therapy sessions, the frequency of intervention sessions or frequency participants performed intervention activities (for example, completed a home exercise a certain number of times per week). This definition also parallels adherence as defined in pharmaceutical trials.²²⁸

DISCUSSION

Intervention fidelity is an essential part of conducting intervention research and implementing the findings into clinical practice.^{13,18,41,92} A lack of a uniform definition of fidelity and its key components has been identified as a barrier to fidelity planning and intervention implementation in clinical trials and their translation to clinical practice.^{29,229} The broad range of fidelity terms, definitions and concepts used in complex interventions literature also makes it difficult to systematically identify fidelity reporting in clinical trials. The CONSIDER framework synthesizes key aspects of intervention fidelity from 269 empirical and methodological papers to

create a fidelity framework developed specifically for clinical trials of physical complex interventions.

CONSIDER was developed as a basis from which to frame and investigate intervention fidelity in rehabilitation and similar complex interventions in healthcare, but also represents an important first step in providing practical guidance for intervention fidelity in the planning and implementation of clinical trials in domains involving physical complex interventions such as physiotherapy and rehabilitation. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first “Best-fit” framework synthesis of intervention fidelity and first empirically based fidelity framework created specifically for complex interventions in the physical domain. Further development of the framework and checklist with broader input from a wider range of stakeholders is needed to refine the framework and enhance its applicability for future evaluations of complex intervention clinical trials.

Much of the fidelity monitoring identified in this framework synthesis and in previous systematic reviews focuses on intervention components adhering to trial protocols or participant adherence to treatment frequencies.^{28,29,84,152} While these are important elements of intervention fidelity, focusing on these alone neglects the influence of other key elements of fidelity on the outcomes of a clinical trial.^{2,80,194} For example, poor treatment specification or interventionist training in the Design stage may lead to suboptimal intervention delivery, which may lead to poor participant exposure to the intervention (Receipt). CONSIDER offers a more complete

conceptualization of fidelity, encompassing both the interventions and the design and conduct of trials to assess their effectiveness.

CONSIDER also supports intervention fidelity that is flexible, recognizing that tailoring and adaptation of interventions may be necessary to accommodate individual participants and clinical contexts.^{230,231} Rather than rigid adherence to large numbers of intervention components, CONSIDER emphasises tailoring and adaptation within pre-determined boundaries that is based on fidelity to interventions' treatment theory, retaining intervention fidelity while not impeding the application and effectiveness of complex interventions.^{2,80,194}

The CONSIDER framework can be used in conjunction with existing clinical trial models or frameworks to contribute a deeper, broader conceptualization of intervention fidelity. It complements other, established design and reporting frameworks such as CONSORT, TIDieR³⁵ or CERT³⁶. Enhancing fidelity in the design and intervention implementation of clinical trials supports enactment of processes reported on TIDieR³⁵, CERT³⁶ and SPIRIT³⁴. While Intervention fidelity is a separate concept from intervention reporting, an important relationship exists between the two. Intervention fidelity cannot be reported adequately if it has not been previously considered or monitored. The processes which support intervention fidelity also support transparency and enhance the documentation of intervention details needed to support reproducibility and the dissemination of evidence-based methods.^{13,30,92,167,170,186} Variable and imprecise description of intervention components in clinical trial papers makes it difficult to identify the active ingredients interventions were meant to deliver or whether departures from

the intended intervention took place.^{1,35,39,105,167,232,233} CONSIDER complements the recommendations of the Rehabilitation Treatment Specification System (RTSS), emphasizing identification of interventions' active ingredients and treatment theory and the development of empirically testable interventions.^{167,170}

The recommendations of the CONSIDER framework can also support the development of better comparison-control treatments for complex interventions, complementing the DITTO (Deconstruct, Identify, Take out, Think risk, Optimise) framework²³⁴ and ASPIRE guidelines for placebo and sham intervention controls in surgical and rehabilitation trials.⁷⁹ Placebo controls or sham interventions appear similar to the experimental treatments but lack their active ingredients,^{235–238} and minimize the risk of biases such as expectation, performance, detection and confirmation biases.^{17,79,235–240} These biases are high in trials of surgical and physiotherapy interventions and weaken the validity of studies' findings, but placebo interventions are methodologically difficult to construct and present to patients.⁷⁹

Interventions' active ingredients and fidelity, as specified in CONSIDER, can be manipulated to move them from the experimental intervention to a placebo intervention delivering no or very low dose of the active ingredients.²⁴¹ Once the intervention being evaluated has been operationalized, its placebo control can be constructed by “moving the needle” between varying levels of intervention fidelity to produce placebo interventions that are identical to the experimental surgical procedure but lack its active or essential components. For example, in the Can Shoulder Arthroscopy Work? (CSAW) trial, a RCT assessing the clinical and cost-effectiveness

of arthroscopic subacromial decompression for shoulder pain, the essential surgical element (bone and soft tissue removal) was manipulated to randomise participants to an arthroscopic surgery group with the essential surgical element (active arm), a diagnostic arthroscopy only without the essential surgical element (no spur removal) placebo arm) or an active monitoring group.²⁴²

No similar guidance exists for the construction of placebo interventions in Physiotherapy or Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine (PRM), encompassing a larger spectrum of medicine and rehabilitation disciplines.²³⁹ The intensive provider-participant contact and multi-modal nature of physical therapy and PRM interventions present unique challenges for the construction of placebo-controlled trials.²³⁹ The International Placebo Symposium Working Group was convened in 2010 to address these and made a number of recommendations that would be supported by use of CONSIDER, including greater efforts to reduce variability in intervention implementation, greater evaluation of the isolated components of rehabilitation interventions, and use of structural equivalence, in which the experimental and placebo groups have similar degree of therapeutic contact.²³⁹

Strengths, limitations, and future directions

CONSIDER has been developed to encompass the unique challenges and opportunities posed by interventions and clinical trials in domains involving physical complex interventions such as physiotherapy and rehabilitation. We followed a thorough, systematic best-fit framework approach and derived evidence from empirical, methodological, and theoretical literature in

these complex interventions, supporting its applicability in their clinical trials. A reported limitation of many existing implementation frameworks and models is that they describe determinants and moderators of fidelity without elaborating on the relationships between them or the mechanisms linking them to implementation outcomes.^{243,244} Our best-fit framework synthesis sought to overcome this limitation through the secondary thematic analysis and reciprocal translation of themes derived from eligible papers, extensive use of exemplars from the complex interventions literature base, and linking of concepts between and across CONSIDER stages.

Our search strategy was comprehensive and maximized sensitivity rather than precision. It was unrestricted by language and included both commercial and grey literature sources.⁵⁴ A broad range of search terms to ensure relevant papers were captured.⁵⁴ Although the search strategies used in this analysis were comprehensive and conducted in multiple search engines, it is possible that some papers describing intervention fidelity may have been missed. The lack of consensus on definitions and components of fidelity, the many terms used to describe it, and poor reporting of fidelity in complex intervention literature increase the risk that some eligible papers may not have been captured by our search terms. However, we employed citation searching and extensive full-text screening to ensure that papers describing intervention fidelity with unanticipated terms were also captured.

Systematic reviews of complex interventions have found poor or completely absent reporting of fidelity monitoring or assessment across clinical trials.^{41,80,118,245,246} This may reflect some degree

of editorial constraint, in which word count limits and manuscript length restrictions limit reporting of some aspects of the conduct of clinical trials.^{246,247} We attempted to overcome this by rigorous full-text screening of all papers for concepts or processes related to fidelity and searched for trials' protocols or registrations, reviewing them and searching for information about intervention fidelity when they were available. The framework synthesis undertaken in this review also aimed for conceptual saturation and generalizability, rather than statistical power^{55,56}, and study selection was purposive rather than exhaustive. The large number of papers in our best-fit framework synthesis maximized the likelihood that conceptual saturation was reached.

Even with our comprehensive searches, we found few reports of trials assessing intervention fidelity in surgical interventions, despite having worked with surgical trialists to enhance the search strategy's sensitivity and extensive efforts to identify application of fidelity principles in surgical trials. It is possible that some surgical trials may have been missed because the processes that support fidelity during clinical trials were described in terms falling outside of our search strategies. To overcome this, full text screening was undertaken for any surgical papers identified with our search strategies or citation searches to identify papers applying any fidelity principles, even if not labelled as such.

