

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Implementation of a community-based, multidisciplinary, family-focused childhood weight management programme: Barriers and facilitators for success

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-016459
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Feb-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Kelleher, Emily; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Harrington, Janas; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Shiely, Frances; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Perry, Ivan; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Mc Hugh, Sheena; University College Cork, Epidemiology & Public Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research, Health services research, Public health
Keywords:	Implementation, barriers, facilitators, childhood, obesity, community

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Title:
4

5 Implementation of a community-based, multidisciplinary, family-focused childhood weight management
6 programme: Barriers and facilitators for success
7
8

9
10 Corresponding Author:
11

12 Emily Kelleher, MPH BSc, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, 4th Floor, Western Gateway Building,
13 University College Cork, Ireland. Email: emily.kelleher@ucc.ie Tel: 00353 (21) 4205517
14
15

16
17 Authors:
18

19 Emily Kelleher, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
20

21
22 Janas M Harrington, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
23

24
25 Frances Shiely, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork and HRB Clinical
26 Research Facility, Mercy University Hospital, Grenville Place, Cork, Ireland
27

28
29 Ivan J Perry, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
30

31
32 Sheena M McHugh, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
33
34

35 Word Count:
36

37 4159
38
39

40 Keywords:
41

42 Implementation; barriers; facilitators; childhood; obesity; community; treatment
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT:

Objective: To explore the barriers and facilitators experienced by those implementing a government-funded, community-based, childhood weight management programme.

Design: Qualitative using semi-structured interviews.

Setting: Two geographical regions in the south and west of the Republic of Ireland.

Participants: 29 national and local level stakeholders responsible for implementing the programme including professionals from dietetics, psychology, public health nursing, physiotherapy, health promotion and administration.

Methods: Framework analysis was used to identify barriers and facilitators which were mapped onto six levels of factors influencing implementation outlined by Grol and Wensing: the innovation, the individual professional, the patient, the social context, the organisational context, and the external environment.

Results: Most barriers occurred at the level of the organisational context. For all stakeholders, barriers arose due to the multidisciplinary nature of the programme, including the lack of role clarity and added complexity of working in different locations. Health professionals' low-perceived self-efficacy in approaching the subject of weight with parents and parental resistance to hearing about their child's weight status were barriers to programme implementation at the individual professional and patient levels, respectively. The main facilitators of implementation, occurring at the level of the health professional, included stakeholders' recognition of the need for a weight management programme and personal interest in the area of childhood obesity. Having a local lead and supportive colleagues were further implementation drivers.

Conclusions: This study highlights the complexities associated with implementing a multidisciplinary childhood weight management programme, particularly translating such programmes to a community setting. Our results suggest the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, the provision of sufficient practical training and resources, and organisational support play pivotal roles in overcoming barriers to change. This evidence can be used to develop an implementation plan to support the translation of interventions into real world settings.

KEYWORDS:

Implementation; barriers; facilitators; childhood; obesity; community

ARTICLE SUMMARY**Article Focus**

- International agencies recommend multi-component programmes to treat and manage childhood obesity.
- These recommendations are largely based on small-scale studies conducted in controlled settings with specialised staff, thus limiting their applicability and generalizability to the real-world.
- When introduced under less-controlled conditions, insight into the factors influencing implementation is crucial. Therefore, the aim of this study was to explore and categorise the barriers and facilitators experienced by those implementing a government-funded, community-based, multi-component childhood weight management pilot programme to inform their eventual scale up.

Strengths and limitations

- While this paper describes barriers and facilitators from the perspective of a wide range of stakeholders and provided a thorough overview of the relevant issues, the themes that emerged were relatively homogenous across disciplines which added to the authority of the findings.
- Data were analysed using a systematic approach [1] and an adapted version of the recognised implementation model by Grol and Wensing was used to classify the barriers and facilitators into levels [2].

BACKGROUND:

Childhood obesity is a worldwide public health concern and there is now widespread agreement that the complex aetiology of the issue requires a multifaceted approach to treatment [4-6]. International recommendations agree that initiatives to treat and manage childhood obesity should be family-focused and

1
2
3 combine healthy eating, physical activity and behavioural components [7]. In 2016, the World Health
4 Organisation published their report of the commission on ending childhood obesity within which they echo
5 these recommendations but also add that they should be delivered by “*multi-professional teams with*
6 *appropriate training and resources*” [8]pg.11. These recommendations, however, have been largely based on
7 small-scale studies conducted in controlled settings with specialised staff, thus limiting their applicability and
8 generalizability to ‘real-world’ settings such as communities or hospitals [5].
9
10
11
12
13

14
15 In public health, once interventions have undergone innovation testing and demonstrated efficacy the next
16 steps include replication and ‘scale-up’ to larger populations in ‘real-world’ settings [9]. There are relatively
17 few examples of published studies reporting on the pragmatic application of effective childhood obesity
18 treatment programmes [10, 11]. While implementation issues such as engagement, local context, staffing and
19 funding are likely to be common across many public health interventions [11], little is documented about the
20 experience of those implementing childhood weight management programmes and even fewer studies detail
21 the factors influencing implementation [12]. For example, a lack of providers trained in evidence-based care
22 for childhood obesity was listed by delegates attending a recent conference in the United States as a major
23 barrier to treatment implementation [6]. Furthermore, with the majority of families declining referral and up
24 to 75% of families discontinuing care, poor engagement with families has proven to be a significant challenge
25 facing teams tasked with implementing such programmes [13, 14].
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 When introduced under less-controlled conditions, insight into the factors influencing implementation is
38 crucial. Therefore, the aim of this study was to explore and categorise the barriers and facilitators experienced
39 by those implementing a government-funded, community-based, multi-component childhood weight
40 management pilot programme to inform their eventual scale up.
41
42
43
44
45

46 **METHODS:**

47 **Intervention and context**

48
49 Although trends appear to be stabilising in Ireland, prevalence of childhood obesity remains high [15].
50 Currently, in Ireland, almost one in four children are either overweight or obese [16] and there is no
51 standardised community-based weight management programme available to those children with obesity.
52 Community programmes are usually provided on an ad-hoc basis and are rarely evaluated or sustained. In an
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 attempt to provide universal treatment the Irish Health Service Executive (HSE) planned to pilot the *W82GO-*
4 *community* programme in two communities with the intention of rolling the programme out nationwide after
5 pilot programme completion.
6
7

8
9
10 *W82GO* aims to improve nutrition, increase physical activity and facilitate behaviour change over one year
11 [17]. It was designed as a hospital-based, family-focused, multidisciplinary programme grounded in
12 behavioural change theory and was modelled on best practice recommendations [5, 7, 8]. The primary goal is a
13 reduction in Body Mass Index Standard Deviation Score and has previously been found to be effective when
14 delivered in a hospital out-patient setting [17].
15
16
17

18
19
20 The *W82GO* programme involves an initial individual assessment to ascertain eligibility followed by two
21 phases. Phase 1 is the initial intensive phase and consists of six weekly group sessions for both the child and
22 his/her parent/carer. These sessions last approximately one and a half to two hours and incorporate
23 educational and practical sessions to increase physical activity, improve nutrition and increase sleep. Upon
24 completion of phase 1, children return with their parents/care-givers for three booster group sessions at three,
25 six and nine months. These sessions aim to encourage the family to continue with lifestyle change and to
26 manage any barriers to change. Finally, at 12 months, the children and their parents/care-givers return for a
27 final individual assessment to document any changes and make plans for sustainment.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 For the current study, *W82GO* was adapted and implemented in two community sites (Site A and Site B) from
37 April 2015 for 12 months and subsequently renamed *W82GO-community*. Both sites were chosen as they were
38 part of a national pilot growth measurement programme and included a mix of rural and urban towns in the
39 west and south of Ireland. Initial assessments took place in community healthcare offices while subsequent
40 group sessions were delivered on weekdays in the afternoon at a local sports or community centre. The
41 programme was offered free of charge and was delivered by a multidisciplinary team of community health
42 professionals including dietitians, physiotherapists, public health nurses, psychologists, health promotion
43 officers and area medical officers. These health professionals were invited to take part in a training
44 programme prior to programme commencement. Training included a needs assessment, a one day
45 educational training course and two days of clinical shadowing with an experienced *W82GO* programme
46 practitioner at the National Children's University Hospital where it was developed. Each community
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practitioner was supplied with a user manual which outlined the programme and detailed the content for both
4
5 phases.

6 7 **Study design and sample**

8
9
10 A qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews was utilised. All stakeholders involved in
11
12 implementing the *W82GO-community* pilot programme (n=38) were contacted by email in the first instance
13
14 and followed up by telephone contact during which the researcher outlined the study aims and methodology.
15
16 Stakeholders included professionals from dietetics, clinical psychology, public health nursing, physiotherapy,
17
18 health promotion, administration as well as individuals from both national and local-level management.

19 20 **Data collection**

21
22
23 All participants were invited to take part in face-to-face interviews. However, due to time and scheduling
24
25 difficulties a mixture of telephone (n=22) and face-to-face (n=7) interviews were conducted between August
26
27 2015 and February 2016 (during programme implementation). To ensure consistency all interviews were
28
29 conducted by a single researcher (EK), trained in qualitative research methods, using a semi structured topic
30
31 guide. This guide was developed based on relevant literature and focused on seven issues: (1) awareness of
32
33 the issue of childhood obesity and existing healthy lifestyle programmes, (2) perceived value of and interest in
34
35 community evidence-based treatment programmes, (3) communication of the *W82GO-community* pilot
36
37 programme; (4) specific role in implementing *W82GO-community*; (5) barriers and enablers to
38
39 implementation; (6) perceived successes and challenges experienced and finally (7) recommendations for the
40
41 future roll-out of childhood weight management programmes in Irish communities. Stakeholders were
42
43 specifically asked to report on the barriers and facilitators to inform the implementation and eventual scale-up
44
45 of community-based obesity treatment programmes. Prompts and probes were used throughout the
46
47 interviews to stimulate discussion. Prior to each interview, participants were informed about the purpose of
48
49 the study, that participation was voluntary and that they could terminate the interview at any stage for any
50
51 reason. Signed informed consent was obtained before each interview, which lasted on average 45 minutes.
52
53 Interviews continued until data saturation was reached, that is when no new themes emerged during the
54
55 preliminary analysis of three consecutive interviews [18]. Interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed
56
57 verbatim.
58
59
60

Data Analysis

Framework analysis was used to analyse the data [1]. This approach enabled the investigation of a priori objectives while also allowing new themes to emerge from the data. One researcher (EK) transcribed and coded each transcript while another (SMH) also undertook initial coding of a selection of transcripts. Similarities and differences between the coding labels and definitions were discussed and the coding framework was refined and applied to the remaining interviews. Codes were synthesised and grouped according to the dominant emergent themes. These themes were mapped onto a framework developed by Grol and Wensing (2004) which specifies six levels of factors that facilitate or impede implementation success: the innovation; the individual professional, the patient; the social context; the organisational context; and the economic and political environment [2]. This framework (Table 1) was chosen because it describes how barriers and facilitators can be identified, categorised, and used for the development of tailored-based implementation strategies to facilitate desired change [2], in this instance implementing the *W82GO-community* programme. Discrepancies on the mapping of themes were discussed until consensus was reached. NVivo (QSR v10) was used to manage data analysis.

Table 1 Barriers to and incentives for change at different levels of healthcare^a

Level	Barriers / Incentives
Innovation	Advantages in practice, feasibility, credibility, attractiveness, accessibility
Individual Practitioner	Awareness, knowledge, attitude, motivation to change, behavioural routines
Patient	Knowledge, skills, attitude, compliance
Social Context	Opinion of colleagues, culture of the network, collaboration, leadership
Organisational Context	Organisation of care processes, staff, capacities, resources, structures
Economic and Political Context	Financial arrangements, regulations, policies

^a*Grol and Wensing's multilevel model[2]*

RESULTS

Stakeholder Characteristics

We contacted 38 stakeholders and recruited 29 interviewees from a range of disciplines and professions, yielding a response rate of 76% (Table 2).

Table 2 Stakeholder characteristics

	Site A	Site B	National	Total
National Manager	NA	NA	1	1
Local Manager	1	1	x	2
Physiotherapists	2	1	1	4
Dietitians	3	x	x	3
Psychologists	1	1	1	3
Public Health Nurses	6	3	x	9
Area Medical Officers	x	1	x	1
Health Promotion Officers	3	1	x	4
Administration	1	x	1	2
Total	17	8	4	29

Barriers and Facilitators

For all participants, barriers arose due to the multidisciplinary nature of the programme, including the lack of understanding of other disciplines, lack of role clarity as well as the added complexities of working in different locations. Participants' recognition of the need for a childhood obesity programme and their own personal interest in the area were the main drivers of implementation while the presence of a local lead and supportive colleagues were further enabling factors. Table 3 presents the perceived barriers and facilitators from the perspective of the stakeholders mapped onto the six implementation levels with quotations to illustrate each level.

INSERT TABLE 3 – Included as a supplementary file

The Innovation

In terms of the *W82GO-community* pilot programme (innovation), while stakeholders believed it came from a credible source having been developed by one of the national children's hospitals in Ireland, many had doubts over its accessibility and about how well it would transfer to the community setting. This uncertainty resulted in feelings of unease and community practitioners were hesitant to get involved initially. One stakeholder explained how she worried at length about what impact the programme would have on existing services and how feasible it was to run in the community; *"The setting is different. We were taking a programme that was from an acute setting into the community - that possibly was where the breakdown happened because you didn't have the same services. You didn't have people on site. There was travel, there was all these other*

1
2
3 logistics that weren't thought about when they were moving an acute programme to the community",
4
5 W82GO021. In particular, stakeholders believed they were dealing with a very different cohort of families than
6
7 the hospital-based programme as described by the following quote; "You've a very different kind of child
8
9 coming into the hospital than you do in the general community. You've a very different kind of parent. Even if
10
11 you'd a parent who was resistant to hearing about their child being overweight, if they are attending hospital
12
13 appointments regularly they are obviously already engaged about their child's health... so I believe that's a
14
15 major barrier straight away that they possibly didn't have to face in the hospital you know?", W82GO010.

16
17 In addition to the differences in the target group, stakeholders believed the programme was too medicalised
18
19 for the community setting and some felt it didn't fit with their perception of a healthy lifestyle programme.
20
21 This was due to the number of health professionals involved and in particular, the involvement of medical
22
23 staff. Furthermore, many stakeholders thought the collection of clinical markers of disease and medical history
24
25 during the initial assessments was unnecessary. As one stakeholder described; "the initial assessments were
26
27 totally irrelevant. I mean when I heard that bloods were being taken I thought oh for God sake. You know we
28
29 were supposed to be running a community-based education intervention where the focus should be on
30
31 changing lifestyles. It's not our job to be diagnosing other problems", W82GO005.

32 33 Individual Professional

34
35 While stakeholders both applauded and recognised the need for such an approach to the treatment of
36
37 childhood obesity, the multidisciplinary nature of the programme created significant barriers to programme
38
39 implementation. The variety of community health professionals involved in the implementation of W82GO-
40
41 community with differing perspectives and priorities led to role uncertainty and in some cases a perception of
42
43 disrespect between disciplines. One stakeholder captures this theme in the following quote; "I suppose the
44
45 other main challenge was the multidisciplinary nature of the programme. I think the challenge is when you put
46
47 together a team obviously from all different backgrounds not with different agendas but with different
48
49 experiences and knowledge and different perspectives", W82GO026. Stakeholders described how "there was
50
51 quite a lack of understanding of the various discipline roles and responsibilities and some were even unsure of
52
53 what some disciplines did", W82GO012. This lack of understanding sometimes resulted in tension between
54
55 disciplines and created a challenging environment to work in. Others recalled feeling concerned about where
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 they fit into the programme and believed a structured programme plan outlining specific roles and
4
5 responsibilities was lacking.
6

7
8 Another key barrier that emerged at the level of the individual professional was their low perceived self-
9
10 efficacy in dealing with childhood obesity and/or working with this young age group. In particular, many
11
12 stakeholders reported their fear of approaching the subject with parents given the risk of upsetting them or
13
14 *“rocking the boat”*. One stakeholder reported that *“it’s something you want to do something about but it can
15
16 be very difficult to approach the subject with parents. It’s a very sensitive issue”*, W82GO001. In our study,
17
18 stakeholders in Site A received motivational interviewing workshops for childhood obesity. This training
19
20 equipped these stakeholders with increased skills and confidence in working with families on weight
21
22 management issues. As one stakeholder described, post motivational interviewing training she wasn’t
23
24 *“frightened of dealing with them at all. It’s kind of second nature to me now... I know the buzz words, I know
25
26 exactly what to say to them. And body language, the whole lot”*, W82GO002. Others felt it was quite ‘alien’ to
27
28 work with children aged 4-6 years and believed they hadn’t the appropriate training to do so.