Nevertheless, previous systematic reviews and methodological papers have also identified a paucity of surgical trials monitoring fidelity principles. Beard et al. (2020) reviewed 96 papers describing surgical placebo controlled trials in the development of the ASPIRE guidelines, finding only four papers reporting elements of fidelity and seven reporting standardization of the

intervention, a component of intervention fidelity for clinical trials in CONSIDER.⁷⁹

Methodological papers have also identified the unique challenges to intervention fidelity and adherence posed by surgical trials, including inherent and unpredictable variability in surgical procedures due to surgical findings, surgeon learning curve effects, and high potential for cross-over (poor adherence) between trial arms in trials comparing operative versus nonoperative therapy.⁷⁸ As a result of the poor representation of surgical papers in the BFFS, the CONSIDER framework represents the perspective of rehabilitation (i.e. physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech-language therapy, exercise interventions, etc.) and not of surgery.

Finally, although the “best-fit” framework synthesis method is particularly suited for developing a comprehensive framework based on existing evidence, and our database of empirical and methodological papers was extensive, CONSIDER and the checklist are initial steps that need to be developed further with broader input from a wider range of stakeholders before they can be presented as a tools trialists should be using. In future stages of their development, a Delphi process will be needed to build consensus about the synthesized definition of fidelity, which fidelity components and qualities are most important, and which qualities should be given the most weighting when developing and evaluating intervention fidelity in complex intervention trials.

Additionally, the applicability of the framework and checklist to study settings challenging for fidelity needs to be explored. Explanatory randomised trials are conducted under idealised conditions to give interventions the best chance to demonstrate an effect (efficacy).^{248,249} These

tightly controlled conditions can facilitate maintenance and monitoring of intervention fidelity. However, pragmatic randomised clinical trials are designed to evaluate the relative effectiveness of interventions under real-life²⁵⁰ conditions, with diverse clinical populations,²⁵¹ and against usual care interventions.^{252,253} Key aspects of intervention delivery may be less tightly controlled in pragmatic trials, creating challenges for assessing and maintaining intervention fidelity.^{233,251,254} The applicability of the CONSIDER framework was investigated in an ongoing pragmatic trial of surgical versus rehabilitation management, the Anterior Cruciate Ligament (ACL) Surgery Necessity in Non Acute Patients (ACL SNNAP)¹⁹³ trial in Chapter V.

CONCLUSION

This framework synthesis represents an important first step in addressing a gap in our understanding of intervention fidelity in complex interventions in the physical domain. While growing attention has been paid to fidelity when interventions are translated and implemented in clinical practice, far less research has focused on intervention fidelity during the clinical trials themselves. Guidance specifically tailored to the planning and implementation of intervention fidelity in clinical trials of these complex intervention is rare, and fidelity frameworks developed for psychology and public health trials do not translate well to physiotherapy and surgery. Failure to implement interventions with a high degree of fidelity could negatively affect the accuracy and validity of clinical trials, undermining patient care and the translation of evidence-based interventions into clinical practice.^{13,29,92,255}

The CONSIDER framework offers guidance for intervention fidelity in the planning and implementation of clinical trials, with implications for reproducibility and the translation of evidence-based interventions to clinical practice.^{251,256–258} Further development of the CONSIDER framework with broader input from a wider range of stakeholders is needed. Ultimately, the framework may help researchers design clinical trials that enable research reproducibility and uptake, reducing waste and benefiting the practice and evidencing of complex interventions in rehabilitation.

Bibliography

1. McGee D, Lorencatto F, Matvienko-Sikar K, Toomey E. Surveying knowledge, practice and attitudes towards intervention fidelity within trials of complex healthcare interventions 11 Medical and Health Sciences 1117 Public Health and Health Services. *Trials*. 2018;19:1–14.
2. Carroll C, Patterson M, Wood S, Booth A, Rick J, Balain S. A conceptual framework for implementation fidelity. *Implement Sci*. 2007;2:1–9.
3. McCulloch P, Altman DG, Campbell WB, Flum DR, Glasziou P, Marshall JC, et al. No surgical innovation without evaluation: the IDEAL recommendations. *Lancet*. 2009;374:1105–12.
4. Hasson H. Systematic evaluation of implementation fidelity of complex interventions in health and social care. *Implement Sci*. 2010;5:67.
5. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2008;a1655.
6. McCulloch P, Altman DG, Campbell WB, Flum DR, Glasziou P, Marshall JC, et al. No surgical innovation without evaluation: the IDEAL recommendations. *Lancet*. 2009;374:1105–12.
7. Beard D, Hamilton D, Davies L, Cook J, Hirst A, McCulloch P, et al. Evidence-Based Evaluation of Practice and Innovation in Physical Therapy Using the IDEAL-Physio Framework. *Phys Ther*. 2018;98:108–21.
8. Mak S, Hunt M, Boruff J, Zaccagnini M, Thomas A. Exploring professional identity in rehabilitation professions: a scoping review. *Adv Heal Sci Educ*. 2022;27:793–815.

9. Negrini S, Selb M, Kiekens C, Todhunter-Brown A, Arienti C, Stucki G, et al. Rehabilitation definition for research purposes. A global stakeholders' initiative by Cochrane Rehabilitation. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med*. 2022;58:333–41.
10. McCulloch P, Cook JA, Altman DG, Heneghan C, Diener MK. IDEAL framework for surgical innovation 1: the idea and development stages. *BMJ*. 2013;346:f3012–f3012.
11. Hawe P, Shiell A, Riley T. Theorising interventions as events in systems. *Am J Community Psychol*. 2009;43:267–76.
12. Hamilton AB, Moin T, Bean-Mayberry B, Finley EP, Huynh AK, Stirman SW, et al. A Pragmatic Approach to Guide Implementation Evaluation Research: Strategy Mapping for Complex Interventions. *Front Public Heal*. 2018;6.
13. Blencowe NS, Brown JM, Cook JA, Metcalfe C, Morton DG, Nicholl J, et al. Interventions in randomised controlled trials in surgery: issues to consider during trial design. *Trials*. 2015;16:392.
14. Nelson DL, Mathiowetz V. Randomized controlled trials to investigate occupational therapy research questions. *Am J Occup Ther*. 2004;58:24–34.
15. Karas S, Plankis L. Consideration of treatment fidelity to improve manual therapy research. *J Man Manip Ther*. 2016;24:233–7.
16. Summerfelt WT. Program strength and fidelity in evaluation. Vol. 7, *Applied Developmental Science*. 2003. p. 55–61.
17. Paradis C. Bias in Surgical Research. *Ann Surg*. 2008;248:180–8.
18. Moncher FJ, Prinz RJ. Treatment fidelity in outcome studies. *Clin Psychol Rev*.

- 1991;11:247–66.
19. Schwartz S, Carpenter KM. The right answer for the wrong question: Consequences of type III error for public health research. *Am J Public Health*. 1999;89:1175–80.
 20. Ellefson MR, Oppenheimer DM. Is replication possible without fidelity? *Psychol Methods*. 2022;
 21. Hawe P, Shiell A, Riley T. Complex interventions: how “out of control” can a randomised controlled trial be? *Bmj*. 2004;328:1561–3.
 22. Dobson D, Cook TJ. Avoiding type III error in program evaluation. *Eval Program Plann*. 1980;3:269–76.
 23. An M, Dusing SC, Harbourne RT, Sheridan SM. What Really Works in Intervention? Using Fidelity Measures to Support Optimal Outcomes. *Phys Ther*. 2020;100:757–65.
 24. Salamh PA, Cory CS, Hanney WJ, Condon HE, Liu X, Kolber MJ. The Efficacy and Treatment Fidelity of Kinesiology Taping in Conjunction With Conservative Treatment Interventions Among Individuals With Shoulder Pain: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis. *Int J Sports Phys Ther*. 2021;16:606–19.
 25. Slaughter SE, Hill JN, Snelgrove-Clarke E. What is the extent and quality of documentation and reporting of fidelity to implementation strategies: A scoping review. *Implement Sci*. 2015;10:1–12.
 26. Prowse PT. A Meta-Evaluation: The Role of Treatment Fidelity within Psychosocial Interventions during the Last Decade. *J Psychiatry*. 2015;18.
 27. Toomey E, Hardeman W, Hankonen N, Byrne M, McSharry J, Matvienko-Sikar K, et al.

- Focusing on fidelity: narrative review and recommendations for improving intervention fidelity within trials of health behaviour change interventions. *Heal Psychol Behav Med.* 2020;8:132–51.
28. Rixon L, Baron J, McGale N, Lorencatto F, Francis J, Davies A. Methods used to address fidelity of receipt in health intervention research: a citation analysis and systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2016;16:663.
 29. Gearing RE, El-Bassel N, Ghesquiere A, Baldwin S, Gillies J, Ngeow E. Major ingredients of fidelity: A review and scientific guide to improving quality of intervention research implementation. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 2011;31:79–88.
 30. McGee D, Lorencatto F, Matvienko-Sikar K, Toomey E. Surveying knowledge, practice and attitudes towards intervention fidelity within trials of complex healthcare interventions. *Trials.* 2018;19:504.
 31. Ibrahim S, Sidani S. Fidelity of Intervention Implementation: A Review of Instruments. *Health (Irvine Calif).* 2015;07:1687–95.
 32. Feely M, Seay KD, Lanier P, Auslander W, Kohl PL. Measuring Fidelity in Research Studies: A Field Guide to Developing a Comprehensive Fidelity Measurement System. *Child Adolesc Soc Work J.* 2018;35:139–52.
 33. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, Group C. CONSORT 2010 Statement : Updated Guidelines for Reporting Parallel Group Randomized Trials TO CONSORT. *Ann Intern Med Acad Clin.* 2010;152:1–8.
 34. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Gotzsche PC, Altman DG, Mann H, Berlin JA, et al. SPIRIT 2013

- explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. *Bmj*. 2013;346:e7586–e7586.
35. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *Bmj*. 2014;348:g1687–g1687.
 36. Slade SC, Dionne CE, Underwood M, Buchbinder R, Beck B, Bennell K, et al. Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template (CERT): Modified Delphi Study. *Phys Ther*. 2016;96:1514–24.
 37. Pérez MC, Minoyan N, Ridde V, Sylvestre MP, Johri M. Comparison of registered and published intervention fidelity assessment in cluster randomised trials of public health interventions in low- and middle-income countries: systematic review protocol. *Syst Rev*. 2016;5:177.
 38. Mowbray CT, Holter MC, Teague GB, Bybee D, Gregory B, Bybee D. Fidelity Criteria: Development, Measurement, and Validation. *Am J Eval*. 2003;24:315–40.
 39. Zoldan Gonzalez G, Moseley AM, Maher CG, Nascimento DP, da Cunha Menezes Costa L, Oliveira Pena Costa L. Quality of musculoskeletal trials Methodological quality and statistical reporting of physical therapy randomized controlled trials relevant to musculoskeletal conditions. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2017;in press.
 40. Schoenwald SK, Garland AF. A review of treatment adherence measurement methods. *Psychol Assess*. 2013;25:146–56.
 41. Quested E, Ntoumanis N, Thøgersen-Ntoumani C, Hagger MS, Hancox JE. Evaluating quality of implementation in physical activity interventions based on theories of

- motivation: current challenges and future directions. *Int Rev Sport Exerc Psychol*. 2017;10:252–69.
42. Nielsen B, Tse T, Haslam B, Carey LM. Development of an audit checklist to evaluate treatment fidelity of a complex rehabilitation intervention. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2022;0:1–8.
 43. Riley BL, MacDonald J, Mansi O, Kothari A, Kurtz D, vonTettenborn LI, et al. Is reporting on interventions a weak link in understanding how and why they work? A preliminary exploration using community heart health exemplars. *Implement Sci*. 2008;3:27.
 44. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009;6:e1000097.
 45. Tong A, Flemming K, McInnes E, Oliver S, Craig J. Enhancing transparency in reporting the synthesis of qualitative research: ENTREQ. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2012;12:1–8.
 46. Booth A, Clarke M, Dooley G, Ghersi D, Moher D, Petticrew M, et al. The nuts and bolts of PROSPERO: an international prospective register of systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2012;1:2.
 47. Carroll C, Booth A, Leaviss J, Rick J. “ Best fit ” framework synthesis : refining the method. 2013;
 48. Booth A, Carroll C. Systematic searching for theory to inform systematic reviews : is it feasible ? Is it desirable ? 2015;220–35.
 49. Booth A. Searching for qualitative research for inclusion in systematic reviews: a structured methodological review. *Syst Rev*. 2016;5:74.

50. Carroll C, Booth A, Cooper K. A worked example of best fit framework synthesis a systematic review of views concerning the taking. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2011;11.
51. Painter JE, Borba CPC, Hynes M, Mays D, Glanz K. The use of theory in health behavior research from 2000 to 2005: A systematic review. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 2008.
52. Bellg AJ, Resnick B, Minicucci DS, Ogedegbe G, Ernst D, Borrelli B, et al. Enhancing treatment fidelity in health behavior change studies: Best practices and recommendations from the NIH Behavior Change Consortium. *Heal Psychol*. 2004;23:443–51.
53. United States National Library of Medicine. ClinicalTrials.gov [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.clinicaltrials.gov>
54. Paez A. Gray literature: An important resource in systematic reviews. *J Evid Based Med*. 2017;10:233–40.
55. Gardner T, Refshauge K, Smith L, McAuley J, Hübscher M, Goodall S. Physiotherapists' beliefs and attitudes influence clinical practice in chronic low back pain: a systematic review of quantitative and qualitative studies. *J Physiother*. 2017;63:132–43.
56. Ames H, Glenton C, Lewin S. Purposive sampling in a qualitative evidence synthesis: A worked example from a synthesis on parental perceptions of vaccination communication. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2019;19:1–9.
57. Suri H. Purposeful Sampling in Qualitative Research Synthesis. *Qual Res J*. 2011;11:63–75.
58. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination U of Y. Systematic reviews: CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in health care. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, 2008. 2009. 294 p.

59. Booth A, Carroll C. How to build up the actionable knowledge base: the role of ‘best fit’ framework synthesis for studies of improvement in healthcare. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2015;24:700–8.
60. Saldana J. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications Inc.; 2016.
61. Wolcott HF. *Transforming qualitative data : description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1994. 55 p.
62. Miles MB, Huberman AM. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1994. 69 p.
63. Nowell LS, Norris JM, White DE, Moules NJ. Thematic Analysis. *Int J Qual Methods*. 2017;16:160940691773384.
64. Miles MB, Huberman AM, Saldana J. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. Third Edition. *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. 2014.
65. Barnett-Page E, Thomas J. Methods for the synthesis of qualitative research: a critical review. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2009;9:59.
66. Anderson CA, Bushman BJ, Bandura A, Braun V, Clarke V, Bussey K, et al. Using thematic analysis in psychology Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Psychiatr Q*. 2014;0887:37–41.
67. Sihvonen R, Paavola M, Malmivaara A, Itälä A, Joukainen A, Nurmi H, et al. Arthroscopic Partial Meniscectomy versus Sham Surgery for a Degenerative Meniscal Tear. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;369:2515–24.

68. Swank DJ, Swank-Bordewijk SCG, Hop WCJ, Van Erp WFM, Janssen IMC, Bonjer HJ, et al. Laparoscopic adhesiolysis in patients with chronic abdominal pain: A blinded randomised controlled multi-centre trial. *Lancet*. 2003;361:1247–51.
69. Thakur Y, Jones DL, Skanes A, Yee R, Drangova M. Right-Side RF Ablation Using Remote Catheter Navigation: Experimental Results In Vivo. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. 2012;23:81–7.
70. Sprowson AP, Jensen CD, Parsons N, Partington P, Emmerson K, Carluke I, et al. The effect of triclosan coated sutures on rate of Surgical Site Infection after hip and knee replacement: A protocol for a double-blind randomised controlled trial. 2014.
71. Sprowson AP, Jensen CD, Gupta S, Parsons N, Murty AN, Jones SM, et al. The effect of high dose antibiotic impregnated cement on rate of surgical site infection after hip hemiarthroplasty for fractured neck of femur: A protocol for a double-blind quasi randomised controlled trial. 2013.
72. Casida JM, Yaremchuk KL, Shpakoff L, Marrocco A, Babicz G, Yarandi H. The effects of guided imagery on sleep and inflammatory response in cardiac surgery: A pilot randomized controlled trial. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)*. 2013;54:269–79.
73. Weston M, Batterham AM, Tew GA, Kothmann E, Kerr K, Nawaz S, et al. Patients Awaiting Surgical Repair for Large Abdominal Aortic Aneurysms Can Exercise at Moderate to Hard Intensities with a Low Risk of Adverse Events. *Front Physiol*. 2017;7:1–11.
74. Stephens TJ, Peden CJ, Pearse RM, Shaw SE, Abbott TEF, Jones EL, et al. Improving care at scale: process evaluation of a multi-component quality improvement intervention to