29
30 Despite these barriers, all stakeholders were aware that childhood obesity was an issue in their respective
31
32 communities and recognised the urgent need for treatment; *“Yeah I think it’s a time bomb that went off over
33
34 the past ten years and that we are behind it, way behind and the sooner we get going and doing whatever we
35
36 can the better”*, W82GO012. Furthermore, stakeholders’ personal interest in tackling the issue, and their
37
38 motivation and dedication to seeing the programme through were what many believed to be the main drivers
39
40 behind programme completion; *“It went ahead due to a lot of determination and not because it was easily
41
42 implementable... if that’s a word”*, W82GO014.

43 44 **Patient**

45
46 Low programme uptake was a key issue during implementation. Many stakeholders believe that obesity has
47
48 become the norm in society and as a result *“people don’t recognise overweight people as being in that actual
49
50 overweight category because it’s become normal to be surrounded by overweight people”*, W82GO021. In
51
52 terms of the W82GO-community pilot programme, almost all stakeholders indicated that although children
53
54 measured as obese on the growth charts their parents seemed unaware of any excess weight and once
55
56 informed, many refused to accept that their child was obese. As a result of this misperception parents didn’t
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 realise or accept the need for treatment. Speaking of her experience, one stakeholder described how *“other*
4 *parents just didn’t reply or didn’t get in touch because they believed everything was ok and there wasn’t a*
5 *problem with their child. They didn’t need any programme. I think that definitely was a huge problem out there*
6 *in the community setting”,* W82GO012. Because of this low recognition amongst parents, many stakeholders
7 recalled the resistance they faced when trying to discuss the issue with them and their fear prior to making
8 contact with parents. One stakeholder explained how some parents would *“be really angry so you’re taking*
9 *angry phonecalls in the evening. You know when you come in from a day’s work so it was really difficult”,*
10 W82GO002.

19 **Social Context**

20
21 Local level stakeholders believed there was a certain level of *“naïvety”* at national level about the reality of
22 rolling out the pilot programme on the ground. They felt consultation during the planning stage was lacking
23 and that national-level stakeholders had *“little experience of the practical aspects of childhood obesity”* as *“no*
24 *one was actually working with obese children or even groups on a day to day basis”,* W82GO004. As a result
25 unrealistic expectations and timeframes prevailed, particularly during the recruitment phase. This led to
26 frustration and confusion among local-level health professionals during implementation.

27
28 Communication between national and local level stakeholders was considered poor. However, the presence of
29 a local lead facilitated the exchange between staff on the ground and management at national level and was
30 seen by almost all stakeholders as crucial for programme implementation. Furthermore, stakeholders felt that
31 because of the multidisciplinary approach of the programme *“you needed someone on the ground”*; if they
32 didn’t have a local lead *“pulling all those people and bits together, it wouldn’t have worked because running*
33 *something like this with people dispersed across a whole county and city is difficult”,* W82GO005. The presence
34 of supportive colleagues and management were identified as further enabling factors.

48 **Organisational Context**

49
50 The multidisciplinary structure of the programme also created barriers at the organisational level. In addition
51 to differing individual perspectives and priorities, the added complexities of working in different locations
52 created difficulties during programme implementation. In many cases stakeholders didn’t *“work at the same*
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *site... or even the same town which was a challenge” as it “took up a lot of time organising between schedules*
4 *and travelling to meet and go through practicalities”, W82GO007.*
5
6

7
8 In addition to these challenges, at the organisational level, stakeholders reported that implementation was
9 hampered due to insufficient resources (i.e. staff and time) and training. It was reported that two other
10 proposed areas withdrew from the pilot programme because of the lack of staff and leadership on the ground
11 to run the programme. Stakeholders felt that they had very different resource issues to the hospital-based
12 teams who are *“within the confines of a hospital... so they would or should have the same vision or focus...
13 whereas we can see now with a community based programme the professionals can be very different in their
14 training, they can have a different ethos in the departments within their community. It’s very individual. We
15 have different line managers and different resources to deal with”, W82GO011.* Some stakeholders *“didn’t
16 want to get involved because of existing workloads”,* and the lack of extra resources or allocated time to
17 implement the pilot. Furthermore, while acknowledging the little time hospital staff had to develop
18 community-specific training, local-level stakeholders felt they needed more *“practical and tailored”*
19 information. Many described the training they received as *‘too general’* and stated that *“it would have been
20 very helpful to have had more practical tips on how to actually run the programme session to session with this
21 age group”, W82GO012.*
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **External Environment**

36
37
38 In the Grol and Wensing model, the ‘economic and political context’ refers to financial arrangements,
39 regulations and policies - themes which did not emerge during our research. Therefore, the sixth level was
40 renamed ‘external environment’ to include wider societal perspectives and determinants.
41
42
43

44
45 In terms of the external environment, the lack of existing services to treat and manage childhood obesity
46 meant many stakeholders were excited to come on board and implement this new initiative. One stakeholder
47 described *“waiting for years for something to happen in this area”, W82GO005.* The media was recognised as
48 both a barrier and a facilitator to programme implementation. While stakeholders believed TV and radio
49 campaigns have the potential to raise awareness they felt that the issue is *“also getting very bad press”* and
50 being *“hyped up a little bit”* which in itself may make it more difficult for parents to come forward.
51
52
53
54
55
56 Additionally, staff felt that the stigma surrounding childhood obesity and weight management programmes
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 created a significant barrier to programme implementation as many parents were reluctant to attend or even
4 talk about the issue of weight for fear of singling out or 'labelling' their child.
5
6

7 8 **Vision for the future**

9
10 In terms of the future scale up of *W82GO-community*, the majority of stakeholders recommend establishing
11 dedicated childhood obesity teams within the community, "ideally people who are located at least in the same
12 town", who can offer a range of interventions for different levels of need. One stakeholder described "a tiered
13 effect, for example there could be a level one which could be a generic workshop or talk that you could roll-out
14 in lots of schools. A level two then would be a seminar for parents and level three would be a group
15 programme. Level four then could be actual specific one on one interventions". Having a tiered approach would
16 enable the team to match the level of need with the family and allow families to choose where on the scale
17 they would best fit.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 26 **DISCUSSION**

27
28 Ambiguity surrounds the effectiveness of community-based childhood weight management programmes [19],
29 and little is documented of the factors influencing their implementation in real-world settings. Their impact on
30 public health depends on their implementation at a national scale and therefore knowledge of the
31 determinants affecting implementation is required [20]. This study identified factors that hampered and
32 facilitated the implementation of *W82GO-community* from a wide range of stakeholder perspectives. Findings
33 suggest that more consideration is needed during the planning stages, including the creation of a structured
34 programme plan outlining specific roles and responsibilities. Local-level stakeholders believe they should be
35 involved in this process as they have practical experience of working with families on the ground in their
36 respective communities.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 A key barrier to the implementation of *W82GO-community* was parental resistance which occurred at the
48 patient level but is also intrinsically linked to the external environment where the increasing normalisation of
49 overweight and obesity is met with a stigma that surrounds the issue. Stakeholders described parental
50 resistance occurring at every stage of the implementation process. Parents did not appear to recognise the
51 issue in their own children and as a result didn't see the need for treatment or refused to accept that their
52 child was carrying excess weight. Lack of parental awareness regarding their child's weight and resistance
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 towards discussing weight issues has been documented in previous research [21-25]. This may be due in part
4
5 to the belief that obesity has become the norm in society, a point which was suggested by stakeholders in this
6
7 study, and previously outlined in the literature [26]. It is also possible that parental resistance stems from the
8
9 stigma that is associated with excess weight and obesity [11, 22-24] or the negative media attention obesity
10
11 has received. The framing of coverage by media may affect people's views about the causes of childhood
12
13 obesity and the most appropriate strategies for addressing the problem [27]. This finding highlights the need,
14
15 at a policy level, for positive awareness-raising campaigns to encourage parental recognition of healthy
16
17 childhood growth and development, in addition to knowledge regarding the importance of identifying obesity
18
19 early in childhood. Future research should focus on factors influencing family's decisions to engage or
20
21 disengage with obesity treatment and provide recommendations on how to encourage participation.

22
23 Low perceived self-efficacy in approaching the subject of weight with parents was a barrier facing staff during
24
25 implementation. Stakeholders in this study see the need for a childhood weight management programme in
26
27 their communities and acknowledge their professional responsibility to get involved. However, they appear
28
29 uncomfortable and unequipped to do this. This is consistent with previous research which found that low
30
31 perceived skills and low perceived self-efficacy hamper the implementation of such programmes [21, 28-31]. In
32
33 our study motivational interviewing workshops equipped stakeholders in Site A with increased skills and
34
35 confidence in working with families on weight management issues. Motivational interviewing is a goal-
36
37 orientated, patient-centred approach based on the use of communication skills to understand individuals'
38
39 motivation for behaviour change [32] and has been found to be useful when applied in health care settings
40
41 [33]. We therefore consider it important that healthcare professionals involved in the implementation of
42
43 obesity programmes receive this training prior to programme commencement.

44
45 The multidisciplinary structure of the programme emerged as both a barrier to and facilitator of
46
47 implementation and spread across many of the levels outlined by Grol and Wensing. While acknowledged that
48
49 it was required to treat such a complex health issue, it resulted in lack of role clarity, a lack of understanding of
50
51 specific discipline roles, and led to difficulties in scheduling. This may in part be due to the structure and
52
53 governance of community health services within Ireland. While there is a vision for multidisciplinary working
54
55 set out in multiple policy documents and an emphasis on integrated care [34], the system is not set-up to
56
57 support the concept. Stakeholders believe a simple roundtable introduction whereby practitioners could share
58
59

1
2
3 their professional background and outline their specific role within the project would have helped overcome
4 this ambiguity. They suggest it is a simple but often overlooked detail. Furthermore, stakeholders feel the
5 establishment of a local lead was critical in assisting multidisciplinary working while also facilitating discussion
6 between national and local level. Laws et al. also highlight the importance of having key local individuals
7 responsible for driving and coordinating research translation [35].
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 16 **Limitations**

17
18 Some limitations must be acknowledged; social desirability bias is a risk when stakeholders are known to the
19 researcher conducting the interviews. In this case the stakeholders knew the researcher as the programme
20 evaluator. However, we do not believe this to be the case as stakeholders were keen to “tell their story”.
21
22 Furthermore, according to de Casterlé *et al.*, (2012) “using a preconceived framework runs the risk of
23 prematurely excluding alternative ways of organising the data”[35]pg.362. However, data was analysed
24 inductively first before mapping onto the Grol and Wensing Framework. In subsequent phases of analysis we
25 adapted the framework to capture the influence of the external environment on implementation.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **CONCLUSION**

34
35 This study highlights the complexities associated with implementing multi-component childhood weight
36 management programmes in the community setting from a wide range of stakeholder perspectives. Our
37 results suggest the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, the provision of sufficient practical training
38 and resources, and organisational support play pivotal roles in overcoming barriers to change. Furthermore,
39 our findings on the challenges of multidisciplinary working and translating hospital programmes to community
40 settings are applicable to the implementation of interventions beyond that of childhood weight management.
41
42 This evidence should be used to develop implementation plans to improve the translation of interventions into
43 real world settings.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **STATEMENTS:**

- 52
53
54
55 • Authors' contributions
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The authors responsibilities were as follows: EK: was responsible for the design and conduct of the research,
4 and writing of the manuscript. SMH: was involved in data analysis and reviewed drafts of the manuscript. EK,
5 SMH, JH, FS and IJP made critical revisions to the paper and gave final approval of the version to be submitted.
6
7

8
9
10 • Acknowledgements

11
12 We are grateful to the stakeholders who agreed to be interviewed for the study, without them this research
13 would not have been possible.
14

15
16
17
18
19 • Competing interests

20
21 The authors declare that they have no competing interests
22

23
24 • Funding

25
26 Source of support: E Kelleher is funded by the Health Research Board SPHeRE/2013/1. The Health Research
27 Board (HRB) supports excellent research that improves people's health, patient care and health service
28 delivery. We aim to ensure that new knowledge is created and then used in policy and practice. In doing so, we
29 support health system innovation and create new enterprise opportunities. Dr Sheena McHugh is funded by
30 the Centre for Ageing Research and Development in Ireland (CARDI), now the Ageing Research and
31 Development Division within the Institute of Public Health in Ireland (IPH).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 • Data Sharing

40
41 Topic guides which were used in the interviews are available as additional supporting files. However, signed
42 confidentiality agreements prevent us from sharing transcripts.
43
44

45
46 • Ethics approval

47
48 Ethical Approval was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the Cork Teaching Hospitals.
49

50
51 References

- 52
53
54 1. Ritchie, J. and J. Lewis, Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students &
55 researchers. 2003, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
56 2. Grol, R. and M. Wensing, What drives change? Barriers to and incentives for achieving
57 evidence-based practice. Med J Aust, 2004. **180**(6 Suppl): p. S57-60.
58
59
60

3. Dierckx de Casterle, B., C. Gastmans, E. Bryon, et al., QUAGOL: a guide for qualitative data analysis. *Int J Nurs Stud*, 2012. **49**(3): p. 360-71.
4. Flynn, M., D. McNeil, B. Maloff, et al., Reducing obesity and related chronic disease risk in children and youth: a synthesis of evidence with 'best practice' recommendations. *Obes Rev*, 2006. **7 Suppl 1**: p. 7-66.
5. Oude Luttikhuis, H., L. Baur, H. Jansen, et al., Interventions for treating obesity in children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 2009(1): p. Cd001872.
6. Wilfley, D., A. Staiano, M. Altman, et al., Improving access and systems of care for evidence-based childhood obesity treatment: Conference key findings and next steps. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*, 2016.
7. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Obesity. Guidance on the prevention of overweight and obesity in adults and children. Clinical Guideline, 43. NICE: London.
8. World Health Organisation., Report of the Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity. 2016, WHO Document Production Services: Geneva, Switzerland.
9. Nutbeam, D. and A. Bauman, Evaluation in a Nutshell: a practical guide to the evaluation of health promotion programs. Vol. 2. 2013, Australia: McGraw-Hill Education.
10. Welsby, D., B. Nguyen, B. O'Hara, et al., Process evaluation of an up-scaled community based child obesity treatment program: NSW Go4Fun(R). *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**: p. 140.
11. Lucas, P., K. Curtis-Tyler, L. Arai, et al., What works in practice: user and provider perspectives on the acceptability, affordability, implementation, and impact of a family-based intervention for child overweight and obesity delivered at scale. *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**: p. 614.
12. Stamatakis, K., C. Vinson, and J. Kerner, Dissemination and Implementation Research in Community and Public Health Settings, in *Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health: Translating Science to Practice*, R. Brownson, G. Colditz, and E. Proctor, Editors. 2012, Oxford University Press: New York.
13. Skelton, J. and B. Beech, Attrition in paediatric weight management: a review of the literature and new directions. *Obes Rev*, 2011. **12**(5): p. e273-81.
14. Kelleher, E., M. Davoren, J. Harrington, et al., Barriers and facilitators to initial and continued attendance at community-based lifestyle programmes among families of overweight and obese children: a systematic review. *Obes Rev*, 2016.
15. Keane, E., P. Kearney, I. Perry, et al., Trends and prevalence of overweight and obesity in primary school aged children in the Republic of Ireland from 2002-2012: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**(1): p. 974.
16. Layte, R. and C. McCrory, Growing Up in Ireland. Overweight and Obesity among 9-year olds. 2011, Department of Children and Youth Affairs: Dublin.
17. O'Malley, G., A. Brinkley, K. Moroney, et al., Is the Temple Street W82GO Healthy Lifestyles Programme effective in reducing BMI SDS? . *Obes Facts*, 2012. **5**(Suppl. 1): p. 178-234
18. Francis, J., M. Johnston, C. Robertson, et al., What is an adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies. *Psychol Health*, 2010. **25**(10): p. 1229-45.
19. Bleich, S., J. Segal, Y. Wu, et al., Systematic review of community-based childhood obesity prevention studies. *Pediatrics*, 2013. **132**(1): p. e201-10.
20. Rogers, E., *Diffusion of Innovations*. 3rd ed. 1983, New York: The Free Press.
21. Gerards, S.M., P. Dagnelie, M. Jansen, et al., Barriers to successful recruitment of parents of overweight children for an obesity prevention intervention: a qualitative study among youth health care professionals. *BMC Fam Pract*, 2012. **13**: p. 37.
22. Grow, H., C. Hsu, L. Liu, et al., Understanding family motivations and barriers to participation in community-based programs for overweight youth: one program model does not fit all. *J Public Health Manag Pract*, 2013. **19**(4): p. E1-e10.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
23. Visram, S., T.D. Hall, and L. Geddes, Getting the balance right: qualitative evaluation of a holistic weight management intervention to address childhood obesity. *J Public Health (Oxf)*, 2012.
24. Newson, L., R. Povey, A. Casson, et al., The experiences and understandings of obesity: families' decisions to attend a childhood obesity intervention. *Psychol Health*, 2013. **28**(11): p. 1287-305.
25. Shiely, F., N. Hon Yan, E. Berkery, et al., The association between weight perception and BMI: Report and measurement data from the growing up in Ireland cohort study of 9 year olds. *Int J Obes*, 2016.
26. Binkin, N., A. Spinelli, G. Baglio, et al., What is common becomes normal: the effect of obesity prevalence on maternal perception. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*, 2013. **23**(5): p. 410-6.
27. Barry, C., M. Jarlenski, R. Grob, et al., News Media Framing of Childhood Obesity in the United States From 2000 to 2009. *Pediatrics*, 2011.
28. Moyers, P., L. Bugle, and E. Jackson, Perceptions of school nurses regarding obesity in school-age children. *J Sch Nurs*, 2005. **21**(2): p. 86-93.
29. Steele, R., Y. Wu, C. Jensen, et al., School nurses' perceived barriers to discussing weight with children and their families: a qualitative approach. *J Sch Health*, 2011. **81**(3): p. 128-37.
30. Story, M., D. Neumark-Stzainer, N. Sherwood, et al., Management of child and adolescent obesity: attitudes, barriers, skills, and training needs among health care professionals. *Pediatrics*, 2002. **110**(1 Pt 2): p. 210-4.
31. Turner, K., J. Shield, and C. Salisbury, Practitioners' views on managing childhood obesity in primary care: a qualitative study. *The British J of Gen Pract*, 2009. **59**(568): p. 856-862.
32. Miller, W. and S. Rollnick, *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people for change*. 2002, New York: The Guilford Press.
33. Lozano, P., H. McPhillips, B. Hartzler, et al., Randomized trial of teaching brief motivational interviewing to pediatric trainees to promote healthy behaviors in families. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*, 2010. **164**(6): p. 561-6.
34. Department of Health., *A Healthy Weight for Ireland 2016–2025*. Obesity Policy and Action Plan 2016, Stationary Office: Dublin.
35. Laws, R., K. Hesketh, K. Ball, et al., Translating an early childhood obesity prevention program for local community implementation: a case study of the Melbourne InFANT Program. *BMC Public Health*, 2016. **16**: p. 748.