- reduce mortality after emergency abdominal surgery (EPOCH trial). *Implement Sci.* 2018;13:142.
75. Wright N, Abantanga F, Amoah M, Appeadu-Mensah W, Bokhary Z, Bvulani B, et al. Developing and implementing an interventional bundle to reduce mortality from gastroschisis in low-resource settings. *Wellcome open Res.* 2019;4:46.
76. Cousins S, Blencowe NS, Tsang C, Lorenc A, Chalmers K, Carr AJ, et al. Reporting of key methodological issues in placebo-controlled trials of surgery needs improvement: a systematic review. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2020;119:109–16.
77. Robinson NB, Fremes S, Hameed I, Rahouma M, Weidenmann V, Demetres M, et al. Characteristics of Randomized Clinical Trials in Surgery From 2008 to 2020. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4:1–13.
78. Katz JN, Losina E, Lohmander LS. OARSI Clinical Trials Recommendations: Design and conduct of clinical trials of surgical interventions for osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthr Cartil.* 2015;23:798–802.
79. Beard DJ, Campbell MK, Blazeby JM, Carr AJ, Weijer C, Cuthbertson BH, et al. Considerations and methods for placebo controls in surgical trials (ASPIRE guidelines). *Lancet.* 2020;395:828–38.
80. Blencowe NS, Mills N, Cook JA, Donovan JL, Rogers CA, Whiting P, et al. Standardizing and monitoring the delivery of surgical interventions in randomized clinical trials. *Br J Surg.* 2016;103:1377–84.
81. Borrelli B, Sepinwall D, Ernst D, Bellg AJ, Czajkowski S, Breger R, et al. A new tool to assess

- treatment fidelity and evaluation of treatment fidelity across 10 years of health behavior research. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2005;73:852–60.
82. Cronbach LJ, Meehl P. The construct validity of psychological tests. *Psychol Bull*. 1955;52:281–301.
 83. Dejong G, Horn SD, Gassaway JA, Slavin MD, Dijkers MP. Toward a taxonomy of rehabilitation interventions: Using an inductive approach to examine the ‘black box’ of rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2004;85:678–86.
 84. Brogan E, Ciccone N, Godecke E. Treatment fidelity in aphasia randomised controlled trials. *Aphasiology*. 2019;33:759–79.
 85. Hurley DA, Hall AM, Currie-Murphy L, Pincus T, Kamper S, Maher C, et al. Theory-driven group-based complex intervention to support self-management of osteoarthritis and low back pain in primary care physiotherapy: Protocol for a cluster randomised controlled feasibility trial (SOLAS). *BMJ Open*. 2016;6.
 86. Kaderavek JN, Justice LM. Fidelity: An Essential Component of Evidence-Based Practice in Speech-Language Pathology. *Am J Speech-Language Pathol*. 2010;19:369–79.
 87. Behrman AL, Bowden MG, Rose DK. Clinical trials in neurorehabilitation. *Handb Clin Neurol*. 2013;110:61–6.
 88. Carpenter JS, Burns DS, Wu J, Yu M, Ryker K, Tallman E, et al. Strategies Used and Data Obtained During Treatment Fidelity Monitoring. *Nurs Res*. 2013;62:59–65.
 89. Dunn W, Little LM, Pope E, Wallisch A. Establishing Fidelity of Occupational Performance Coaching. *OTJR (Thorofare N J)*. 2018;38:96–104.

90. Miller J, Barber D, Donnelly C, French S, Green M, Hill J, et al. PROPEL: implementation of an evidence based pelvic floor muscle training intervention for women with pelvic organ prolapse: a realist evaluation and outcomes study protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7:843.
91. Toomey E, Matvienko-Sikar K, Heary C, Delaney L, Queally M, Hayes CB, et al. Intervention Fidelity Within Trials of Infant Feeding Behavioral Interventions to Prevent Childhood Obesity: A Systematic Review. *Ann Behav Med*. 2019;53:75–97.
92. Toomey E, Hardeman W. Addressing Intervention Fidelity Within Physical Therapy Research and Clinical Practice. *J Orthop Sport Phys Ther*. 2017;47:895–8.
93. Pérez D, Van der Stuyft P, Zabala MC, Castro M, Lefèvre P. A modified theoretical framework to assess implementation fidelity of adaptive public health interventions. *Implement Sci*. 2016;11:1–11.
94. Bronars CA, Hanza MM, Meiers SJ, Patten CA, Clark MM, Nigon JA, et al. Treatment Fidelity Among Family Health Promoters Delivering a Physical Activity and Nutrition Intervention to Immigrant and Refugee Families. *Heal Educ Behav*. 2017;44:262–70.
95. Resnick B, Michael K, Shaughnessy M, Nahm ES, Sorkin JD, Macko R. Exercise intervention research in stroke: optimizing outcomes through treatment fidelity. *Top Stroke Rehabil*. 2011;18 Suppl 1:611–9.
96. Adams C, Lockton E, Gaile J, Earl G, Freed J. Implementation of a manualized communication intervention for school-aged children with pragmatic and social communication needs in a randomized controlled trial: the Social Communication Intervention Project. *Int J Lang Commun Disord*. 2012;47:245–56.

97. Toomey E, Matthews J, Guerin S, Hurley DA. Development of a Feasible Implementation Fidelity Protocol Within a Complex Physical Therapy–Led Self-Management Intervention. *Phys Ther.* 2016;96:1287–98.
98. Toomey E, Currie-Murphy L, Matthews J, Hurley DA. Implementation fidelity of physiotherapist-delivered group education and exercise interventions to promote self-management in people with osteoarthritis and chronic low back pain: a rapid review part II. *Man Ther.* 2015;20:287–94.
99. Bryant C, Lewis P, Bennell KL, Ahamed Y, Crough D, Jull GA, et al. Can physical therapists deliver a pain coping skills program? an examination of training processes and outcomes. *Phys Ther.* 2014;94:1443–54.
100. Persch AC, Page SJ. Protocol Development, Treatment Fidelity, Adherence to Treatment, and Quality Control. *Am J Occup Ther.* 2013;67:146–53.
101. Forster A, Hartley S, Barnard L, Ozer S, Hardicre N, Crocker T, et al. An intervention to support stroke survivors and their carers in the longer term (LoTS2Care): study protocol for a cluster randomised controlled feasibility trial. *Trials.* 2018;19:317.
102. Campbell R, Rawlins E, Wells S, Kipping RR, Chittleborough CR, Peters TJ, et al. Intervention fidelity in a school-based diet and physical activity intervention in the UK: Active for Life Year 5. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2015;12:141.
103. Karas S, Plankis L. Treatment fidelity: Implications for manual therapy research. 2016.
104. Silveira SL, McCroskey J, Wingo BC, Motl RW. eHealth-Based Behavioral Intervention for Increasing Physical Activity in Persons With Multiple Sclerosis: Fidelity Protocol for a

- Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2019;8:e12319.
105. Toomey E, Matthews J, Hurley DA. Using mixed methods to assess fidelity of delivery and its influencing factors in a complex self-management intervention for people with osteoarthritis and low back pain. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7:1–14.
 106. Avery L, Sniehotta FF, Denton SJ, Steen N, McColl E, Taylor R, et al. Movement as Medicine for Type 2 Diabetes: Protocol for an open pilot study and external pilot clustered randomised controlled trial to assess acceptability, feasibility and fidelity of a multifaceted behavioural intervention targeting physical activity in. *Trials*. 2014;15:1–18.
 107. Boden I, El-Ansary D, Zalucki N, Robertson IK, Browning L, Skinner EH, et al. Physiotherapy education and training prior to upper abdominal surgery is memorable and has high treatment fidelity: a nested mixed-methods randomised-controlled study. 2018.
 108. Muir A, Ziviani J, Boyd R, Sakzewski L. Treatment fidelity in provider-supported parent-implemented intervention studies for infants with/at risk of developmental delay or disability: Systematic review. 2018.
 109. Breckenridge J, Jones D. Evaluation in everyday occupational therapy practice: Should we be thinking about treatment fidelity? *Br J Occup Ther*. 2015;78:331–3.
 110. Broekhuizen K, van Poppel MNM, Koppes LL, Kindt I, Brug J, van Mechelen W. Can Multiple Lifestyle Behaviours Be Improved in People with Familial Hypercholesterolemia? Results of a Parallel Randomised Controlled Trial. 2012.
 111. Cox M, O'Connor C, Biggs K, Hind D, Bortolami O, Franklin M, et al. The feasibility of early pulmonary rehabilitation and activity after COPD exacerbations: External pilot randomised

- controlled trial, qualitative case study and exploratory economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess (Rockv)*. 2018;22:1–204.
112. DeVito Dabbs A, Song MKK, Hawkins R, Aubrecht J, Kovach K, Terhorst L, et al. An intervention fidelity framework for technology-based behavioral interventions. *Nurs Res*. 2011;60:340–7.
113. Di Rezze B, Law M, Eva K, Pollock N, Gorter JW. The Paediatric Rehabilitation Observational Measure of Fidelity (PROF): Development and validation. 2013.
114. Di Rezze B, Law M, Eva K, Pollock N, Gorter JW. Therapy behaviours in paediatric rehabilitation: essential attributes for intervention with children with physical disabilities. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2014;36:16–22.
115. Salamh PA, Liu X, Hanney WJ, Sprague PA, Kolber MJ, Baron JS, et al. Promoting psychosocial well-being following stroke: study protocol for a randomized, controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2018;9:1173–86.
116. Dillon L, Clemson L, Coxon K, Keay L. Understanding the implementation and efficacy of a home-based strength and balance fall prevention intervention in people aged 50 years or over with vision impairment: a process evaluation protocol. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2018;18:512.
117. Fortier CB, Kenna A, Dams-O'Connor K, Fonda J, Levin LK, Hursh C, et al. Feasibility of a Skills-Based Group Reintegration Workshop for OEF/OIF Veterans: STEP-Home. 2018.
118. French CT, Diekemper RL, Irwin RS, Adams TM, Altman KW, Barker AF, et al. Assessment of Intervention Fidelity and Recommendations for Researchers Conducting Studies on the

- Diagnosis and Treatment of Chronic Cough in the Adult: CHEST Guideline and Expert Panel Report. *Chest*. 2015;148:32–54.
119. Galaviz KI, Harden SM, Smith E, Blackman KC, Berrey LM, Mama SK, et al. Physical activity promotion in Latin American populations: a systematic review on issues of internal and external validity. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2014;11:77.
120. Gladwell PW, Cramp F, Palmer S. Matching the perceived benefits of Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation (TENS) for chronic musculoskeletal pain against Patient Reported Outcome Measures using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). 2019.
121. Hand BN, Darragh AR, Persch AC. Thoroughness and psychometrics of fidelity measures in occupational and physical therapy: A systematic review. *Am J Occup Ther*. 2018;72:7205205050p1–10.
122. Hildebrand MW, Host HH, Binder EF, Carpenter B, Freedland KE, Morrow-Howell N, et al. Measuring treatment fidelity in a rehabilitation intervention study. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2012;91:715–24.
123. Kladouchou V, Papathanasiou I, Efstratiadou EA, Christaki V, Hilari K. Treatment integrity of elaborated semantic feature analysis aphasia therapy delivered in individual and group settings. *Int J Lang Commun Disord*. 2017;52:733–49.
124. Lambert JD, Greaves CJ, Farrand P, Cross R, Haase AM, Taylor AH. Assessment of fidelity in individual level behaviour change interventions promoting physical activity among adults: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*. 2017;17:1–13.

125. Leeuw M, Goossens MEJB, de Vet HCW, Vlaeyen JWS. The fidelity of treatment delivery can be assessed in treatment outcome studies: a successful illustration from behavioral medicine. 2009.
126. Arbesman M, Lieberman D, Berlanstein DR. Method for the Evidence-Based Reviews on Occupational Therapy and Stroke. *Am J Occup Ther*. 2015;69:1–5.
127. Mars T, Ellard D, Carnes D, Homer K, Underwood M, Taylor SJC. Fidelity in complex behaviour change interventions: A standardised approach to evaluate intervention integrity. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3:e003555.
128. McLennon SM, Hancock RD, Redelman K, Scarton LJ, Riley E, Sweeney B, et al. Comparing treatment fidelity between study arms of a randomized controlled clinical trial for stroke family caregivers. 2016.
129. Moore SA, Hrisos N, Flynn D, Errington L, Price C, Avery L. How should long-term free-living physical activity be targeted after stroke? A systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2018;15:100.
130. Pastva AM, Duncan PW, Reeves GR, Nelson MB, Whellan DJ, O'Connor CM, et al. Strategies for supporting intervention fidelity in the rehabilitation therapy in older acute heart failure patients (REHAB-HF) trial. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2018;64:118–27.
131. Sandborgh M, Lindberg P, Åsenlöf P, Denison E. Implementing behavioural medicine in physiotherapy treatment. Part I: clinical trial. *Adv Physiother*. 2010;12:2–12.
132. Sandborgh M, Åsenlöf P, Lindberg P, Denison E. Implementing behavioural medicine in physiotherapy treatment. Part II: Adherence to treatment protocol. 2010.

133. Skidmore ER, Dawson DR, Whyte EM, Butters MA, Dew MA, Grattan ES, et al. Developing complex interventions: lessons learned from a pilot study examining strategy training in acute stroke rehabilitation. *Clin Rehabil*. 2014;28:378–87.
134. Wilbur J, Schoeny ME, Buchholz SW, Fogg L, Miller AM, Braun LT, et al. Women’s Lifestyle Physical Activity Program for African American Women: Fidelity Plan and Outcomes. *J Phys Act Health*. 2016;13:1100–9.
135. Woolf C, Cauter A, Haigh Z, Galliers J, Wilson S, Kessie A, et al. A comparison of remote therapy, face to face therapy and an attention control intervention for people with aphasia: a quasi-randomised controlled feasibility study. *Clin Rehabil*. 2016;30:359–73.
136. Barber SE, Jackson C, Hewitt C, Ainsworth HR, Buckley H, Akhtar S, et al. Assessing the feasibility of evaluating and delivering a physical activity intervention for pre-school children: a pilot randomised controlled trial. *Pilot feasibility Stud*. 2016;2:12.
137. White P, Gilworth G, Lewin S, Hogg L, Tuffnell R, Taylor SJCC, et al. Improving uptake and completion of pulmonary rehabilitation in COPD with lay health workers: feasibility of a clinical trial. *Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis*. 2019;
138. Robbins-Welty GA, Mueser L, Mitchell C, Pope N, Arnold R, Park SY, et al. Interventionist training and intervention fidelity monitoring and maintenance for CONNECT, a nurse-led primary palliative care in oncology trial. *Contemp Clin Trials Commun*. 2018;10:57–61.
139. McDowell K, O’Neill B, Blackwood B, Clarke C, Gardner E, Johnston P, et al. Effectiveness of an exercise programme on physical function in patients discharged from hospital following critical illness: A randomised controlled trial (the REVIVE trial). *Thorax*.

- 2016;72:600–9.
140. Broekhuizen K, Jelsma GM J, van PoppelNM M, Koppes LJ L, Brug J, van Mechelen W. Is the process of delivery of an individually tailored lifestyle intervention associated with improvements in LDL cholesterol and multiple lifestyle behaviours in people with Familial Hypercholesterolemia? *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12:348.
 141. Broekhuizen K, van Poppel MNM, Koppes LLJ, Brug J, van Mechelen W. A tailored lifestyle intervention to reduce the cardiovascular disease risk of individuals with Familial Hypercholesterolemia (FH): design of the PRO-FIT randomised controlled trial. 2010.
 142. Yates BC, Schumacher KL, Norman JE, Krogstrand KS, Meza J, Shurmur S. Intervention fidelity in a translational study: lessons learned. *Res Theory Nurs Pract*. 2013;27:131–48.
 143. Robins JL, Jallo N, Kinser PA. Treatment Fidelity in Mind–Body Interventions. *J Holist Nurs*. 2019;37:189–99.
 144. Palsola M, Renko E, Kostamo K, Lorencatto F, Hankonen N. Thematic analysis of acceptability and fidelity of engagement for behaviour change interventions: The Let’s Move It intervention interview study. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2020;25:772–89.
 145. Boden I, Skinner EH, Browning L, Reeve J, Anderson L, Hill C, et al. Preoperative physiotherapy for the prevention of respiratory complications after upper abdominal surgery: Pragmatic, double blinded, multicentre randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2018;360.
 146. Hart T, Bagiella E. Design and implementation of clinical trials in rehabilitation research. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2012;93:S117–26.