Table 3 Perceived Barriers and Facilitators to the Implementation of W82GO in the Community

Levels	Quotations to illustrate the identified levels
The Innovation	
Credibility	(+) <i>"I suppose because it was attached to an acute hospital and because there was a consultant paediatrician and you had a lot of disciplines and a lot of very competent professionals involved, and that it had been successful when delivered there. That was the main reason I believed in the programme I suppose", W82GO003</i>
Attractiveness (i.e. Multidisciplinary nature)	(+) <i>"I do think the MDT approach was superb. I think that is you're going to do something for a child who is obese then you need it."</i>
Transferability (i.e. different population, different resource issues)	(-) <i>"You are talking about a different cohort of families. Families who are already in the system. They are used to going in for appointments. You're talking about a group who've already had difficulties identified by their GP or whoever so by the time they are going for the group they are already sold, they are used to it and they are used to that sort of setting which is very kind of fast and quick-paced and very focused", W82GO002</i>
Relevance (e.g. too medicalised)	(-) <i>"I think the area medical officer, the medical input I think is probably optional or at least part-time. It's of less importance. It medicalised this community programme a bit too much", W82GO021</i>
The Individual Professional	
Awareness of the problem / Recognition of need	(+) <i>"It is a problem, most definitely. I think it's a time bomb that went off over the past 10 years and that we are behind it. Way behind it and the sooner we get going and get doing something the better", W82GO013</i>
Personal interest and motivation	(+) <i>"So that enthusiasm and that dedication made it happen, it was key to its success", W82GO011</i>
Low self-efficacy	(-) <i>"I wouldn't be especially skilled in assessing children you know with obesity and that kind of thing... Or talking to parents about it... I was concerned about my own ability to, to get up to speed fairly quickly", W82GO015</i>
Attitudes (i.e. Multidisciplinary perspectives)	(-) <i>"I suppose the other main challenge was the multidisciplinary nature of the programme. I think the challenges of it is when you put together a team obviously from all different backgrounds not with different agendas but with different experiences and knowledge and different perspectives", W82GO026</i>
The Patient	
Parental Resistance (weight misperception and denial)	(-) <i>"I think there was a denial that there was anything wrong with their child, or that their child was overweight. There was a total denial about that because the population in general look like their child. Their child may be a little bit above of what the normal population looks like, but they didn't see that as an issue at all.", W82GO028</i> (-) <i>"Like there was still a reluctance on the part of the parents to accept that their child was obese and that certainly was an issue. So even at this stage they would have had discussions with the public health nurse and the area medical officer and then I would have seen them and they still didn't believe that their child was obese", W82GO004</i> (-) <i>"Other parents then just flat out denied that their child was overweight and accused me a being wrong and that they didn't believe me. They often actually compared their children to others you know saying he's not as big as some other fella down the road and i really should be going to have a chat with that mother", W82GO008</i>
The Social Context	
Supportive colleagues	(+) <i>Presence of supportive colleagues "once she came on board there was two of us, it was a lot easier to share the workload and if i couldn't be there for a day she could be there for it so I</i>

Leadership	<p><i>suppose that definitely took the load off and she also acted as a sounding board you know? If there was something I wasn't sure of I could say what do you think about this and vice-versa. you know what I mean?", W82GO016</i></p> <p><i>(+) "I mean if we didn't have her pulling all those people and bits together it wouldn't have worked. She did a great job in i think the co-ordination role cause i think running something like this with people dispersed across a whole county and city then you need a project manager on the ground.", W82GO017</i></p>
Collaboration between national and local teams	<p><i>(-) "There was a feeling at a national level that this was just going to be rolled out like 3 a week kind of thing and that everyone would take up on it", W82GO009</i></p>
The Organisational Context	
MDT Structure (logistics)	<p><i>(-) "I suppose one of the challenges definitely is that the health professionals are all in different places", W82GO004</i></p>
Resources	<p><i>(-) "I guess time constraints 'cause a lot of people were pressurised for time. Like even ourselves we wouldn't have been able to go to every session and I would have liked to have gone but we just couldn't. We didn't have the time. We didn't have the staff to be able to attend so i think time and resource pressures were the main concerns", W82GO013</i></p>
Training	<p><i>(-) "It (the training) was as if they were trying to sell us the programme when you know we were already there. We were already sold. I mean we knew why it was important... because of the obesity issue so there was no need to go over all that again. They should have just focused on how to actually implement and deliver the programme", W82GO011</i></p>
External Environment	
Lack of existing services	<p><i>(+) "There is nothing out there so that's where it was great to have something like W82GO. That if you did see a child that you know there was something. Some sort of pathway"</i></p>
Media	<p><i>(+) "There was a huge media campaign ongoing around the time we were implementing the programme which got some parents thinking and talking. I mean those things do have a big impact. Things like Operation Transformation that's aired in January have a huge impact. I think we need more media on the impact of childhood obesity and not just the long-term impacts", W82GO003</i></p> <p><i>(-) "I think maybe it's (obesity) hyped up a little bit in the media. I think maybe that in itself could be making things difficult for parents to come forward. We don't have any other disease related issue hyped up as much you know? If you had a child with obesity you would be feeling a small bit cringe like. You'd be wanting to find somewhere private to get some help like you know", W82GO020</i></p>
Stigma	<p><i>(-) "Wouldn't have their child come to a programme in case they'd be labelled overweight or obese. There is a stigma and just from hearing again I wasn't in the parents room, but just from hearing other colleagues feedback it's the parents fear of feeling judged and blamed", W82GO002</i></p>

(+) Facilitators, (-) Barriers.

COREQ Checklist for Qualitative Research:

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Pg. 6
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	Pg. 1
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Pg. 1
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Pg. 1
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Pg. 6
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Pg. 3
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Pg. 15
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	Pg. 1
Domain 2: study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	Pg. 6-7
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Pg. 6
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Pg. 6
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	Pg. 7
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Pg. 7
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Pg. 6
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	NA
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Pg. 7
<i>Data collection</i>		

17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Pg. 6
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	NA
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Pg. 6
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes
21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	Pg. 6
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Pg. 6
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Pg. 7
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	N/A
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Pg. 7
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Pg. 7
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	NA
<i>Reporting</i>		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Pg. 8-13
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Pg. 8-13
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Pg. 8-13
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Discussion of major and minor themes Pg. 8-13

BMJ Open

Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a community-based, multidisciplinary, family-focused childhood weight management programme: A qualitative study.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-016459.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Apr-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Kelleher, Emily; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Harrington, Janas; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Shiely, Frances; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Perry, Ivan; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Mc Hugh, Sheena; University College Cork, Epidemiology & Public Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research, Health services research, Public health
Keywords:	Implementation, barriers, facilitators, childhood, obesity, community

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Title:
4

5 Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a community-based, multidisciplinary, family-focused
6
7 childhood weight management programme: A qualitative study
8

9
10 Corresponding Author:
11

12 Emily Kelleher, MPH BSc, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, 4th Floor, Western Gateway Building,
13 University College Cork, Ireland. Email: emily.kelleher@ucc.ie Tel: 00353 (21) 4205517
14
15

16
17 Authors:
18

19 Emily Kelleher, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
20

21
22 Janas M Harrington, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
23

24
25 Frances Shiely, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork and HRB Clinical
26 Research Facility, Mercy University Hospital, Grenville Place, Cork, Ireland
27

28
29 Ivan J Perry, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
30

31
32 Sheena M McHugh, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
33
34

35 Word Count:
36

37 4159
38
39

40 Keywords:
41

42 Implementation; barriers; facilitators; childhood; obesity; community; treatment
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT:

Objective: To explore the barriers and facilitators experienced by those implementing a government-funded, community-based, childhood weight management programme.

Design: Qualitative using semi-structured interviews.

Setting: Two geographical regions in the south and west of the Republic of Ireland.

Participants: 29 national and local level stakeholders responsible for implementing the programme including professionals from dietetics, psychology, public health nursing, physiotherapy, health promotion and administration.

Methods: Framework analysis was used to identify barriers and facilitators which were mapped onto six levels of factors influencing implementation outlined by Grol and Wensing: the innovation, the individual professional, the patient, the social context, the organisational context, and the external environment.

Results: Most barriers occurred at the level of the organisational context. For all stakeholders, barriers arose due to the multidisciplinary nature of the programme, including the lack of role clarity and added complexity of working in different locations. Health professionals' low-perceived self-efficacy in approaching the subject of weight with parents and parental resistance to hearing about their child's weight status were barriers to programme implementation at the individual professional and patient levels, respectively. The main facilitators of implementation, occurring at the level of the health professional, included stakeholders' recognition of the need for a weight management programme and personal interest in the area of childhood obesity. Having a local lead and supportive colleagues were further implementation drivers.

Conclusions: This study highlights the complexities associated with implementing a multidisciplinary childhood weight management programme, particularly translating such programmes to a community setting. Our results suggest the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, the provision of sufficient practical training and resources, and organisational support play pivotal roles in overcoming barriers to change. This evidence can be used to develop an implementation plan to support the translation of interventions into real world settings.

KEYWORDS:

Implementation; barriers; facilitators; childhood; obesity; community

ARTICLE SUMMARY**Strengths and limitations**

- This is one of few qualitative studies, and the first in Ireland, that explored the factors that hampered and facilitated the implementation of a community-based, multi-component childhood weight management programme from a wide range of stakeholder perspectives.
- While interviewing a wide range of stakeholders provided a thorough overview of the relevant issues, the themes that emerged were relatively homogenous across disciplines which added to the authority of the findings.
- Data were analysed using a systematic approach and an adapted version of the implementation model by Grol and Wensing was used to classify the barriers and facilitators into levels.
- Using a preconceived framework runs the risk of prematurely excluding other ways of organising the data. However, data was analysed inductively first before mapping onto the Grol and Wensing Framework.

BACKGROUND:

Childhood obesity is a worldwide public health concern and there is now widespread agreement that the complex aetiology of the issue requires a multifaceted approach to treatment [1-3]. International recommendations agree that initiatives to reduce and manage childhood obesity should be family-focused and combine healthy eating, physical activity and behavioural components [2, 4, 5]. In 2016, the World Health Organisation published their report of the commission on ending childhood obesity within which they echo these recommendations but also add that they should be delivered by “*multi-professional teams with appropriate training and resources*” [5]pg.11. These recommendations, however, have been largely based on small-scale studies conducted in controlled settings with specialised staff, thus limiting their applicability and generalizability to ‘real-world’ settings such as communities or hospitals [2].

1
2
3 In public health, once interventions have undergone innovation testing and demonstrated efficacy the next
4 steps include replication and 'scale-up' to larger populations in 'real-world' settings [6]. There are relatively
5 few examples of published studies reporting on the pragmatic application of effective childhood obesity
6 treatment programmes [7, 8]. While implementation issues such as engagement, local context, staffing and
7 funding are likely to be common across many public health interventions [8], little is documented about the
8 experience of those implementing childhood weight management programmes and even fewer studies detail
9 the factors influencing implementation [9]. For example, a lack of providers trained in evidence-based care for
10 childhood obesity was listed by delegates attending a recent conference in the United States as a major barrier
11 to treatment implementation [3]. Furthermore, with the majority of families declining referral and up to 75%
12 of families discontinuing care, poor engagement with families has proven to be a significant challenge facing
13 teams tasked with implementing such programmes [10, 11].

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 When introduced under less-controlled conditions, insight into the factors influencing implementation is
26 crucial. Therefore, the aim of this study was to explore and categorise the barriers and facilitators experienced
27 by those implementing a government-funded, community-based, multi-component childhood weight
28 management pilot programme to inform their eventual scale up.

29 30 31 32 33 **METHODS:**

34 35 36 **Intervention and context**

37
38
39 Although trends appear to be stabilising in Ireland, prevalence of childhood obesity remains high [12].
40 Currently, in Ireland, almost one in four children are either overweight or obese [13] and there is no
41 standardised community-based weight management programme available to those children with obesity.
42 Community programmes are usually provided on an ad-hoc basis and are rarely evaluated or sustained. In an
43 attempt to identify a universal treatment the Irish Health Service Executive (HSE) planned to pilot the *W82GO-*
44 *community* programme in two communities. This programme had previously demonstrated effectiveness in
45 the hospital setting [14]. Its effectiveness in the community setting was to be assessed with the intention of
46 nationwide rollout should the programme demonstrate a positive impact on body mass index (BMI). The
47 Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) checklist [15] was used to specify the details of
48 programme delivery and is included in Supplementary file 1.

1
2
3 In summary, *W82GO* aims to improve nutrition, increase physical activity and facilitate behaviour change over
4 one year [14]. It was designed as a hospital-based, family-focused, multidisciplinary programme grounded in
5 behavioural change theory and was modelled on best practice recommendations [2, 5, 16]. The primary goal
6 was a reduction in Body Mass Index Standard Deviation Score and has previously been found to be effective
7 when delivered in a hospital out-patient setting [14].
8
9

10
11
12
13 The *W82GO* programme involves an initial individual assessment to ascertain family eligibility followed by two
14 phases. Families were eligible for the programme if the child was between 5-7 years old; was obese (BMI
15 ≥ 98 th centile); had no limitations to engaging in physical activity; was not taking medication known to affect
16 body weight; and had at least one parent/carer who was able to attend each of the programme sessions.
17 Siblings were also welcome to attend the sessions. Phase 1 involved an initial intensive phase consisting of six
18 weekly group sessions for both the child and his/her parent/carer. These sessions lasted approximately one
19 and a half to two hours and incorporated educational and practical sessions to increase physical activity,
20 improve nutrition and increase sleep. Upon completion of phase 1, children returned with their parents/care-
21 givers for three booster group sessions at three, six and nine months. These sessions aimed to encourage the
22 family to continue with lifestyle change and to manage any barriers to change. Finally, at 12 months, the
23 children and their parents/care-givers returned for a final individual assessment to document any changes and
24 make plans for sustainment.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 For the current study, *W82GO* was adapted and implemented in two community sites (Site A and Site B) from
38 April 2015 for 12 months and subsequently renamed *W82GO-community*. Both sites were chosen as they were
39 part of a national pilot growth measurement programme and included a mix of rural and urban towns in the
40 west and south of Ireland. Initial assessments took place in community healthcare offices while subsequent
41 group sessions were delivered on weekdays in the afternoon at a local sports or community centre. The
42 programme was offered free of charge and was delivered by existing community health professionals including
43 dietitians, psychologists, public health nurses, physiotherapists, health promotion officers, area medical
44 officers and administrators. These health professionals were brought together as a team and asked to deliver
45 this programme as part of their existing roles. Table 1 outlines their specific responsibilities during programme
46 implementation. All staff were invited to take part in a training programme prior to programme
47 commencement Training included a needs assessment, a one day educational training course and two days of
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

clinical shadowing with an experienced W82GO programme practitioner at the National Children's University Hospital where it was developed. Each community practitioner was supplied with a user manual which outlined the programme and detailed the content for both phases.