147. Walton H, Spector A, Tombor I, Michie S. Measures of fidelity of delivery of, and engagement with, complex, face-to-face health behaviour change interventions: A systematic review of measure quality. *Br J Health Psychol.* 2017;22:872–903.
148. Galea Holmes MN, Wileman V, Hassan S, Denning J, Critchley D, Norton S, et al. Physiotherapy informed by Acceptance and Commitment Therapy for chronic low back pain: A mixed-methods treatment fidelity evaluation. *Br J Health Psychol.* 2022;27:935–55.
149. Clark F, Pyatak EA, Carlson M, Blanche EI, Vigen C, Hay J, et al. Implementing trials of complex interventions in community settings: the USC-Rancho Los Amigos pressure ulcer prevention study (PUPS). *Clin Trials.* 2014;11:218–29.
150. Toomey E, Currie-Murphy L, Matthews J, Hurley DA. The effectiveness of physiotherapist-delivered group education and exercise interventions to promote self-management for people with osteoarthritis and chronic low back pain: A rapid review Part I. *Man Ther.* 2015;20:265–86.
151. Stevens AB, Strasser DC, Uomoto J, Bowen SE, Falconer JA, AB S, et al. Utility of Treatment Implementation methods in clinical trial with rehabilitation teams. *J Rehabil Res Dev.* 2007;44:537–46.
152. Behn N, Harrison M, Brady MC, Breitenstein C, Carragher M, Fridriksson J, et al. Developing, monitoring, and reporting of fidelity in aphasia trials: core recommendations from the collaboration of aphasia trialists (CATs) trials for aphasia panel. *Aphasiology.* 2022;00:1–23.

153. Sekhon M, Cartwright M, Francis JJ. Acceptability of healthcare interventions: an overview of reviews and development of a theoretical framework. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017;17:88.
154. Köykkä K, Absetz P, Araújo-Soares V, Knittle K, Sniehotta FF, Hankonen N. Combining the reasoned action approach and habit formation to reduce sitting time in classrooms: Outcome and process evaluation of the Let's Move It teacher intervention. *J Exp Soc Psychol*. 2019;81:27–38.
155. Hankonen N, Heino MTJ, Araujo-Soares V, Sniehotta FF, Sund R, Vasankari T, et al. 'Let's Move It' – a school-based multilevel intervention to increase physical activity and reduce sedentary behaviour among older adolescents in vocational secondary schools: a study protocol for a cluster-randomised trial. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16:451.
156. Simmons RG, Walters ST, Pappas LM, Boucher KM, Boonyasiriwat W, Gammon A, et al. Implementation of best practices regarding treatment fidelity in the family colorectal cancer awareness and risk education randomized controlled trial. *SAGE Open*. 2014;4.
157. Leventhal H, Friedman MA. Does Establishing Fidelity of Treatment Help in Understanding Treatment Efficacy? Comment on Bellg et al. (2004). *Heal Psychol*. 2004;23:452–6.
158. Wilson MG, Basta TB, Bynum BH, DeJoy DM, Vandenberg RJ, Dishman RK. Do intervention fidelity and dose influence outcomes? Results from the Move to Improve worksite physical activity program. *Health Educ Res*. 2010;25:294–305.
159. Vaughan-Graham J, Cott C, Wright FV. The Bobath (NDT) concept in adult neurological rehabilitation: what is the state of the knowledge? A scoping review. Part II: intervention

- studies perspectives. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2015;37:1909–28.
160. Poltawski L, Norris M, Dean S. Intervention fidelity: Developing an experience-based model for rehabilitation research. *J Rehabil Med.* 2014;46:609–15.
161. Allan LM, Wheatley A, Flynn E, Smith A, Fox C, Howel D, et al. Is it feasible to deliver a complex intervention to improve the outcome of falls in people with dementia? A protocol for the DIFRID feasibility study. *Pilot feasibility Stud.* 2018;4:170.
162. Söderlund A, Bring A, Åsenlöf P. A three-group study, internet-based, face-to-face based and standard-management after acute whiplash associated disorders (WAD) - Choosing the most efficient and cost-effective treatment: Study protocol of a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2009;10.
163. Blanche EI, Fogelberg D, Diaz J, Carlson M, Clark F. Manualization of occupational therapy interventions: Illustrations from the pressure ulcer prevention research program. *Am J Occup Ther.* 2011;65:711–9.
164. Beneciuk JM, George SZ, Greco CM, Schneider MJ, Wegener ST, Saper RB, et al. Targeted interventions to prevent transitioning from acute to chronic low back pain in high-risk patients: development and delivery of a pragmatic training course of psychologically informed physical therapy for the TARGET trial. *Trials.* 2019;20:256.
165. Åsenlöf P, Denison E, Lindberg P. Individually tailored treatment targeting activity, motor behavior, and cognition reduces pain-related disability: A randomized controlled trial in patients with musculoskeletal pain. 2005.
166. Crossley KM, Vicenzino B, Lentzos J, Schache AG, Pandy MG, Ozturk H, et al. Exercise,

- education, manual-therapy and taping compared to education for patellofemoral osteoarthritis: a blinded, randomised clinical trial. *Osteoarthr Cartil.* 2015;23:1457–64.
167. Zanca JM, Turkstra LS, Chen C, Packel A, Ferraro M, Hart T, et al. Advancing Rehabilitation Practice Through Improved Specification of Interventions. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2019;100:164–71.
168. Vaughan-Graham J, Cott C, Wright F V. The Bobath/NDT concept in adult neurological rehabilitation: What is the state of the knowledge? A scoping review. 2015.
169. Salamh PA, Liu X, Hanney WJ, Sprague PA, Kolber MJ. The efficacy and fidelity of clinical interventions used to reduce posterior shoulder tightness: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *J Shoulder Elb Surg.* 2019;28:1204–13.
170. Van Stan JH, Dijkers MP, Whyte J, Hart T, Turkstra LS, Zanca JM, et al. The Rehabilitation Treatment Specification System: Implications for Improvements in Research Design, Reporting, Replication, and Synthesis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2019;100:146–55.
171. Hart T, Dijkers MP, Whyte J, Turkstra LS, Zanca JM, Packel A, et al. A Theory-Driven System for the Specification of Rehabilitation Treatments. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2018;0.
172. Tougas ME, Hayden JA, McGrath PJ, Huguet A, Rozario S. A Systematic Review Exploring the Social Cognitive Theory of Self-Regulation as a Framework for Chronic Health Condition Interventions. Courvoisier DS, editor. *PLoS One.* 2015;10:e0134977.
173. Parham LD, Cohn ES, Spitzer S, Koomar JA, Miller LJ, Burke JP, et al. Fidelity in sensory integration intervention research. *Am J Occup Ther.* 2007;61:216–27.
174. Dijkers MP, Hart T, Tsaousides T, Whyte J, Zanca JM. Treatment taxonomy for

- rehabilitation: Past, present, and prospects. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2014;95:S6–16.
175. Whyte J. Contributions of Treatment Theory and Enablement Theory to Rehabilitation Research and Practice. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2014;95:S17-S23.e2.
176. Hart T. Treatment definition in complex rehabilitation interventions. *Neuropsychol Rehabil.* 2009;19:824–40.
177. Webb TL, Joseph J, Yardley L, Michie S. Using the Internet to Promote Health Behavior Change: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of the Impact of Theoretical Basis, Use of Behavior Change Techniques, and Mode of Delivery on Efficacy. *J Med Internet Res.* 2010;12:e4.
178. Glanz K, Bishop DB. The Role of Behavioral Science Theory in Development and Implementation of Public Health Interventions. *Annu Rev Public Health.* 2010;31:399–418.
179. Poltawski L, Briggs J, Forster A, Goodwin VA, James M, Taylor RS, et al. Informing the design of a randomised controlled trial of an exercise-based programme for long term stroke survivors: lessons from a before-and-after case series study. *BMC Res Notes.* 2013;6:324.
180. Blencowe N, Boddy A, Harris A, Hanna T, Whiting P, Cook J, et al. Accounting for intervention complexity in RCTs in surgery: New approaches for intervention definition and methods for monitoring fidelity. *Trials* Nov 29, 2013 p. O86.
181. Perepletchikova F, Treat TA, Kazdin AE. Treatment Integrity in Psychotherapy Research: Analysis of the Studies and Examination of the Associated Factors. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2007;75:829–41.

182. Bickman L. The functions of program theory. *New Dir Progr Eval.* 1987;1987:5–18.
183. Agha RA, Borrelli MR, Farwana R, Koshy K, Fowler AJ, Orgill DP, et al. The SCARE 2018 statement: Updating consensus Surgical CAse REport (SCARE) guidelines. *Int J Surg.* 2018;60:132–6.
184. Agha RA, Borrelli MR, Farwana R, Koshy K, Fowler AJ, Orgill DP, et al. The PROCESS 2018 statement: Updating Consensus Preferred Reporting Of CasE Series in Surgery (PROCESS) guidelines. *Int J Surg.* 2018;60:279–82.
185. Altman DG. The Revised CONSORT Statement for Reporting Randomized Trials: Explanation and Elaboration. *Ann Intern Med.* 2001;134:663.
186. Toomey E, Matthews J, Guerin S, Hurley DA. Development of a Feasible Implementation Within a Complex Physical Therapy – Led Self-Management Intervention. *Phys Ther.* 2016;96:1287–98.
187. LeLaurin J, Schmitzberger M, Eliazar-Macke N, Freytes IM, Dang S, Uphold C. A commentary on methodological issues in stroke caregiver research: lessons learned from three RESCUE intervention studies. 2019.
188. Birken M, Henderson C, Slade M. The development of an occupational therapy intervention for adults with a diagnosed psychotic disorder following discharge from hospital. *Pilot Feasibility Stud.* 2018;4.
189. O’Neill B, O’Shea O, McDonough S, McGarvey L, Bradbury I, Arden M, et al. Clinician-Facilitated Physical Activity Intervention Versus Pulmonary Rehabilitation for Improving Physical Activity in COPD: A Feasibility Study. *COPD J Chronic Obstr Pulm Dis.*

- 2018;15:254–64.
190. Schaaf RC, Benevides T, Mailloux Z, Faller P, Hunt J, Van Hooydonk E, et al. An intervention for sensory difficulties in children with autism: A randomized trial. 2014.
 191. Lenker JA, Fuhrer MJ, Jutai JW, Demers L, Scherer MJ, DeRuyter F. Treatment theory, intervention specification, and treatment fidelity in assistive technology outcomes research. *Assist Technol*. 2010;22:129–40.
 192. Sheill A, Hawe P, Gold L. Complex interventions or complex systems? Implications for health economic evaluation. *Bmj*. 2008;336:1281–3.
 193. Beard DJ, Davies L, Cook JA, Stokes J, Leal J, Fletcher H, et al. Rehabilitation versus surgical reconstruction for non-acute anterior cruciate ligament injury (ACL SNNAP): a pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2022;400:605–15.
 194. Borrelli B. The assessment, monitoring, and enhancement of treatment fidelity in public health clinical trials. *J Public Health Dent*. 2012;71:S52–S63.
 195. Ownsworth T, Fleming J, Tate R, Beadle E, Griffin J, Kendall M, et al. Do People With Severe Traumatic Brain Injury Benefit From Making Errors? A Randomized Controlled Trial of Error-Based and Errorless Learning. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2017;31:1072–82.
 196. Holt RI, Hind D, Gossage-Worrall R, Bradburn MJ, Saxon D, McCrone P, et al. Structured lifestyle education to support weight loss for people with schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder and first episode psychosis: the STEPWISE RCT. *Health Technol Assess*. 2018;22:1–160.
 197. Morrison JD, Becker H, Stuijbergen AK. Evaluation of Intervention Fidelity in a Multisite

- Clinical Trial in Persons With Multiple Sclerosis. *J Neurosci Nurs*. 2017;49:344–8.
198. Thomas LH, Watkins CL, French B, Sutton C, Forshaw D, Cheater F, et al. Study protocol: ICONS: identifying continence options after stroke: a randomised trial. *Trials*. 2011;12:131.
199. Malden S, Hughes AR, Gibson AM, Bardid F, Androutsos O, De Craemer M, et al. Adapting the ToyBox obesity prevention intervention for use in Scottish preschools: Protocol for a feasibility cluster randomised controlled trial. 2018.
200. Jørgensen MB, Faber A, Jespersen T, Hansen K, Ektor-Andersen J, Hansen J V, et al. Implementation of physical coordination training and cognitive behavioural training interventions at cleaning workplaces--secondary analyses of a randomised controlled trial. 2012.
201. Logan A, Freeman J, Kent B, Pooler J, Creanor S, Vickery J, et al. Standing Practice In Rehabilitation Early after Stroke (SPIRES): a functional standing frame programme (prolonged standing and repeated sit to stand) to improve function and quality of life and reduce neuromuscular impairment in people with severe sub-acu. *Pilot feasibility Stud*. 2018;4:66.
202. Åsenlöf P, Denison E, Lindberg P. Long-term follow-up of tailored behavioural treatment and exercise based physical therapy in persistent musculoskeletal pain: A randomized controlled trial in primary care. *Eur J Pain*. 2009;13:1080–8.
203. Roberts JL, Pritchard AW, Williams M, Totton N, Morrison V, Din NU, et al. Mixed methods process evaluation of an enhanced community-based rehabilitation intervention for

- elderly patients with hip fracture. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8:e021486.
204. Gardner CL. Adherence: A Concept Analysis. *Int J Nurs Knowl*. 2015;26:96–101.
205. Snowden A, Martin C, Mathers B, Donnell A. Concordance: a concept analysis. *J Adv Nurs*. Snowden A. 2014;70:46–59.
206. Lichstein KL, Riedel BW, Grieve R. Fair tests of clinical trials: A treatment implementation model. *Adv Behav Res Ther*. 1994;16:1–29.
207. Williamson E, Ward L, Vadher K, Dutton SJ, Parker B, Petrou S, et al. Better Outcomes for Older people with Spinal Trouble (BOOST) Trial: A randomised controlled trial of a combined physical and psychological intervention for older adults with neurogenic claudication, a protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8.
208. Masterson-Algar P, Burton CR, Rycroft-Malone J. The generation of consensus guidelines for carrying out process evaluations in rehabilitation research. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2018;18.
209. Ginsburg LR, Hoben M, Easterbrook A, Anderson RA, Estabrooks CA, Norton PG. Fidelity is not easy! Challenges and guidelines for assessing fidelity in complex interventions. *Trials*. 2021;22:372.
210. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, et al. Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2015;350:h1258–h1258.
211. Wesson J, Clemson L, Brodaty H, Lord S, Taylor M, Gitlin L, et al. A feasibility study and pilot randomised trial of a tailored prevention program to reduce falls in older people with mild dementia. *BMC Geriatr*. 2013;13:89.

212. Baron JS, Sullivan KJ, Swaine JM, Aspinall A, Jaglal S, Presseau J, et al. Self-management interventions for skin care in people with a spinal cord injury: part 2-a systematic review of use of theory and quality of intervention reporting. *Spinal Cord*. 2018;56:837–46.
213. Stein KF, Sargent JT, Rafaels N. Establishing Fidelity of the Independent Variable in Nursing Clinical Trials. *Nurs Res*. 2007;56:54–62.
214. Bissonnette JM. Adherence: a concept analysis. *J Adv Nurs*. 2008;63:634–43.
215. Argent R, Daly A, Caulfield B. Patient Involvement With Home-Based Exercise Programs: Can Connected Health Interventions Influence Adherence? *JMIR mHealth uHealth*. 2018;6:e47.
216. Gladwell P, Williams WW, Badlan K, Cramp F, Palmer S. Problems, Solutions, and Strategies Reported by Users of Transcutaneous Electrical Nerve Stimulation for Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain: Qualitative Exploration Using Patient Interviews. *Phys Ther*. 2016;96:1039–48.
217. Barber SE, Akhtar S, Jackson C, Bingham DD, Hewitt C, Routen A, et al. Preschoolers in the Playground: a pilot cluster randomised controlled trial of a physical activity intervention for children aged 18 months to 4 years. *Public Heal Res*. 2015;3:1–210.
218. Harwood RH, van der Wardt V, Goldberg SE, Kearney F, Logan P, Hood-Moore V, et al. A development study and randomised feasibility trial of a tailored intervention to improve activity and reduce falls in older adults with mild cognitive impairment and mild dementia. *Pilot feasibility Stud*. 2018;4:49.
219. Proctor E, Silmere H, Raghavan R, Hovmand P, Aarons G, Bunger A, et al. Outcomes for