Table 1 Health professional roles during the implementation of W82GO-community

Community Health Professional	Role in implementation of W82GO-community
National Manager	Overseeing implementation of W82GO-community in both community sites
Local Manager	Overseeing implementation of W82GO-community at local level. Local manager in Site B was involved in referring to the programme.
Physiotherapists	Involved in initial assessments and delivering programme material
Dietitians	Involved in initial assessments and delivering programme material
Psychologists	Involved in initial assessments and delivering programme material
Public Health Nurses	Referral to the programme
Area Medical Officers	Involved in initial assessments
Health Promotion Officers	Delivering programme material
Administration	Involved in contacting parents re programme sessions

Study design and sample

A qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews was utilised. We adopted a purposive approach to sampling, inviting stakeholders with knowledge and experience of planning, coordinating or delivering of W82GO-community. Stakeholders included professionals from dietetics (n=5), clinical psychology (n=3), public health nursing (n=13), physiotherapy (n=4), health promotion (n=4), medicine (n=4), administration (n=2) as well as individuals from both national and local-level management (n=3). To ensure representation from each stakeholder group and given the small number of individuals in each, we invited all stakeholders to participate. All stakeholders were contacted by email in the first instance and followed up by telephone contact during which the researcher outlined the study aims and methodology.

Data collection

All participants were invited to take part in face-to-face interviews. However, due to time and scheduling difficulties a mixture of telephone (n=22) and face-to-face (n=7) interviews were conducted between August 2015 and February 2016 (during programme implementation). To ensure consistency all interviews were conducted by a single trained qualitative researcher (EK), using a semi structured topic guide. Participants

1
2
3 knew the interviewer as an independent programme evaluator conducting this research as part of her PhD
4 training. The topic guide was developed based on relevant literature and focused on seven issues: (1)
5 awareness of the issue of childhood obesity and existing healthy lifestyle programmes, (2) perceived value of
6 and interest in community evidence-based treatment programmes, (3) communication of the *W82GO-*
7 *community* pilot programme; (4) specific role in implementing *W82GO-community*; (5) barriers and enablers to
8 implementation; (6) perceived successes and challenges experienced and finally (7) recommendations for the
9 future roll-out of childhood weight management programmes in Irish communities. Core topics were the same
10 across stakeholders and particular probes were added for specific stakeholder groups depending on their role
11 during programme. For example public health nurses were specifically asked to report on the barriers and
12 facilitators to referral. Prompts and probes were used throughout the interviews to stimulate discussion. Prior
13 to each interview, participants were informed about the purpose of the study, that participation was voluntary
14 and that they could terminate the interview at any stage for any reason. Signed informed consent was
15 obtained before each interview, which lasted on average 45 minutes. Interviews were digitally recorded and
16 transcribed verbatim. Data collection and analysis was iterative. Data saturation was judged to have been
17 reached between interviews 20 and 25. However during recruitment, other stakeholders had expressed an
18 interest in sharing their experience and so were given the opportunity to participate. The data from these
19 interviews overlapped with the existing coding framework and thus contributed to the main themes. Ethical
20 approval was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the Cork Teaching Hospitals.

38 **Data Analysis**

39
40
41 Framework analysis was used to analyse the data [17]. This approach enabled the investigation of a priori
42 objectives while also allowing new themes to emerge from the data. One researcher (EK) transcribed and
43 coded each transcript while another (SMH) undertook initial coding of a selection of transcripts. Similarities
44 and differences between the coding labels and definitions were discussed and the coding framework was
45 refined and applied to the remaining interviews. While this process was conducted at an early stage of the
46 analysis, the coding process was iterative; emergent codes were added to the framework and contributed to
47 the development of themes across the interviews. Codes were synthesised and grouped according to the
48 dominant emergent themes. Themes were also analysed across stakeholder groups to identify similarities and
49 differences across disciplines and positions. These themes were mapped onto a framework developed by Grol
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

and Wensing (2004) which specifies six levels of factors that facilitate or impede implementation success: the innovation; the individual professional, the patient; the social context; the organisational context; and the economic and political environment [18]. Mapping emergent themes to the framework at this stage of the analysis ensured that we did not impose a predefined structure or terminology on participants' accounts. This well-established framework (Table 2) was chosen because it describes how barriers and facilitators can be identified, categorised, and used for the development of tailor-based implementation strategies to facilitate desired change [18], in this instance implementing the *W82GO-community* programme. Discrepancies on the mapping of themes were discussed until consensus was reached. NVivo (QSR v10) was used to manage data analysis.

Table 2 Barriers to and incentives for change at different levels of healthcare^a

Level	Barriers / Incentives
Innovation	Advantages in practice, feasibility, credibility, attractiveness, accessibility
Individual Practitioner	Awareness, knowledge, attitude, motivation to change, behavioural routines
Patient	Knowledge, skills, attitude, compliance
Social Context	Opinion of colleagues, culture of the network, collaboration, leadership
Organisational Context	Organisation of care processes, staff, capacities, resources, structures
Economic and Political Context	Financial arrangements, regulations, policies

^a*Grol and Wensing's multilevel model[18]*

RESULTS

Stakeholder Characteristics

We contacted 38 stakeholders and recruited 29 interviewees from a range of disciplines and professions, yielding a response rate of 76% (Table 3).

Table 3 Stakeholder characteristics

	Site A	Site B	National	Total
National Manager	NA	NA	1	1
Local Manager	1	1	x	2
Physiotherapists	2	1	1	4
Dietitians	3	x	x	3
Psychologists	1	1	x	2
Public Health Nurses	6	3	x	9
Area Medical Officers	x	2	x	2
Health Promotion Officers	3	1	x	4

Administration	1	x	1	2
Total	17	9	3	29

Barriers and Facilitators

For all participants, barriers arose due to the multidisciplinary nature of the programme, including the lack of understanding of other disciplines, lack of role clarity as well as the added complexities of working in different locations. Participants' recognition of the need for a childhood obesity programme and their own personal interest in the area were the main drivers of implementation while the presence of a local lead and supportive colleagues were further enabling factors. Views on the main barriers and facilitators to implementation were consistent across stakeholders; despite different disciplinary backgrounds, they had common experiences as implementers adding to the authority of the findings. Table 4 presents the perceived barriers and facilitators from the perspective of the stakeholders mapped onto the six implementation levels with quotations to illustrate each level.

Table 4 Perceived Barriers and Facilitators to the Implementation of W82GO in the Community

Levels	Quotations to illustrate the identified levels
The Innovation	
Credibility	(+) <i>"I suppose because it was attached to an acute hospital and because there was a consultant paediatrician and you had a lot of disciplines and a lot of very competent professionals involved, and that it had been successful when delivered there. That was the main reason I believed in the programme I suppose", W82GO003</i>
Attractiveness (i.e. Multidisciplinary nature)	(+) <i>"I do think the MDT approach was superb. I think that is you're going to do something for a child who is obese then you need it."</i>
Transferability (i.e. different population, different resource issues)	(-) <i>"You are talking about a different cohort of families. Families who are already in the system. They are used to going in for appointments. You're talking about a group who've already had difficulties identified by their GP or whoever so by the time they are going for the group they are already sold, they are used to it and they are used to that sort of setting which is very kind of fast and quick-paced and very focused", W82GO002</i>
Relevance (e.g. too medicalised)	(-) <i>"I think the area medical officer, the medical input I think is probably optional or at least part-time. It's of less importance. It medicalised this community programme a bit too much", W82GO021</i>
The Individual Professional	
Awareness of the problem / Recognition of need	(+) <i>"It is a problem, most definitely. I think it's a time bomb that went off over the past 10 years and that we are behind it. Way behind it and the sooner we get going and get doing something the better", W82GO013</i>
Personal interest and motivation	(+) <i>"So that enthusiasm and that dedication made it happen, it was key to its success", W82GO011</i>
Low self-efficacy	(-) <i>"I wouldn't be especially skilled in assessing children you know with obesity and that kind of thing... Or talking to parents about it... I was concerned about my own ability to, to get up to speed fairly quickly", W82GO015</i>

Attitudes (i.e. Multidisciplinary perspectives)	(-) "I suppose the other main challenge was the multidisciplinary nature of the programme. I think the challenges of it is when you put together a team obviously from all different backgrounds not with different agendas but with different experiences and knowledge and different perspectives", W82GO026
The Patient	
Parental Resistance (weight misperception and denial)	(-) "I think there was a denial that there was anything wrong with their child, or that their child was overweight. There was a total denial about that because the population in general look like their child. Their child may be a little bit above of what the normal population looks like, but they didn't see that as an issue at all", W82GO028
The Social Context	
Supportive colleagues	(+) "Once she came on board there was two of us, it was a lot easier to share the workload and if I couldn't be there for a day she could be there for it so I suppose that definitely took the load off and she also acted as a sounding board you know? If there was something I wasn't sure of I could say what do you think about this and vice-versa, you know what I mean?", W82GO016
Leadership	(+) "I mean if we didn't have her pulling all those people and bits together it wouldn't have worked. She did a great job in I think the co-ordination role cause I think running something like this with people dispersed across a whole county and city then you need a project manager on the ground.", W82GO017
Collaboration between national and local teams	(-) "There was a feeling at a national level that this was just going to be rolled out like 3 a week kind of thing and that everyone would take up on it", W82GO009
The Organisational Context	
MDT Structure (logistics)	(-) "I suppose one of the challenges definitely is that the health professionals are all in different places", W82GO004
Resources	(-) "I guess time constraints 'cause a lot of people were pressurised for time. Like even ourselves we wouldn't have been able to go to every session and I would have liked to have gone but we just couldn't. We didn't have the time. We didn't have the staff to be able to attend so i think time and resource pressures were the main concerns", W82GO013
Training	(-) "It (the training) was as if they were trying to sell us the programme when you know we were already there. We were already sold. I mean we knew why it was important... because of the obesity issue so there was no need to go over all that again. They should have just focused on how to actually implement and deliver the programme", W82GO011
External Environment	
Lack of existing services	(+) "There is nothing out there so that's where it was great to have something like W82GO. That if you did see a child that you know there was something. Some sort of pathway"
Media	(+) "There was a huge media campaign ongoing around the time we were implementing the programme which got some parents thinking and talking. I mean those things do have a big impact. Things like Operation Transformation that's aired in January have a huge impact. I think we need more media on the impact of childhood obesity and not just the long-term impacts", W82GO003 (-) "I think maybe it's (obesity) hyped up a little bit in the media. I think maybe that in itself could be making things difficult for parents to come forward. We don't have any other disease related issue hyped up as much you know? If you had a child with obesity you would be feeling a small bit cringe like. You'd be wanting to find somewhere private to get some help like you know", W82GO020
Stigma	(-) "Wouldn't have their child come to a programme in case they'd be labelled overweight or obese. There is a stigma and just from hearing again I wasn't in the parents room, but just from hearing other colleagues feedback it's the parents fear of feeling judged and

	<i>blamed</i> ",W82GO002
--	--------------------------

(+) Facilitators, (-) Barriers.

The Innovation

In terms of the *W82GO-community* pilot programme (innovation), while stakeholders believed it came from a credible source having been developed by one of the national children's hospitals in Ireland, many had doubts over its accessibility and about how well it would transfer to the community setting. This uncertainty resulted in feelings of unease and community practitioners were hesitant to get involved initially. One stakeholder explained how she worried at length about what impact the programme would have on existing services and how feasible it was to run in the community; *"The setting is different. We were taking a programme that was from an acute setting into the community - that possibly was where the breakdown happened because you didn't have the same services. You didn't have people on site. There was travel, there was all these other logistics that weren't thought about when they were moving an acute programme to the community"*, W82GO021. In particular, stakeholders believed they were dealing with a very different cohort of families than the hospital-based programme as described by the following quote; *"You've a very different kind of child coming into the hospital than you do in the general community. You've a very different kind of parent. Even if you had a parent who was resistant to hearing about their child being overweight, if they are attending hospital appointments regularly they are obviously already engaged about their child's health... so I believe that's a major barrier straight away that they possibly didn't have to face in the hospital you know?"*, W82GO010.

In addition to the differences in the target group, stakeholders believed the programme was too medicalised for the community setting and some felt it did not fit with their perception of a healthy lifestyle programme. This was due to the number of health professionals involved and in particular, the involvement of medical staff. Furthermore, many stakeholders thought the collection of clinical markers of disease and medical history during the initial assessments was unnecessary. As one stakeholder described; *"the initial assessments were totally irrelevant. I mean when I heard that bloods were being taken I thought oh for God sake. You know we were supposed to be running a community-based education intervention where the focus should be on changing lifestyles. It's not our job to be diagnosing other problems"*, W82GO005.

Individual Professional

While stakeholders both applauded and recognised the need for such an approach to the treatment of childhood obesity, the multidisciplinary nature of the programme created significant barriers to programme implementation. The variety of community health professionals involved in the implementation of *W82GO-community* with differing perspectives and priorities led to role uncertainty and in some cases a perception of disrespect between disciplines. One stakeholder captures this theme in the following quote; *“I suppose the other main challenge was the multidisciplinary nature of the programme. I think the challenge is when you put together a team obviously from all different backgrounds not with different agendas but with different experiences and knowledge and different perspectives”*, W82GO026. Stakeholders described how *“there was quite a lack of understanding of the various discipline roles and responsibilities and some were even unsure of what some disciplines did”*, W82GO012. This lack of understanding sometimes resulted in tension between disciplines and created a challenging environment to work in. Others recalled feeling concerned about where they fit into the programme and believed a structured programme plan outlining specific roles and responsibilities was lacking.

Another key barrier that emerged at the level of the individual professional was their low perceived self-efficacy in dealing with childhood obesity and/or working with this young age group. In particular, many stakeholders reported their fear of approaching the subject with parents given the risk of upsetting them or *“rocking the boat”*. One stakeholder reported that *“it’s something you want to do something about but it can be very difficult to approach the subject with parents. It’s a very sensitive issue”*, W82GO001. In our study, stakeholders in Site A received motivational interviewing workshops for childhood obesity. This training equipped these stakeholders with increased skills and confidence in working with families on weight management issues. As one stakeholder described, post motivational interviewing training she wasn’t *“frightened of dealing with them [parents] at all”, It’s kind of second nature to me now... I know the buzz words, I know exactly what to say to them. And body language, the whole lot”*, W82GO002. Others felt it was quite *“alien”* to work with children aged 4-6 years and believed they hadn’t the appropriate training to do so.

1
2
3 Despite these barriers, all stakeholders were aware that childhood obesity was an issue in their respective
4 communities and recognised the urgent need for treatment; *"Yeah I think it's a time bomb that went off over*
5 *the past ten years and that we are behind it, way behind and the sooner we get going and doing whatever we*
6 *can the better"*, W82GO012. Furthermore, stakeholders' personal interest in tackling the issue, and their
7 motivation and dedication to seeing the programme through were what many believed to be the main drivers
8 behind programme completion; *"It went ahead due to a lot of determination and not because it was easily*
9 *implementable... if that's a word"*, W82GO014.
10
11

12 **Patient**

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Low programme uptake was a key issue during implementation. Many stakeholders believe that obesity has
21 become the norm in society and as a result *"people don't recognise overweight people as being in that actual*
22 *overweight category because it's become normal to be surrounded by overweight people"*, W82GO021. In
23 terms of the *W82GO-community* pilot programme, almost all stakeholders indicated that although children
24 measured as obese on the growth charts their parents seemed unaware of any excess weight and once
25 informed, many refused to accept that their child was obese. As a result of this misperception parents did not
26 realise or accept the need for treatment. Speaking of her experience, one stakeholder described how *"other*
27 *parents just didn't reply or didn't get in touch because they believed everything was ok and there wasn't a*
28 *problem with their child. They didn't need any programme. I think that definitely was a huge problem out there*
29 *in the community setting"*, W82GO012. Because of this low recognition amongst parents, many stakeholders
30 recalled the resistance they faced when trying to discuss the issue with them and their fear prior to making
31 contact with parents. One stakeholder explained how some parents would *"be really angry so you're taking*
32 *angry phone calls in the evening. You know when you come in from a day's work so it was really difficult"*,
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
W82GO002.