- Implementation Research: Conceptual Distinctions, Measurement Challenges, and Research Agenda. *Adm Policy Ment Heal Ment Heal Serv Res*. 2011;38:65–76.
220. Pyatak EA, Carandang K, Vigen C, Blanchard J, Sequeira PA, Wood JR, et al. Resilient, Empowered, Active Living with Diabetes (REAL Diabetes) study: Methodology and baseline characteristics of a randomized controlled trial evaluating an occupation-based diabetes management intervention for young adults. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2017;54:8–17.
221. Burkart S, St Laurent CW, Alhassan S. Process evaluation of a culturally-tailored physical activity intervention in African-American mother-daughter dyads. *Prev Med reports*. 2017;8:88–92.
222. Tuntland H, Aaslund MK, Espehaug B, Førland O, Kjekken I. Reablement in community-dwelling older adults: A randomised controlled trial Physical functioning, physical health and activity. *BMC Geriatr*. 2015;15.
223. Sturkenboom IH, Nijhuis-van der Sanden MW, Graff MJ. A process evaluation of a home-based occupational therapy intervention for Parkinson’s patients and their caregivers performed alongside a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Rehabil*. 2016;30:1186–99.
224. Godfrey E, Galea Holmes M, Wileman V, Mccracken L, Norton S, Moss-Morris R, et al. Physiotherapy informed by Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (PACT): Protocol for a randomised controlled trial of PACT versus usual physiotherapy care for adults with chronic low back pain. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6.
225. Cook CE, George SZ, Keefe F. Different interventions, same outcomes? Here are four good reasons. *Br J Sports Med*. 2018;52:951–2.

226. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, et al. A new framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions: Update of Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2021;374:1–11.
227. Thibaut A, Beudart C, Martens G, Bornheim S, Kaux JF. Common Bias and Challenges in Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine Research: How to Tackle Them. *Front Rehabil Sci*. 2022;3:1–12.
228. Dalli LL, Kilkenny MF, Arnet I, Sanfilippo FM, Cummings DM, Kapral MK, et al. Towards better reporting of the proportion of days covered method in cardiovascular medication adherence: A scoping review and new tool TEN-SPIDERS. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2022;88:4427–42.
229. Sweeney-Magee M, Kale D, Galton S, Hamill A, Gilbert H. Assessing the fidelity of delivery of an intervention to increase attendance at the English Stop Smoking Services. *Implement Sci*. 2016;11:166.
230. James K, Quirk A, Patterson S, Brennan G, Stewart D. Quality of intervention delivery in a cluster randomised controlled trial: A qualitative observational study with lessons for fidelity. *Trials*. 2017;18:1–10.
231. Stirman SW, Miller CJ, Toder K, Calloway A. Development of a framework and coding system for modifications and adaptations of evidence-based interventions. *Implement Sci*. 2013;8:65.
232. Yamato TP, Maher CG, Saragiotto BT, Hoffmann TC, Moseley AM. How completely are physiotherapy interventions described in reports of randomised trials? *Physiother (United*

- Kingdom). 2016;102:121–6.
233. Vernooij-Dassen M, Moniz-Cook E. Raising the standard of applied dementia care research: Addressing the implementation error. *Aging Ment Health*. 2014;18:809–14.
234. Cousins SE, Blencowe NS, Tsang C, Chalmers KA, Mardanpour A, Carr A, et al. Optimising the design of invasive placebo interventions in randomised controlled trials. *Br J Surg*. 2019;in press.
235. Probst P, Grummich K, Harnoss JC, Hüttner FJ, Jensen K, Braun S, et al. Placebo-Controlled Trials in Surgery. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2016;95:e3516.
236. Tracey I. Getting the pain you expect: Mechanisms of placebo, nocebo and reappraisal effects in humans. *Nat Med*. 2010;16:1277–83.
237. Maddocks M, Kerry R, Turner A, Howick J. Problematic placebos in physical therapy trials. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2016;22:598–602.
238. Niemansburg SL, van Delden JJM, Dhert WJA, Bredenoord AL. Reconsidering the ethics of sham interventions in an era of emerging technologies. *Surgery*. 2015;157:801–10.
239. Fregni F, Imamura M, Chien HF, Lew HL, Boggio P, Kaptchuk TJ, et al. Challenges and Recommendations for Placebo Controls in Randomized Trials in Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2010;89:160–72.
240. Bialosky JE, Bishop MD, Cleland JA. Individual Expectation: An Overlooked, but Pertinent, Factor in the Treatment of Individuals Experiencing Musculoskeletal Pain. *Phys Ther*. 2010/06/30. 2010;90:1345–55.
241. Campaner R, Cerri M. Manipulative evidence and medical interventions: some

- qualifications. *Hist Philos Life Sci.* 2020;42:15.
242. Beard DJ, Rees JL, Cook JA, Rombach I, Cooper C, Merritt N, et al. Arthroscopic subacromial decompression for subacromial shoulder pain (CSAW): a multicentre, pragmatic, parallel group, placebo-controlled, three-group, randomised surgical trial. *Lancet.* 2018;391:329–38.
243. Burchett HED, Blanchard L, Kneale D, Thomas J. Assessing the applicability of public health intervention evaluations from one setting to another: a methodological study of the usability and usefulness of assessment tools and frameworks. *Heal Res Policy Syst.* 2018;16:88.
244. Ziemann A, Brown L, Sadler E, Ocloo J, Boaz A, Sandall J. Influence of external contextual factors on the implementation of health and social care interventions into practice within or across countries—a protocol for a ‘best fit’ framework synthesis. *Syst Rev.* 2019;8:258.
245. Greaves CJ, Sheppard KE, Abraham C, Hardeman W, Roden M, Evans PH, et al. Systematic review of reviews of intervention components associated with increased effectiveness in dietary and physical activity interventions. *BMC Public Health.* 2011;11:119.
246. Schroter S, Glasziou P, Heneghan C. Quality of descriptions of treatments: A review of published randomised controlled trials. *BMJ Open.* 2012;2:1–7.
247. Glasziou P, Meats E, Heneghan C, Shepperd S. What is missing from descriptions of treatment in trials and reviews? *BMJ.* 2008;336:1472–4.
248. Rothwell PM. External validity of randomised controlled trials: “To whom do the results of this trial apply?” *Lancet.* 2005;365:82–93.

249. Loudon K, Treweek S, Sullivan F, Donnan P, Thorpe KE, Zwarenstein M. The PRECIS-2 tool: designing trials that are fit for purpose. *BMJ*. 2015;350:h2147–h2147.
250. Luce BR, Drummond M, Jönsson B, Neumann PJ, Schwartz J. S, Siebert U, et al. EBM, HTA, and CER: Clearing the Confusion. *Milbank Q*. 2010;88:256–76.
251. Keefe FJ, Jensen MP, Williams AC d. C, George SZ. The yin and yang of pragmatic clinical trials of behavioral interventions for chronic pain. *Pain*. 2021;Publish Ah.
252. Patsopoulos NA. A pragmatic view on pragmatic trials. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci*. 2011;13:217–24.
253. Dal-Ré R, Janiaud P, Ioannidis JPA. Real-world evidence: How pragmatic are randomized controlled trials labeled as pragmatic? *BMC Med*. 2018;16:49.
254. Nieuwenhuis JB, Irving E, Oude Rengerink K, Lloyd E, Goetz I, Grobbee DE, et al. Pragmatic trial design elements showed a different impact on trial interpretation and feasibility than explanatory elements. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2016;77:95–100.
255. Candy B, Vickerstaff V, Jones L, King M. Description of complex interventions: Analysis of changes in reporting in randomised trials since 2002. *Trials*. 2018;19:1–9.
256. Breitenstein SM, Gross D, Garvey CA, Hill C, Fogg L, Resnick B. Implementation fidelity in community-based interventions. *Res Nurs Health*. 2010;33:164–73.
257. Denis JL, Hebert Y, Langley A, Lozeau D, Trottier LH. Explanation Diffusion Patterns of Complex Health Care Innovations. *Heal Care Manag Rev*. 2002;27:60–73.
258. McCreight MS, Rabin BA, Glasgow RE, Ayele RA, Leonard CA, Gilmartin HM, et al. Using the Practical, Robust Implementation and Sustainability Model (PRISM) to qualitatively

assess multilevel contextual factors to help plan, implement, evaluate, and disseminate health services programs. *Transl Behav Med.* 2019;9:1002–11.