58 **Social Context**

59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
Local level stakeholders believed there was a certain level of *"naïvety"* at national level about the reality of
rolling out the pilot programme on the ground. They felt consultation during the planning stage was lacking
and that national-level stakeholders had *"little experience of the practical aspects of childhood obesity"* as *"no*
one was actually working with obese children or even groups on a day to day basis", W82GO004. As a result

1
2
3 unrealistic expectations and timeframes prevailed, particularly during the recruitment phase. This led to
4 frustration and confusion among local-level health professionals during implementation.
5
6

7
8 Communication between national and local level stakeholders was considered poor. However, the presence of
9 a local lead facilitated the exchange between staff on the ground and management at national level and was
10 seen by almost all stakeholders as crucial for programme implementation. Furthermore, stakeholders felt that
11 because of the multidisciplinary approach of the programme *"you needed someone on the ground"*; if they did
12 not have a local lead *"pulling all those people and bits together, it wouldn't have worked because running*
13 *something like this with people dispersed across a whole county and city is difficult"*, W82GO005. The presence
14 of supportive colleagues and management were identified as further enabling factors.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Organisational Context**

22
23 The multidisciplinary structure of the programme also created barriers at the organisational level. In addition
24 to differing individual perspectives and priorities, the added complexities of working in different locations
25 created difficulties during programme implementation. In many cases stakeholders didn't *"work at the same*
26 *site... or even the same town which was a challenge"* as it *"took up a lot of time organising between schedules*
27 *and travelling to meet and go through practicalities"*, W82GO007.
28
29

30
31 In addition to these challenges, at the organisational level, stakeholders reported that implementation was
32 hampered due to insufficient resources (i.e. staff and time) and training. It was reported that two other
33 proposed areas withdrew from the pilot programme because of the lack of staff and leadership on the ground
34 to run the programme. Stakeholders felt that they had very different resource issues to the hospital-based
35 teams who are *"within the confines of a hospital... so they would or should have the same vision or focus...
36 whereas we can see now with a community based programme the professionals can be very different in their
37 training, they can have a different ethos in the departments within their community. It's very individual. We
38 have different line managers and different resources to deal with"*, W82GO011. Some stakeholders *"didn't
39 want to get involved because of existing workloads"*, and the lack of extra resources or allocated time to
40 implement the pilot. Furthermore, while acknowledging the little time hospital staff had to develop
41 community-specific training, local-level stakeholders felt they needed more *"practical and tailored"*
42 information. Many described the training they received as *'too general'* and stated that *"it would have been
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60*

1
2
3 *very helpful to have had more practical tips on how to actually run the programme session to session with this*
4 *age group”, W82GO012.*

7 **External Environment**

8
9
10 In the Grol and Wensing model, the ‘economic and political context’ refers to financial arrangements,
11 regulations and policies - themes which did not emerge during our research. Therefore, the sixth level was
12 renamed ‘external environment’ to include wider societal perspectives and determinants.
13
14

15
16 In terms of the external environment, the lack of existing services to treat and manage childhood obesity
17 meant many stakeholders were excited to come on board and implement this new initiative. One stakeholder
18 described *“waiting for years for something to happen in this area”, W82GO005.* The media was recognised as
19 both a barrier and a facilitator to programme implementation. While stakeholders believed TV and radio
20 campaigns have the potential to raise awareness they felt that the issue is *“also getting very bad press”* and
21 being *“hyped up a little bit”* which in itself may make it more difficult for parents to come forward.
22 Additionally, staff felt that the stigma surrounding childhood obesity and weight management programmes
23 created a significant barrier to programme implementation as they believed many parents were reluctant to
24 attend or even talk about the issue of weight for fear of singling out or *‘labelling’* their child.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Vision for the future**

36
37 In terms of the future scale up of *W82GO-community*, the majority of stakeholders recommend establishing
38 dedicated childhood obesity teams within the community, *“ideally people who are located at least in the same*
39 *town”,* who can offer a range of interventions for different levels of need. One stakeholder described *“a tiered*
40 *effect, for example there could be a level one which could be a generic workshop or talk that you could roll-out*
41 *in lots of schools. A level two then would be a seminar for parents and level three would be a group*
42 *programme. Level four then could be actual specific one on one interventions”.* Having a tiered approach would
43 enable the team to match the level of need with the family and allow families to choose where on the scale
44 they would best fit.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **DISCUSSION**

1
2
3 This study identifies the barriers and facilitators to implementing a community-based weight management
4 programme from the perspective of stakeholders tasked with delivering such a programme. While community-
5 based weight management programmes have become an important response to the obesity epidemic given
6 their potential reach and accessibility for families, the majority are based on small, efficacy trials [2] and little is
7 known about the factors influencing their implementation in real-world settings. Our findings suggest that
8 more consideration is needed during the planning stages, including the creation of a structured programme
9 plan outlining specific roles and responsibilities. Local-level stakeholders believe they should be involved in this
10 process as they have practical experience of working with families on the ground in their respective
11 communities.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 A key barrier to the implementation of *W82GO-community* was perceived parental resistance which occurred
22 at the patient level but is also intrinsically linked to the external environment where the increasing
23 normalisation of overweight and obesity coexists with a stigma that surrounds the issue. Stakeholders
24 delivering the programme described parental resistance occurring at every stage of the implementation
25 process and suggested that parents did not appear to recognise the issue in their own children. As a result
26 stakeholders believed that parents did not see the need for treatment or refused to accept that their child was
27 carrying excess weight. While parental attitudes reported in this study were based on the perceptions of staff,
28 a lack of parental awareness regarding their child's weight and resistance towards discussing weight issues has
29 been documented in previous research [19-23]. This may be due in part to the belief that obesity has become
30 the norm in society, a point which was suggested by stakeholders in this study, and previously outlined in the
31 literature [24]. It is also possible that parental resistance stems from the stigma that is associated with excess
32 weight and obesity [8, 20-22] or the negative media attention obesity has received. The framing of coverage by
33 media may affect people's views about the causes of childhood obesity and the most appropriate strategies
34 for addressing the problem [25]. Our findings highlight the need, at a policy level, for positive awareness-
35 raising campaigns to encourage parental recognition of healthy childhood growth and development, in
36 addition to knowledge regarding the importance of identifying obesity early in childhood.

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Low perceived self-efficacy in approaching the subject of weight with parents was a barrier facing staff during implementation. Stakeholders in this study see the need for a childhood weight management programme in their communities and acknowledge their professional responsibility to get involved. However, they appear

1
2
3 uncomfortable and unequipped to do this. This is consistent with previous research which found that low
4 perceived skills and low perceived self-efficacy hamper the implementation of such programmes [19, 26-29]. In
5 our study motivational interviewing workshops equipped stakeholders in Site A with increased skills and
6 confidence in working with families on weight management issues. Motivational interviewing is a goal-
7 orientated, patient-centred approach based on the use of communication skills to understand individuals'
8 motivation for behaviour change [30] and has been found to be useful when applied in health care settings
9 [31]. We therefore consider it important that healthcare professionals involved in the implementation of
10 obesity programmes receive this training prior to programme commencement.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 The multidisciplinary structure of the programme emerged as both a barrier to and facilitator of
20 implementation and spread across many of the levels outlined by Grol and Wensing. While acknowledged that
21 it was required to treat such a complex health issue, it resulted in lack of role clarity, a lack of understanding of
22 specific discipline roles, and led to difficulties in scheduling. This may in part be due to the structure and
23 governance of community health services within Ireland. While there is a vision for multidisciplinary working
24 set out in multiple policy documents and an emphasis on integrated care [32], the system is not set-up to
25 support the concept. Stakeholders believe a simple roundtable introduction whereby practitioners could share
26 their professional background and outline their specific role within the project would have helped overcome
27 this ambiguity. They suggest it is a simple but often overlooked detail. Furthermore, stakeholders feel the
28 establishment of a local lead was critical in assisting multidisciplinary working while also facilitating discussion
29 between national and local level. Laws et al. also highlight the importance of having key local individuals
30 responsible for driving and coordinating research translation [33].

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 Finally, an important finding from this research was the inherent problems in a '*one size fits all*' approach to
44 community-based treatment. Stakeholders in our study suggest a tiered approach may be more suitable,
45 beginning with a brief intervention which intensifies based on a child's degree of obesity, the family's
46 motivation, and the capacity of the community and/or healthcare provider. This finding is in line with a
47 suggestion from Staniford et al. who suggest that future interventions should tailor treatment according to
48 participants' age, degree of obesity and their readiness or confidence to change [34]. In addition to tailoring a
49 programme to the individual, programmes need to be adapted for the community setting. Stakeholders in our
50 study raised concerns that the W82GO programme, having been developed in a hospital setting, was too
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 medicalised for community practice. In particular, the lengthy assessment process which in some cases
4 involved blood tests and the presence of medically trained doctors, was unnecessary for a community-based
5 lifestyle programme. This finding is consistent with previous research conducted by Watson et al. who
6 evaluated a family-based childhood obesity treatment intervention and found they needed to modify the
7 assessment process by replacing community paediatrician assessments with parent/carer self-completion forms
8 for reasons of time and cost [35]. To develop a full picture of treatment, future research should examine what
9 aspects of the programme work, for whom, in what context and why.

10
11 While this study provides important insight into the implementation of childhood obesity programme in the
12 community, several limitations should be acknowledged. According to de Casterlé *et al.*, (2012) "*using a*
13 *preconceived framework runs the risk of prematurely excluding alternative ways of organising the*
14 *data*"[36]pg.362. However, data was analysed inductively first before mapping emergent themes onto the Grol
15 and Wensing Framework. In subsequent phases of analysis we adapted the framework to capture the
16 influence of the external environment on implementation. Social desirability bias is a risk when stakeholders
17 are known to the researcher conducting the interviews. In this case the stakeholders knew the researcher as
18 the programme evaluator. However, we do not believe this bias had an effect as stakeholders were keen to
19 "*tell their story*". It is also important to note that parental attitudes reported in this study were based on the
20 perceptions of staff delivering the programme. Other studies have identified differences between parents,
21 staff and children in terms of their attitudes towards childhood obesity treatment [34]. We are conducting
22 further research with parents and children to understand the factors influencing their decisions to engage or
23 disengage with obesity treatment.

24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 **CONCLUSION**

44
45
46 In light of the dearth of knowledge available on the translation of multi-component childhood weight
47 management programmes to community settings, this study highlights the barriers and facilitators to
48 implementing such programmes from a wide range of community healthcare and admin perspectives. Our
49 results suggest the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, the provision of sufficient practical training
50 and resources, and organisational support play pivotal roles in overcoming barriers to change. Furthermore,
51 our findings on the challenges of multidisciplinary working and translating hospital programmes to community
52 settings are applicable to the implementation of interventions beyond that of childhood weight management.

1
2
3 This evidence should be used to develop implementation plans to improve the translation of interventions into
4
5 real world settings.
6

7 **STATEMENTS:**
8

- 9
10
 - Authors' contributions

11
12 The authors responsibilities were as follows: EK: was responsible for the design and conduct of the research,
13 and writing of the manuscript. SMH: was involved in data analysis and reviewed drafts of the manuscript. EK,
14 SMH, JH, FS and IJP made critical revisions to the paper and gave final approval of the version to be submitted.
15
16
17

- 18
19
 - Acknowledgements

20
21 We are grateful to the stakeholders who agreed to be interviewed for the study, without them this research
22 would not have been possible.
23

- 24
25
 - Competing interests

26
27 The authors declare that they have no competing interests
28

- 29
30
 - Funding

31
32 Source of support: E Kelleher is funded by the Health Research Board SPHeRE/2013/1. The Health Research
33 Board (HRB) supports excellent research that improves people's health, patient care and health service
34 delivery. We aim to ensure that new knowledge is created and then used in policy and practice. In doing so, we
35 support health system innovation and create new enterprise opportunities. Dr Sheena McHugh is funded by
36 the Centre for Ageing Research and Development in Ireland (CARDI), now the Ageing Research and
37 Development Division within the Institute of Public Health in Ireland (IPH).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

- 46
47
 - Data Sharing

48
49 Topic guides which were used in the interviews are available as additional supporting files. However, signed
50 confidentiality agreements prevent us from sharing transcripts.
51

- 52
53
 - Ethics approval

54
55 Ethical Approval was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the Cork Teaching Hospitals.
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Flynn, M., D. McNeil, B. Maloff, et al., Reducing obesity and related chronic disease risk in children and youth: a synthesis of evidence with 'best practice' recommendations. *Obes Rev*, 2006. **7 Suppl 1**: p. 7-66.
2. Oude Luttikhuis, H., L. Baur, H. Jansen, et al., Interventions for treating obesity in children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 2009(1): p. Cd001872.
3. Wilfley, D., A. Staiano, M. Altman, et al., Improving access and systems of care for evidence-based childhood obesity treatment: Conference key findings and next steps. *Obesity (Silver Spring)*, 2016.
4. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Weight management: lifestyle services for overweight or obese children and young people. Clinical Guideline, 47. 2013, NICE: London.
5. World Health Organisation., Report of the Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity. 2016, WHO Document Production Services: Geneva, Switzerland.
6. Nutbeam, D. and A. Bauman, Evaluation in a Nutshell: a practical guide to the evaluation of health promotion programs. Vol. 2. 2013, Australia: McGraw-Hill Education.
7. Welsby, D., B. Nguyen, B. O'Hara, et al., Process evaluation of an up-scaled community based child obesity treatment program: NSW Go4Fun(R). *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**: p. 140.
8. Lucas, P., K. Curtis-Tyler, L. Arai, et al., What works in practice: user and provider perspectives on the acceptability, affordability, implementation, and impact of a family-based intervention for child overweight and obesity delivered at scale. *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**: p. 614.
9. Stamatakis, K., C. Vinson, and J. Kerner, Dissemination and Implementation Research in Community and Public Health Settings, in *Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health: Translating Science to Practice*, R. Brownson, G. Colditz, and E. Proctor, Editors. 2012, Oxford University Press: New York.
10. Skelton, J. and B. Beech, Attrition in paediatric weight management: a review of the literature and new directions. *Obes Rev*, 2011. **12**(5): p. e273-81.
11. Kelleher, E., M. Davoren, J. Harrington, et al., Barriers and facilitators to initial and continued attendance at community-based lifestyle programmes among families of overweight and obese children: a systematic review. *Obes Rev*, 2016.
12. Keane, E., P. Kearney, I. Perry, et al., Trends and prevalence of overweight and obesity in primary school aged children in the Republic of Ireland from 2002-2012: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**(1): p. 974.
13. Layte, R. and C. McCrory, Growing Up in Ireland. Overweight and Obesity among 9-year olds. 2011, Department of Children and Youth Affairs: Dublin.
14. O'Malley, G., A. Brinkley, K. Moroney, et al., Is the Temple Street W82GO Healthy Lifestyles Programme effective in reducing BMI SDS? . *Obes Facts*, 2012. **5**(Suppl. 1): p. 178-234
15. Hoffmann, T., P. Glasziou, I. Boutron, et al., Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ*, 2014. **348**: p. g1687.
16. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Obesity. Guidance on the prevention of overweight and obesity in adults and children. Clinical Guideline, 43. 2015, NICE: London.
17. Ritchie, J. and J. Lewis, Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students & researchers. 2003, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
18. Grol, R. and M. Wensing, What drives change? Barriers to and incentives for achieving evidence-based practice. *Med J Aust*, 2004. **180**(6 Suppl): p. S57-60.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
19. Gerards, S.M., P. Dagnelie, M. Jansen, et al., Barriers to successful recruitment of parents of overweight children for an obesity prevention intervention: a qualitative study among youth health care professionals. *BMC Fam Pract*, 2012. **13**: p. 37.
20. Grow, H., C. Hsu, L. Liu, et al., Understanding family motivations and barriers to participation in community-based programs for overweight youth: one program model does not fit all. *J Public Health Manag Pract*, 2013. **19**(4): p. E1-e10.
21. Visram, S., T.D. Hall, and L. Geddes, Getting the balance right: qualitative evaluation of a holistic weight management intervention to address childhood obesity. *J Public Health (Oxf)*, 2012.
22. Newson, L., R. Povey, A. Casson, et al., The experiences and understandings of obesity: families' decisions to attend a childhood obesity intervention. *Psychol Health*, 2013. **28**(11): p. 1287-305.
23. Shiely, F., N. Hon Yan, E. Berkery, et al., The association between weight perception and BMI: Report and measurement data from the growing up in Ireland cohort study of 9 year olds. *Int J Obes*, 2016.
24. Binkin, N., A. Spinelli, G. Baglio, et al., What is common becomes normal: the effect of obesity prevalence on maternal perception. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*, 2013. **23**(5): p. 410-6.
25. Barry, C., M. Jarlenski, R. Grob, et al., News Media Framing of Childhood Obesity in the United States From 2000 to 2009. *Pediatrics*, 2011.
26. Moyers, P., L. Bugle, and E. Jackson, Perceptions of school nurses regarding obesity in school-age children. *J Sch Nurs*, 2005. **21**(2): p. 86-93.
27. Steele, R., Y. Wu, C. Jensen, et al., School nurses' perceived barriers to discussing weight with children and their families: a qualitative approach. *J Sch Health*, 2011. **81**(3): p. 128-37.
28. Story, M., D. Neumark-Stzainer, N. Sherwood, et al., Management of child and adolescent obesity: attitudes, barriers, skills, and training needs among health care professionals. *Pediatrics*, 2002. **110**(1 Pt 2): p. 210-4.
29. Turner, K., J. Shield, and C. Salisbury, Practitioners' views on managing childhood obesity in primary care: a qualitative study. *The British Jof Gen Pract*, 2009. **59**(568): p. 856-862.
30. Miller, W. and S. Rollnick, *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people for change*. 2002, New York: The Guilford Press.
31. Lozano, P., H. McPhillips, B. Hartzler, et al., Randomized trial of teaching brief motivational interviewing to pediatric trainees to promote healthy behaviors in families. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*, 2010. **164**(6): p. 561-6.
32. Department of Health., *A Healthy Weight for Ireland 2016–2025. Obesity Policy and Action Plan 2016*, Stationary Office: Dublin.
33. Laws, R., K. Hesketh, K. Ball, et al., Translating an early childhood obesity prevention program for local community implementation: a case study of the Melbourne INFANT Program. *BMC Public Health*, 2016. **16**: p. 748.
34. Staniford, L.J., J.D. Breckon, R.J. Copeland, et al., Key stakeholders' perspectives towards childhood obesity treatment: A qualitative study. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 2011. **15**(3): p. 230-244.
35. Watson, P., L. Dugdill, K. Pickering, et al., Service evaluation of the GOALS family-based childhood obesity treatment intervention during the first 3 years of implementation. *BMJ Open*, 2015. **5**(2).
36. Dierckx de Casterle, B., C. Gastmans, E. Bryon, et al., QUAGOL: a guide for qualitative data analysis. *Int J Nurs Stud*, 2012. **49**(3): p. 360-71.

Supplementary Material 1: Completed TIDieR checklist



Template for Intervention
Description and Replication

The TIDieR (Template for Intervention Description and Replication) Checklist

Information to include when describing an intervention and the location of the information

Item number	Item	
	BRIEF NAME	
1.	Provide the name or a phrase that describes the intervention.	'W82GO-community' – a multi-component, family-focused childhood weight management pilot programme delivered in the community setting.
	WHY	
2.	Describe any rationale, theory, or goal of the elements essential to the intervention.	The W82GO-community programme is a family-focused programme grounded in behavioural change theory (transtheoretical model and social cognitive theory) and aims to reduce obesity in children with BMI \geq 98th percentile, improve children's dietary intake, physical activity levels and weight status while also increasing children's quality of life and psychosocial health.
	WHAT	
3.	Materials: Describe any physical or informational materials used in the intervention, including those provided to participants or used in intervention delivery or in training of intervention providers. Provide information on where the materials can be accessed (e.g. online appendix, URL).	The W82GO-community programme includes: (1) The W82GO-community pilot programme was delivered by a multi-disciplinary team using a manual developed to support community-based healthcare professionals to deliver the programme in their area. It does so through the provision of a guide to setting up a team and preparing the delivery of the programme; a framework for individual sessions that allows for session preparation and planning including programme presentations on disc; materials, including

template letters and evaluation forms that can be adapted to suit the local context and information on additional resources that are available to support the team

(2) W82GO leaflet outlining the programmes goals and core elements to be distributed to families during recruitment

(3) W82GO family information booklet including goal setting and additional resources and tips were distributed to all families attending the programme

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 **4.** Procedures: Describe each of the procedures, activities, and/or
15 processes used in the intervention, including any enabling or support
16 activities.
17
18

Recruitment: heights and weights were measured in school by public health nurses (PHNs) using standardised procedures. Weight and height data was subsequently used to calculate body mass index (BMI) and children were classified as obese if their BMI plotted ≥ 98 th BMI percentile for age and gender using the UK90 recommended cut-off points for treatment or referral which are currently used in Irish practice. Parents of children meeting this eligibility criterion were contacted by their school PHN to inform them of their child's weight status and those who indicated an interest in attending the programme were subsequently invited to attend an initial screening assessment.

This individualised initial assessment assessed eligibility before programme commencement. This assessment was carried out by a multidisciplinary team to rule out underlying medical conditions. In addition, indicators of health literacy, health beliefs and physical and environmental variables that might act as barriers to change were recorded.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Following the initial assessment six group sessions took places over six weeks and group booster sessions occurred at three, six and nine months. During these group sessions parents and their children received an educational session for the first hour. Children were taken out to complete physical activity for the last 30 minutes while parents an received extra educational session. At 12 months another individualised final assessment took place to document any changes and make plans for sustainment.

WHO PROVIDED

5. For each category of intervention provider (e.g. psychologist, nursing assistant), describe their expertise, background and any specific training given.

The W82GO community-programme was delivered by a multidisciplinary team of community health professionals including dietitians, physiotherapists, public health nurses, psychologists, health promotion officers, area medical officers, administrators and local area management. These health professionals had varying levels of experience of dealing with childhood obesity and as a result were invited to take part in a training programme prior to programme commencement. Training included a needs assessment, a one day educational training course and two days of clinical shadowing with an experienced W82GO programme practitioner at Temple Street Children's University Hospital in Dublin, Ireland. Each community practitioner was also supplied with a user manual which outlined the programme and detailed the content for both phases.

Public health nurses in one of the sites received motivational interviewing training specific to childhood obesity as part of routine training in the area already being conducted in that area.

HOW

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

6. Describe the modes of delivery (e.g. face-to-face or by some other mechanism, such as internet or telephone) of the intervention and whether it was provided individually or in a group.

The W82GO-community programme involved face-to-face sessions and included a mixture of group and individualised sessions as outlined above.

15
16

WHERE

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

7. Describe the type(s) of location(s) where the intervention occurred, including any necessary infrastructure or relevant features.

Initial assessments took place in community healthcare offices. Subsequent group sessions were delivered on weekdays in the afternoon at a local sports or community centre.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

WHEN and HOW MUCH

8. Describe the number of times the intervention was delivered and over what period of time including the number of sessions, their schedule, and their duration, intensity or dose.

The programme was run in two sites (Site A and Site B) over 12 months. The individual assessment lasted approximately one and half to two hours. The initial intensive phase consisted of 6 weekly group sessions for both the child and his/her parent/carer and these occurred over one afternoon a week and lasted approximately one and a half to two hours. The three booster sessions at three, six and nine months lasted approximately one to one and a half hours. During these group sessions parents and their children received an educational session for the first hour. Children were taken out to complete physical activity for the last 30 minutes while parents an received extra educational session.

45
46
47

TAILORING

9. If the intervention was planned to be personalised, titrated or adapted, then describe what, why, when, and how.

All families received the same intervention.

MODIFICATIONS

10.† If the intervention was modified during the course of the study, describe the changes (what, why, when, and how).

Two sites delivered the pilot programme to their respective communities. Site A decided to separate children and parents from the start of the group sessions because they felt children of this age would not gain anything nor

1 were likely to understand the educational sessions. Children received a full
 2 physical activity session instead while parents received the educational
 3 session alone.
 4

5 Owing to low numbers attending the programme in Site B programme staff
 6 chose not to go ahead with the final assessment at 12 months and instead
 7 conducted the final assessments during the third booster session.
 8

9
 10 **HOW WELL**

- | | | | |
|----|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11 | 12 11. | 13 Planned: If intervention adherence or fidelity was assessed, describe
14 how and by whom, and if any strategies were used to maintain or
15 improve fidelity, describe them. | 16 Fidelity of intervention delivery was assessed using trainer self-reports and
17 exit interviews. |
| 18 | 19 12.† | 20 Actual: If intervention adherence or fidelity was assessed, describe the
21 extent to which the intervention was delivered as planned. | 22 In Site A, the programme was delivered in a more interactive manner (i.e.
23 without the use of programme slides). Site B followed the manuals as planned. |

24 ** **Authors** - use N/A if an item is not applicable for the intervention being described. **Reviewers** – use ‘?’ if information about the element is not reported/not sufficiently reported.

25 † If the information is not provided in the primary paper, give details of where this information is available. This may include locations such as a published protocol or other published
 26 papers (provide citation details) or a website (provide the URL).

27 ‡ If completing the TIDieR checklist for a protocol, these items are not relevant to the protocol and cannot be described until the study is complete.

28 * We strongly recommend using this checklist in conjunction with the TIDieR guide (see *BMJ* 2014;348:g1687) which contains an explanation and elaboration for each item.

29
 30 * The focus of TIDieR is on reporting details of the intervention elements (and where relevant, comparison elements) of a study. Other elements and methodological features of studies are
 31 covered by other reporting statements and checklists and have not been duplicated as part of the TIDieR checklist. When a **randomised trial** is being reported, the TIDieR checklist should be
 32 used in conjunction with the CONSORT statement (see www.consort-statement.org) as an extension of **Item 5 of the CONSORT 2010 Statement**. When a **clinical trial protocol** is being
 33 reported, the TIDieR checklist should be used in conjunction with the SPIRIT statement as an extension of **Item 11 of the SPIRIT 2013 Statement** (see www.spirit-statement.org). For
 34 alternate study designs, TIDieR can be used in conjunction with the appropriate checklist for that study design (see www.equator-network.org).
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47

COREQ Checklist for Qualitative Research:

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Pg. 6
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	Pg. 1, 6 & 7
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Pg. 1, 6
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Pg. 1,6
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Pg. 6
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Pg. 3
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Pg. 15
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	Pg. 1,3,6
Domain 2: study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	Pg. 6-7
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Pg. 6
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Pg. 6
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	Pg. 7
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Pg. 7
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Pg. 6
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	NA
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Pg. 7
<i>Data collection</i>		

17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Pg. 6
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	NA
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Pg. 6
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes
21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	Pg. 6
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Pg. 6
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Pg. 7
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	N/A
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Pg. 7
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Pg. 7
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	NA
<i>Reporting</i>		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Pg. 8-13
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Pg. 8-13
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Pg. 8-13
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Discussion of major and minor themes Pg. 8-13

BMJ Open

Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a community-based, multidisciplinary, family-focused childhood weight management programme in Ireland: A qualitative study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-016459.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Jun-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Kelleher, Emily; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Harrington, Janas; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Shiely, Frances; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Perry, Ivan; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Mc Hugh, Sheena; University College Cork, Epidemiology & Public Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research, Health services research, Public health
Keywords:	Implementation, barriers, facilitators, childhood, obesity, community

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Title:
4

5 Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a community-based, multidisciplinary, family-focused
6 childhood weight management programme in Ireland: A qualitative study
7
8

9
10 Corresponding Author:
11

12 Emily Kelleher, MPH BSc, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, 4th Floor, Western Gateway Building,
13 University College Cork, Ireland. Email: emily.kelleher@ucc.ie Tel: 00353 (21) 4205517
14
15

16
17 Authors:
18

19 Emily Kelleher, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
20
21

22 Janas M Harrington, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
23
24

25 Frances Shiely, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork and HRB Clinical
26 Research Facility, Mercy University Hospital, Grenville Place, Cork, Ireland
27
28

29 Ivan J Perry, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
30
31

32 Sheena M McHugh, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
33
34

35 Keywords:
36

37 Implementation; barriers; facilitators; childhood; obesity; community; treatment
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT:

Objective: To explore the barriers and facilitators experienced by those implementing a government-funded, community-based, childhood weight management programme.

Design: Qualitative using semi-structured interviews.

Setting: Two geographical regions in the south and west of the Republic of Ireland.

Participants: 29 national and local level stakeholders responsible for implementing the programme including professionals from dietetics, psychology, public health nursing, physiotherapy, health promotion and administration.

Methods: Framework analysis was used to identify barriers and facilitators which were mapped onto six levels of factors influencing implementation outlined by Grol and Wensing: the innovation, the individual professional, the patient, the social context, the organisational context, and the external environment.

Results: Most barriers occurred at the level of the organisational context. For all stakeholders, barriers arose due to the multidisciplinary nature of the programme, including the lack of role clarity and added complexity of working in different locations. Health professionals' low-perceived self-efficacy in approaching the subject of weight with parents and parental resistance to hearing about their child's weight status were barriers to programme implementation at the individual professional and patient levels, respectively. The main facilitators of implementation, occurring at the level of the health professional, included stakeholders' recognition of the need for a weight management programme and personal interest in the area of childhood obesity. Having a local lead and supportive colleagues were further implementation drivers.

Conclusions: This study highlights the complexities associated with implementing a multidisciplinary childhood weight management programme, particularly translating such programmes to a community setting. Our results suggest the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, the provision of sufficient practical training and resources, and organisational support play pivotal roles in overcoming barriers to change. This evidence can be used to develop an implementation plan to support the translation of interventions into real world settings.

KEYWORDS:

Implementation; barriers; facilitators; childhood; obesity; community

ARTICLE SUMMARY**Strengths and limitations**

- This is one of few qualitative studies, and the first in Ireland, that explored the factors that hampered and facilitated the implementation of a community-based, multi-component childhood weight management programme from a wide range of stakeholder perspectives.
- While interviewing a wide range of stakeholders provided a thorough overview of the relevant issues, the themes that emerged were relatively homogenous across disciplines which added to the authority of the findings.
- Data were analysed using a systematic approach and an adapted version of the implementation model by Grol and Wensing was used to classify the barriers and facilitators into levels.
- Using a preconceived framework runs the risk of prematurely excluding other ways of organising the data. However, data was analysed inductively first before mapping onto the Grol and Wensing Framework.

BACKGROUND:

Childhood obesity is a worldwide public health concern and there is now widespread agreement that the complex aetiology of the issue requires a multifaceted approach to treatment [1-3]. International recommendations agree that initiatives to reduce and manage childhood obesity should be family-focused and combine healthy eating, physical activity and behavioural components [2, 4, 5]. In 2016, the World Health Organisation published their report of the commission on ending childhood obesity within which they echo these recommendations but also add that they should be delivered by *“multi-professional teams with appropriate training and resources”* [5]pg.11. These recommendations, however, have been largely based on small-scale studies conducted in controlled settings with specialised staff, thus limiting their applicability and generalizability to ‘real-world’ settings such as communities or hospitals [2].

1
2
3 In public health, once interventions have undergone innovation testing and demonstrated efficacy the next
4 steps include replication and 'scale-up' to larger populations in 'real-world' settings [6]. There are relatively
5 few examples of published studies reporting on the pragmatic application of effective childhood obesity
6 treatment programmes [7, 8]. While implementation issues such as engagement, local context, staffing and
7 funding are likely to be common across many public health interventions [8], little is documented about the
8 experience of those implementing childhood weight management programmes and even fewer studies detail
9 the factors influencing implementation [9]. For example, a lack of providers trained in evidence-based care for
10 childhood obesity was listed by delegates attending a recent conference in the United States as a major barrier
11 to treatment implementation [3]. Furthermore, with the majority of families declining referral and up to 75%
12 of families discontinuing care, poor engagement with families has proven to be a significant challenge facing
13 teams tasked with implementing such programmes [10, 11].
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 When introduced under less-controlled conditions, insight into the factors influencing implementation is
26 crucial. Therefore, the aim of this study was to explore and categorise the barriers and facilitators experienced
27 by those implementing a government-funded, community-based, multi-component childhood weight
28 management pilot programme to inform their eventual scale up.
29
30
31
32

33 **METHODS:**

34 **Intervention and context**

35
36
37 Although trends appear to be stabilising in Ireland, prevalence of childhood obesity remains high [12].
38 Currently, in Ireland, almost one in four children are either overweight or obese [13] and there is no
39 standardised community-based weight management programme available to those children with obesity.
40 Community programmes are usually provided on an ad-hoc basis and are rarely evaluated or sustained. In an
41 attempt to identify a universal treatment the Irish Health Service Executive (HSE) planned to pilot the *W82GO-*
42 *community* programme in two communities. This programme had previously demonstrated effectiveness in
43 the hospital setting [14]. Its effectiveness in the community setting was to be assessed with the intention of
44 nationwide rollout should the programme demonstrate a positive impact on body mass index (BMI). The
45 Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) checklist [15] was used to specify the details of
46 programme delivery and is included in Supplementary file 1.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In summary, *W82GO* aims to improve nutrition, increase physical activity and facilitate behaviour change over
4 one year [14]. It was designed as a hospital-based, family-focused, multidisciplinary programme grounded in
5 behavioural change theory and was modelled on best practice recommendations [2, 5, 16]. The primary goal
6 was a reduction in Body Mass Index Standard Deviation Score and has previously been found to be effective
7 when delivered in a hospital out-patient setting [14].
8
9

10
11
12 The *W82GO* programme involves an initial individual assessment to ascertain family eligibility followed by two
13 phases. Families were eligible for the programme if the child was between 5-7 years old; was obese (BMI
14 ≥ 98 th centile); had no limitations to engaging in physical activity; was not taking medication known to affect
15 body weight; and had at least one parent/carer who was able to attend each of the programme sessions.
16 Siblings were also welcome to attend the sessions. Phase 1 involved an initial intensive phase consisting of six
17 weekly group sessions for both the child and his/her parent/carer. These sessions lasted approximately one
18 and a half to two hours and incorporated educational and practical sessions to increase physical activity,
19 improve nutrition and increase sleep. Upon completion of phase 1, children returned with their parents/care-
20 givers for three booster group sessions at three, six and nine months. These sessions aimed to encourage the
21 family to continue with lifestyle change and to manage any barriers to change. Finally, at 12 months, the
22 children and their parents/care-givers returned for a final individual assessment to document any changes and
23 make plans for sustainment.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 For the current study, *W82GO* was adapted and implemented in two community sites (Site A and Site B) from
38 April 2015 for 12 months and subsequently renamed *W82GO-community*. Both sites were chosen as they were
39 part of a national pilot growth measurement programme and included a mix of rural and urban towns in the
40 west and south of Ireland. Initial assessments took place in community healthcare offices while subsequent
41 group sessions were delivered on weekdays in the afternoon at a local sports or community centre. The
42 programme was offered free of charge and was delivered by existing community health professionals including
43 dietitians, psychologists, public health nurses, physiotherapists, health promotion officers, area medical
44 officers and administrators. These health professionals were brought together as a team and asked to deliver
45 this programme as part of their existing roles. Table 1 outlines their specific responsibilities during programme
46 implementation. All staff were invited to take part in a training programme prior to programme
47 commencement. Training included a needs assessment, a one day educational training course and two days of
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

clinical shadowing with an experienced *W82GO* programme practitioner at the National Children's University Hospital where it was developed. Each community practitioner was supplied with a user manual which outlined the programme and detailed the content for both phases.

Table 1 Health professional roles during the implementation of *W82GO*-community

Health Professional	Role in implementation of <i>W82GO</i> -community
National Manager (n=1)	Overseeing implementation of <i>W82GO</i> -community in both community sites
Local Manager (n=2)	Overseeing implementation of <i>W82GO</i> -community at local level. Local manager in Site B was involved in referring to the programme.
Physiotherapists (n=4)	Involved in initial assessments and delivering programme material
Dietitians (n=5)	Involved in initial assessments and delivering programme material
Psychologists (n=3)	Involved in initial assessments and delivering programme material
Public Health Nurses (n=13)	Referral to the programme
Area Medical Officers (n=4)	Involved in initial assessments
Health Promotion Officers (n=4)	Delivering programme material
Administration (n=2)	Involved in contacting parents re programme sessions

Study design and sample

A qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews was utilised. We adopted a purposive approach to sampling, inviting stakeholders with knowledge and experience of planning, coordinating or delivering *W82GO*-community. To ensure representation from each stakeholder group and given the small number of individuals in each, we invited all stakeholders to participate (n=38, see table 1). All stakeholders were contacted by email in the first instance and followed up by telephone contact during which the researcher outlined the study aims and methodology.

Data collection

All participants were invited to take part in face-to-face interviews. However, due to time and scheduling difficulties a mixture of telephone and face-to-face interviews were conducted between August 2015 and February 2016 (during programme implementation). To ensure consistency all interviews were conducted by a single trained qualitative researcher (EK), using a semi structured topic guide. Participants knew the interviewer as an independent programme evaluator conducting this research as part of her PhD training. The topic guide was developed based on relevant literature and focused on seven issues: (1) awareness of the

1
2
3 issue of childhood obesity and existing healthy lifestyle programmes, (2) perceived value of and interest in
4 community evidence-based treatment programmes, (3) communication of the *W82GO-community* pilot
5 programme; (4) specific role in implementing *W82GO-community*; (5) barriers and enablers to
6 implementation; (6) perceived successes and challenges experienced and finally (7) recommendations for the
7 future roll-out of childhood weight management programmes in Irish communities. Core topics were the same
8 across stakeholders and particular probes were added for specific stakeholder groups depending on their role
9 during the programme. For example public health nurses were specifically asked to report on the barriers and
10 facilitators to referral. Prompts and probes were used throughout the interviews to stimulate discussion. Prior
11 to each interview, participants were informed about the purpose of the study, that participation was voluntary
12 and that they could terminate the interview at any stage for any reason. Signed informed consent was
13 obtained before each interview, which lasted on average 45 minutes. Interviews were digitally recorded and
14 transcribed verbatim. Data collection and analysis was iterative. Data saturation was judged to have been
15 reached between interviews 20 and 25. However during recruitment, other stakeholders had expressed an
16 interest in sharing their experience and so were given the opportunity to participate. The data from these
17 interviews overlapped with the existing coding framework and thus contributed to the main themes. Ethical
18 approval was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the Cork Teaching Hospitals.

34 35 **Data Analysis**

36
37 Framework analysis was used to analyse the data [17]. This approach enabled the investigation of a priori
38 objectives while also allowing new themes to emerge from the data. One researcher (EK) transcribed and
39 coded each transcript while another (SMH) undertook initial coding of a selection of transcripts. Similarities
40 and differences between the coding labels and definitions were discussed and the coding framework was
41 refined and applied to the remaining interviews. While this process was conducted at an early stage of the
42 analysis, the coding process was iterative; emergent codes were added to the framework and contributed to
43 the development of themes across the interviews. Codes were synthesised and grouped according to the
44 dominant emergent themes. Themes were also analysed across stakeholder groups to identify similarities and
45 differences across disciplines and positions. These themes were mapped onto a framework developed by Grol
46 and Wensing (2004) which specifies six levels of factors that facilitate or impede implementation success: the
47 innovation; the individual professional, the patient; the social context; the organisational context; and the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

economic and political environment [18]. Mapping emergent themes to the framework at this stage of the analysis ensured that we did not impose a predefined structure or terminology on participants' accounts. This well-established framework (Table 2) was chosen because it describes how barriers and facilitators can be identified, categorised, and used for the development of tailor-based implementation strategies to facilitate desired change [18], in this instance implementing the *W82GO-community* programme. Discrepancies on the mapping of themes were discussed until consensus was reached. NVivo (QSR v10) was used to manage data analysis.

Table 2 Barriers to and incentives for change at different levels of healthcare^a

Level	Barriers / Incentives
Innovation	Advantages in practice, feasibility, credibility, attractiveness, accessibility
Individual Practitioner	Awareness, knowledge, attitude, motivation to change, behavioural routines
Patient	Knowledge, skills, attitude, compliance
Social Context	Opinion of colleagues, culture of the network, collaboration, leadership
Organisational Context	Organisation of care processes, staff, capacities, resources, structures
Economic and Political Context	Financial arrangements, regulations, policies

^a*Grol and Wensing's multilevel model*[18]

RESULTS

Stakeholder Characteristics

We contacted 38 stakeholders and recruited 29 interviewees (7 face-to-face, 22 telephone) from a range of disciplines and professions, yielding a response rate of 76% (Table 3).

Table 3 Stakeholder characteristics

	Site A	Site B	National	Total
National Manager	NA	NA	1	1
Local Manager	1	1	x	2
Physiotherapists	2	1	1	4
Dietitians	3	x	x	3
Psychologists	1	1	x	2
Public Health Nurses	6	3	x	9
Area Medical Officers	x	2	x	2
Health Promotion Officers	3	1	x	4
Administration	1	x	1	2
Total	17	9	3	29

Barriers and Facilitators

For all participants, barriers arose due to the multidisciplinary nature of the programme, including the lack of understanding of other disciplines, lack of role clarity as well as the added complexities of working in different locations. Participants' recognition of the need for a childhood obesity programme and their own personal interest in the area were the main drivers of implementation while the presence of a local lead and supportive colleagues were further enabling factors. Views on the main barriers and facilitators to implementation were consistent across stakeholders; despite different disciplinary backgrounds, they had common experiences as implementers adding to the authority of the findings. Table 4 presents the perceived barriers and facilitators from the perspective of the stakeholders mapped onto the six implementation levels with quotations to illustrate each level.

Table 4 Perceived Barriers and Facilitators to the Implementation of W82GO in the Community

Levels	Quotations to illustrate the identified levels
The Innovation	
Credibility	(+) <i>"I suppose because it was attached to an acute hospital and because there was a consultant paediatrician and you had a lot of disciplines and a lot of very competent professionals involved, and that it had been successful when delivered there. That was the main reason I believed in the programme I suppose", W82GO003</i>
Attractiveness (i.e. Multidisciplinary nature)	(+) <i>"I do think the MDT approach was superb. I think that is you're going to do something for a child who is obese then you need it." W82GO018</i>
Transferability (i.e. different population, different resource issues)	(-) <i>"You are talking about a different cohort of families. Families who are already in the system. They are used to going in for appointments. You're talking about a group who've already had difficulties identified by their GP or whoever so by the time they are going for the group they are already sold, they are used to it and they are used to that sort of setting which is very kind of fast and quick-paced and very focused", W82GO002</i>
Relevance (e.g. too medicalised)	(-) <i>"I think the area medical officer, the medical input I think is probably optional or at least part-time. It's of less importance. It medicalised this community programme a bit too much", W82GO021</i>
The Individual Professional	
Awareness of the problem / Recognition of need	(+) <i>"It is a problem, most definitely. I think it's a time bomb that went off over the past 10 years and that we are behind it. Way behind it and the sooner we get going and get doing something the better", W82GO013</i>
Personal interest and motivation	(+) <i>"So that enthusiasm and that dedication made it happen, it was key to its success", W82GO011</i>
Low self-efficacy	(-) <i>"I wouldn't be especially skilled in assessing children you know with obesity and that kind of thing... Or talking to parents about it... I was concerned about my own ability to, to get up to speed fairly quickly", W82GO015</i>

Attitudes (i.e. Multidisciplinary perspectives)	(-) "I suppose the other main challenge was the multidisciplinary nature of the programme. I think the challenges of it is when you put together a team obviously from all different backgrounds not with different agendas but with different experiences and knowledge and different perspectives", W82GO026
The Patient	
Parental Resistance (weight misperception and denial)	(-) "I think there was a denial that there was anything wrong with their child, or that their child was overweight. There was a total denial about that because the population in general look like their child. Their child may be a little bit above of what the normal population looks like, but they didn't see that as an issue at all", W82GO028
The Social Context	
Supportive colleagues	(+) "Once she came on board there was two of us, it was a lot easier to share the workload and if I couldn't be there for a day she could be there for it so I suppose that definitely took the load off and she also acted as a sounding board you know? If there was something I wasn't sure of I could say what do you think about this and vice-versa, you know what I mean?", W82GO016
Leadership	(+) "I mean if we didn't have her pulling all those people and bits together it wouldn't have worked. She did a great job in I think the co-ordination role cause I think running something like this with people dispersed across a whole county and city then you need a project manager on the ground.", W82GO017
Collaboration between national and local teams	(-) "I did feel there was a very big gap once the decision had been made nationally to roll this out, there was a very big gap then us on the ground and them, there was no consultation or collaboration with people on the ground and I think that's where the problem was", W82GO003
The Organisational Context	
MDT Structure (logistics)	(-) "I suppose one of the challenges definitely is that the health professionals are all in different places", W82GO004
Resources	(-) "I guess time constraints 'cause a lot of people were pressurised for time. Like even ourselves we wouldn't have been able to go to every session and I would have liked to have gone but we just couldn't. We didn't have the time. We didn't have the staff to be able to attend so i think time and resource pressures were the main concerns", W82GO013
Training	(-) "It (the training) was as if they were trying to sell us the programme when you know we were already there. We were already sold. I mean we knew why it was important... because of the obesity issue so there was no need to go over all that again. They should have just focused on how to actually implement and deliver the programme", W82GO011
External Environment	
Lack of existing services	(+) "There is nothing out there so that's where it was great to have something like W82GO. That if you did see a child that you know there was something. Some sort of pathway"
Media	(+) "There was a huge media campaign ongoing around the time we were implementing the programme which got some parents thinking and talking. I mean those things do have a big impact. Things like Operation Transformation that's aired in January have a huge impact. I think we need more media on the impact of childhood obesity and not just the long-term impacts", W82GO003 (-) "I think maybe it's (obesity) hyped up a little bit in the media. I think maybe that in itself could be making things difficult for parents to come forward. We don't have any other disease related issue hyped up as much you know? If you had a child with obesity you would be feeling a small bit cringe like. You'd be wanting to find somewhere private to get some help like you know", W82GO020
Stigma	(-) "Wouldn't have their child come to a programme in case they'd be labelled overweight or obese. There is a stigma and just from hearing again I wasn't in the parents room, but just from hearing other colleagues feedback it's the parents fear of feeling judged and

	<i>blamed</i> ",W82GO002
--	--------------------------

(+) Facilitators, (-) Barriers.

The Innovation

In terms of the *W82GO-community* pilot programme (innovation), while stakeholders believed it came from a credible source having been developed by one of the national children's hospitals in Ireland, many had doubts over its accessibility and about how well it would transfer to the community setting. This uncertainty resulted in feelings of unease and community practitioners were hesitant to get involved initially. One stakeholder explained how she worried at length about what impact the programme would have on existing services and how feasible it was to run in the community; *"The setting is different. We were taking a programme that was from an acute setting into the community - that possibly was where the breakdown happened because you didn't have the same services. You didn't have people on site. There was travel, there was all these other logistics that weren't thought about when they were moving an acute programme to the community"*, W82GO021. In particular, stakeholders believed they were dealing with a very different cohort of families than the hospital-based programme as described by the following quote; *"You've a very different kind of child coming into the hospital than you do in the general community. You've a very different kind of parent. Even if you had a parent who was resistant to hearing about their child being overweight, if they are attending hospital appointments regularly they are obviously already engaged about their child's health... so I believe that's a major barrier straight away that they possibly didn't have to face in the hospital you know?"*, W82GO010.

In addition to the differences in the target group, stakeholders believed the programme was too medicalised for the community setting and some felt it did not fit with their perception of a healthy lifestyle programme. This was due to the number of health professionals involved and in particular, the involvement of medical staff. Furthermore, many stakeholders thought the collection of clinical markers of disease and medical history during the initial assessments was unnecessary. As one stakeholder described; *"the initial assessments were totally irrelevant. I mean when I heard that bloods were being taken I thought oh for God sake. You know we were supposed to be running a community-based education intervention where the focus should be on changing lifestyles. It's not our job to be diagnosing other problems"*, W82GO005.

Individual Professional

While stakeholders both applauded and recognised the need for a multidisciplinary approach to the treatment of childhood obesity, it created significant barriers to programme implementation. The variety of community health professionals involved in the implementation of *W82GO-community* with differing perspectives and priorities led to role uncertainty and in some cases a perception of disrespect between disciplines. One stakeholder captures this theme in the following quote; *"I suppose the other main challenge was the multidisciplinary nature of the programme. I think the challenge is when you put together a team obviously from all different backgrounds not with different agendas but with different experiences and knowledge and different perspectives"*, W82GO026. Stakeholders described how *"there was quite a lack of understanding of the various discipline roles and responsibilities and some were even unsure of what some disciplines did"*, W82GO012. This lack of understanding sometimes resulted in tension between disciplines and created a challenging environment to work in. Others recalled feeling concerned about where they fit into the programme and believed a structured programme plan outlining specific roles and responsibilities was lacking.

Another key barrier that emerged at the level of the individual professional was their low perceived self-efficacy in dealing with childhood obesity and/or working with this young age group. In particular, many stakeholders reported their fear of approaching the subject with parents given the risk of upsetting them or *"rocking the boat"*. One stakeholder reported that *"it's something you want to do something about but it can be very difficult to approach the subject with parents. It's a very sensitive issue"*, W82GO001. In our study, stakeholders in Site A received motivational interviewing workshops for childhood obesity. This training equipped these stakeholders with increased skills and confidence in working with families on weight management issues. As one stakeholder described, post motivational interviewing training she wasn't *"frightened of dealing with them [parents] at all", It's kind of second nature to me now... I know the buzz words, I know exactly what to say to them. And body language, the whole lot"*, W82GO002. Others felt it was quite *"alien"* to work with children aged 5-6 years and believed they had not the appropriate training to do so.

Despite these barriers, all stakeholders were aware that childhood obesity was an issue in their respective communities and recognised the urgent need for treatment; *"Yeah I think it's a time bomb that went off over*

1
2
3 *the past ten years and that we are behind it, way behind and the sooner we get going and doing whatever we*
4 *can the better”, W82GO012. Furthermore, stakeholders’ personal interest in tackling the issue, and their*
5 *motivation and dedication to seeing the programme through were what many believed to be the main drivers*
6 *behind programme completion; “It went ahead due to a lot of determination and not because it was easily*
7 *implementable... if that’s a word”, W82GO014.*

13 **Patient**

14
15
16 Low programme uptake was a key issue during implementation. Many stakeholders believe that obesity has
17 become the norm in society and as a result *“people don’t recognise overweight people as being in that actual*
18 *overweight category because it’s become normal to be surrounded by overweight people”, W82GO021. In*
19 *terms of the W82GO-community pilot programme, almost all stakeholders indicated that although children*
20 *measured as obese on the growth charts their parents seemed unaware of any excess weight and once*
21 *informed, many refused to accept that their child was obese. As a result of this misperception parents did not*
22 *realise or accept the need for treatment. Speaking of her experience, one stakeholder described how “other*
23 *parents just didn’t reply or didn’t get in touch because they believed everything was ok and there wasn’t a*
24 *problem with their child. They didn’t need any programme. I think that definitely was a huge problem out there*
25 *in the community setting”, W82GO012. Because of this low recognition amongst parents, many stakeholders*
26 *recalled the resistance they faced when trying to discuss the issue with them and their fear prior to making*
27 *contact with parents. One stakeholder explained how some parents would “be really angry so you’re taking*
28 *angry phone calls in the evening. You know when you come in from a day’s work so it was really difficult”,*
29 *W82GO002.*

44 **Social Context**

45
46 Local level stakeholders believed there was a certain level of *“naïvety”* at national level about the reality of
47 rolling out the pilot programme on the ground. They felt consultation during the planning stage was lacking
48 and that national-level stakeholders had *“little experience of the practical aspects of childhood obesity”* as *“no*
49 *one was actually working with obese children or even groups on a day to day basis”, W82GO004. As a result*
50 *unrealistic expectations and timeframes prevailed, particularly during the recruitment phase. This led to*
51 *frustration and confusion among local-level health professionals during implementation.*

1
2
3 Communication between national and local level stakeholders was considered poor. However, the presence of
4 a local lead facilitated the exchange between staff on the ground and management at national level and was
5 seen by almost all stakeholders as crucial for programme implementation. Furthermore, stakeholders felt that
6 because of the multidisciplinary approach of the programme “*you needed someone on the ground*”; if they did
7 not have a local lead “*pulling all those people and bits together, it wouldn't have worked because running*
8 *something like this with people dispersed across a whole county and city is difficult*”, W82GO005. The presence
9 of supportive colleagues and management were identified as further enabling factors.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Organisational Context**

18
19 The multidisciplinary structure of the programme also created barriers at the organisational level. In addition
20 to differing individual perspectives and priorities, the added complexities of working in different locations
21 created difficulties during programme implementation. In many cases stakeholders didn't “*work at the same*
22 *site... or even the same town which was a challenge*” as it “*took up a lot of time organising between schedules*
23 *and travelling to meet and go through practicalities*”, W82GO007.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 In addition to these challenges, at the organisational level, stakeholders reported that implementation was
31 hampered due to insufficient resources (i.e. staff and time) and training. It was reported that two other
32 proposed areas withdrew from the pilot programme because of the lack of staff and leadership on the ground
33 to run the programme. Stakeholders felt that they had very different resource issues to the hospital-based
34 teams who are “*within the confines of a hospital... so they would or should have the same vision or focus...*
35 *whereas we can see now with a community based programme the professionals can be very different in their*
36 *training, they can have a different ethos in the departments within their community. It's very individual. We*
37 *have different line managers and different resources to deal with*”, W82GO011. Some stakeholders “*didn't*
38 *want to get involved because of existing workloads*”, and the lack of extra resources or allocated time to
39 implement the pilot. Furthermore, while acknowledging the little time hospital staff had to develop
40 community-specific training, local-level stakeholders felt they needed more “*practical and tailored*”
41 information. Many described the training they received as ‘*too general*’ and stated that “*it would have been*
42 *very helpful to have had more practical tips on how to actually run the programme session to session with this*
43 *age group*”, W82GO012.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

External Environment

In the Grol and Wensing model, the 'economic and political context' refers to financial arrangements, regulations and policies - themes which did not emerge during our research. Therefore, the sixth level was renamed 'external environment' to include wider societal perspectives and determinants.

In terms of the external environment, the lack of existing services to treat and manage childhood obesity meant many stakeholders were excited to come on board and implement this new initiative. One stakeholder described *"waiting for years for something to happen in this area"*, W82GO005. The media was recognised as both a barrier and a facilitator to programme implementation. While stakeholders believed TV and radio campaigns have the potential to raise awareness they felt that the issue is *"also getting very bad press"* and being *"hyped up a little bit"* which in itself may make it more difficult for parents to come forward. Additionally, staff felt that the stigma surrounding childhood obesity and weight management programmes created a significant barrier to programme implementation as they believed many parents were reluctant to attend or even talk about the issue of weight for fear of singling out or *'labelling'* their child.

Vision for the future

In terms of the future scale up of *W82GO-community*, the majority of stakeholders recommend establishing dedicated childhood obesity teams within the community, *"ideally people who are located at least in the same town"*, who can offer a range of interventions for different levels of need. One stakeholder described *"a tiered effect, for example there could be a level one which could be a generic workshop or talk that you could roll-out in lots of schools. A level two then would be a seminar for parents and level three would be a group programme. Level four then could be actual specific one on one interventions"*. Having a tiered approach would enable the team to match the level of need with the family and allow families to choose where on the scale they would best fit.

DISCUSSION

This study identifies the barriers and facilitators to implementing a community-based weight management programme from the perspective of stakeholders tasked with delivering such a programme. While community-based weight management programmes have become an important response to the obesity epidemic given their potential reach and accessibility for families, the majority are based on small, efficacy trials [2] and little is

1
2
3 known about the factors influencing their implementation in real-world settings. Our findings suggest that
4 more consideration is needed during the planning stages, including the creation of a structured programme
5 plan outlining specific roles and responsibilities. Local-level stakeholders believe they should be involved in this
6 process as they have practical experience of working with families on the ground in their respective
7 communities. In addition to their experience, the stakeholders we interviewed are keen to get involved in
8 community-based weight management treatment provided the appropriate training and resources have been
9 allocated. Within their 10 year framework for action, the Irish Government recognise the need for additional
10 resources to be assigned and seek to *“mobilise the health services to better prevent and address overweight
11 and obesity through effective community-based health promotion programmes”*[19] as well as providing
12 training and skills development. Given this renewed commitment by the Irish Department of Health to
13 empower community teams and communities, the road ahead looks promising.
14
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 A key barrier to the implementation of *W82GO-community* was perceived parental resistance which occurred
26 at the patient level but is also intrinsically linked to the external environment where the increasing
27 normalisation of overweight and obesity coexists with a stigma that surrounds the issue. Stakeholders
28 delivering the programme described parental resistance occurring at every stage of the implementation
29 process and suggested that parents did not appear to recognise the issue in their own children. As a result
30 stakeholders believed that parents did not see the need for treatment or refused to accept that their child was
31 carrying excess weight. While parental attitudes reported in this study were based on the perceptions of staff,
32 a lack of parental awareness regarding their child’s weight and resistance towards discussing weight issues has
33 been documented in previous research [20-24]. This may be due in part to the belief that obesity has become
34 the norm in society, a point which was suggested by stakeholders in this study, and previously outlined in the
35 literature [25]. It is also possible that parental resistance stems from the stigma that is associated with excess
36 weight and obesity [8, 21-23] or the negative media attention obesity has received. The framing of coverage by
37 media may affect people’s views about the causes of childhood obesity and the most appropriate strategies
38 for addressing the problem [26]. Our findings highlight the need, at a policy level, for positive awareness-
39 raising campaigns to encourage parental recognition of healthy childhood growth and development, in
40 addition to knowledge regarding the importance of identifying obesity early in childhood.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Low perceived self-efficacy in approaching the subject of weight with parents was a barrier facing staff during
4 implementation. Stakeholders in this study see the need for a childhood weight management programme in
5 their communities and acknowledge their professional responsibility to get involved. However, they appear
6 uncomfortable and unequipped to do this. This is consistent with previous research which found that low
7 perceived skills and low perceived self-efficacy hamper the implementation of such programmes [20, 27-30]. In
8 our study motivational interviewing workshops equipped stakeholders in Site A with increased skills and
9 confidence in working with families on weight management issues. Motivational interviewing is a goal-
10 orientated, patient-centred approach based on the use of communication skills to understand individuals'
11 motivation for behaviour change [31] and has been found to be useful when applied in health care settings
12 [32]. We therefore consider it important that healthcare professionals involved in the implementation of
13 obesity programmes receive this training prior to programme commencement.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 The multidisciplinary structure of the programme emerged as both a barrier to and facilitator of
26 implementation and spread across many of the levels outlined by Grol and Wensing. While acknowledged that
27 it was required to treat such a complex health issue, it resulted in lack of role clarity, a lack of understanding of
28 specific discipline roles, and led to difficulties in scheduling. This may in part be due to the structure and
29 governance of community health services within Ireland. While there is a vision for multidisciplinary working
30 set out in multiple policy documents and an emphasis on integrated care [33], the system is not set-up to
31 support the concept. Stakeholders believe a simple roundtable introduction whereby practitioners could share
32 their professional background and outline their specific role within the project would have helped overcome
33 this ambiguity. They suggest it is a simple but often overlooked detail. Furthermore, stakeholders feel the
34 establishment of a local lead was critical in assisting multidisciplinary working while also facilitating discussion
35 between national and local level. Laws et al. also highlight the importance of having key local individuals
36 responsible for driving and coordinating research translation [34].
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Finally, an important finding from this research was the inherent problems in a '*one size fits all*' approach to
50 community-based treatment. Stakeholders in our study suggest a tiered approach may be more suitable,
51 beginning with a brief intervention which intensifies based on a child's degree of obesity, the family's
52 motivation, and the capacity of the community and/or healthcare provider. This finding is in line with a
53 suggestion from Staniford et al. who suggest that future interventions should tailor treatment according to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participants' age, degree of obesity and their readiness or confidence to change [35]. In addition to tailoring a
4
5 programme to the individual, programmes need to be adapted for the community setting. Stakeholders in our
6
7 study raised concerns that the W82GO programme, having been developed in a hospital setting, was too
8
9 medicalised for community practice. In particular, the lengthy assessment process which in some cases
10
11 involved blood tests and the presence of medically trained doctors, was unnecessary for a community-based
12
13 lifestyle programme. This finding is consistent with previous research conducted by Watson et al. who
14
15 evaluated a family-based childhood obesity treatment intervention and found they needed to modify the
16
17 assessment process by replacing community paediatrician assessments with parent/carer self-completion forms
18
19 for reasons of time and cost [36]. To develop a full picture of treatment, future research should examine what
20
21 aspects of the programme work, for whom, in what context and why.

22
23 While this study provides important insight into the implementation of childhood obesity programme in the
24
25 community, several limitations should be acknowledged. According to de Casterlé *et al.*, (2012) "*using a*
26
27 *preconceived framework runs the risk of prematurely excluding alternative ways of organising the*
28
29 *data*"[37]pg.362. However, data was analysed inductively first before mapping emergent themes onto the Grol
30
31 and Wensing Framework. In subsequent phases of analysis we adapted the framework to capture the
32
33 influence of the external environment on implementation. Social desirability bias is a risk when stakeholders
34
35 are known to the researcher conducting the interviews. In this case the stakeholders knew the researcher as
36
37 the programme evaluator. However, we do not believe this bias had an effect as stakeholders were keen to
38
39 "*tell their story*". It is also important to note that parental attitudes reported in this study were based on the
40
41 perceptions of staff delivering the programme. Other studies have identified differences between parents,
42
43 staff and children in terms of their attitudes towards childhood obesity treatment [35]. We are conducting
44
45 further research with parents and children to understand the factors influencing their decisions to engage or
46
47 disengage with obesity treatment.

48 49 **CONCLUSION**

50
51
52 In light of the dearth of knowledge available on the translation of multi-component childhood weight
53
54 management programmes to community settings, this study highlights the barriers and facilitators to
55
56 implementing such programmes from a wide range of community healthcare and admin perspectives. Our
57
58 results suggest the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, the provision of sufficient practical training
59
60

1
2
3 and resources, and organisational support play pivotal roles in overcoming barriers to change. Furthermore,
4
5 our findings on the challenges of multidisciplinary working and translating hospital programmes to community
6
7 settings are applicable to the implementation of interventions beyond that of childhood weight management.
8
9 This evidence should be used to develop implementation plans to improve the translation of interventions into
10
11 real world settings.

12 13 **STATEMENTS:**

- 14
15
16 • Authors' contributions

17
18 The authors responsibilities were as follows: EK: was responsible for the design and conduct of the research,
19
20 and writing of the manuscript. SMH: was involved in data analysis and reviewed drafts of the manuscript. EK,
21
22 SMH, JH, FS and IJP made critical revisions to the paper and gave final approval of the version to be submitted.
23

- 24
25
26 • Acknowledgements

27
28 We are grateful to the stakeholders who agreed to be interviewed for the study, without them this research
29
30 would not have been possible.

- 31
32
33 • Competing interests

34
35 The authors declare that they have no competing interests

- 36
37
38 • Funding

39
40 Source of support: E Kelleher is funded by the Health Research Board SPHeRE/2013/1. The Health Research
41
42 Board (HRB) supports excellent research that improves people's health, patient care and health service
43
44 delivery. We aim to ensure that new knowledge is created and then used in policy and practice. In doing so, we
45
46 support health system innovation and create new enterprise opportunities. Dr Sheena McHugh is funded by
47
48 the Centre for Ageing Research and Development in Ireland (CARDI), now the Ageing Research and
49
50 Development Division within the Institute of Public Health in Ireland (IPH).

- 51
52
53 • Data Sharing

54
55 Topic guides which were used in the interviews are available as additional supporting files. However, signed
56
57 confidentiality agreements prevent us from sharing transcripts.

- Ethics approval

Ethical Approval was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the Cork Teaching Hospitals.

References

1. Flynn, M., D. McNeil, B. Maloff, et al., Reducing obesity and related chronic disease risk in children and youth: a synthesis of evidence with 'best practice' recommendations. *Obes Rev*, 2006. **7 Suppl 1**: p. 7-66.
2. Oude Luttikhuis, H., L. Baur, H. Jansen, et al., Interventions for treating obesity in children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 2009(1): p. Cd001872.
3. Wilfley, D., A. Staiano, M. Altman, et al., Improving access and systems of care for evidence-based childhood obesity treatment: Conference key findings and next steps. *Obesity* (Silver Spring), 2016.
4. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Weight management: lifestyle services for overweight or obese children and young people. Clinical Guideline, 47. 2013, NICE: London.
5. World Health Organisation., Report of the Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity. 2016, WHO Document Production Services: Geneva, Switzerland.
6. Nutbeam, D. and A. Bauman, Evaluation in a Nutshell: a practical guide to the evaluation of health promotion programs. Vol. 2. 2013, Australia: McGraw-Hill Education.
7. Welsby, D., B. Nguyen, B. O'Hara, et al., Process evaluation of an up-scaled community based child obesity treatment program: NSW Go4Fun(R). *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**: p. 140.
8. Lucas, P., K. Curtis-Tyler, L. Arai, et al., What works in practice: user and provider perspectives on the acceptability, affordability, implementation, and impact of a family-based intervention for child overweight and obesity delivered at scale. *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**: p. 614.
9. Stamatakis, K., C. Vinson, and J. Kerner, Dissemination and Implementation Research in Community and Public Health Settings, in *Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health: Translating Science to Practice*, R. Brownson, G. Colditz, and E. Proctor, Editors. 2012, Oxford University Press: New York.
10. Skelton, J. and B. Beech, Attrition in paediatric weight management: a review of the literature and new directions. *Obes Rev*, 2011. **12**(5): p. e273-81.
11. Kelleher, E., M. Davoren, J. Harrington, et al., Barriers and facilitators to initial and continued attendance at community-based lifestyle programmes among families of overweight and obese children: a systematic review. *Obes Rev*, 2016.
12. Keane, E., P. Kearney, I. Perry, et al., Trends and prevalence of overweight and obesity in primary school aged children in the Republic of Ireland from 2002-2012: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**(1): p. 974.
13. Layte, R. and C. McCrory, Growing Up in Ireland. Overweight and Obesity among 9-year olds. 2011, Department of Children and Youth Affairs: Dublin.
14. O'Malley, G., A. Brinkley, K. Moroney, et al., Is the Temple Street W82GO Healthy Lifestyles Programme effective in reducing BMI SDS? . *Obes Facts*, 2012. **5**(Suppl. 1): p. 178-234
15. Hoffmann, T., P. Glasziou, I. Boutron, et al., Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ*, 2014. **348**: p. g1687.
16. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Obesity. Guidance on the prevention of overweight and obesity in adults and children. Clinical Guideline, 43. 2015, NICE: London.

17. Ritchie, J. and J. Lewis, *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students & researchers*. 2003, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
18. Grol, R. and M. Wensing, What drives change? Barriers to and incentives for achieving evidence-based practice. *Med J Aust*, 2004. **180**(6 Suppl): p. S57-60.
19. Department of Health., *A Healthy Weight for Ireland. Obesity Policy and Action Plan: 2016–2025*. 2016: Dublin.
20. Gerards, S.M., P. Dagnelie, M. Jansen, et al., Barriers to successful recruitment of parents of overweight children for an obesity prevention intervention: a qualitative study among youth health care professionals. *BMC Fam Pract*, 2012. **13**: p. 37.
21. Grow, H., C. Hsu, L. Liu, et al., Understanding family motivations and barriers to participation in community-based programs for overweight youth: one program model does not fit all. *J Public Health Manag Pract*, 2013. **19**(4): p. E1-e10.
22. Visram, S., T.D. Hall, and L. Geddes, Getting the balance right: qualitative evaluation of a holistic weight management intervention to address childhood obesity. *J Public Health (Oxf)*, 2012.
23. Newson, L., R. Povey, A. Casson, et al., The experiences and understandings of obesity: families' decisions to attend a childhood obesity intervention. *Psychol Health*, 2013. **28**(11): p. 1287-305.
24. Shiely, F., N. Hon Yan, E. Berkery, et al., The association between weight perception and BMI: Report and measurement data from the growing up in Ireland cohort study of 9 year olds. *Int J Obes*, 2016.
25. Binkin, N., A. Spinelli, G. Baglio, et al., What is common becomes normal: the effect of obesity prevalence on maternal perception. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*, 2013. **23**(5): p. 410-6.
26. Barry, C., M. Jarlenski, R. Grob, et al., News Media Framing of Childhood Obesity in the United States From 2000 to 2009. *Pediatrics*, 2011.
27. Moyers, P., L. Bugle, and E. Jackson, Perceptions of school nurses regarding obesity in school-age children. *J Sch Nurs*, 2005. **21**(2): p. 86-93.
28. Steele, R., Y. Wu, C. Jensen, et al., School nurses' perceived barriers to discussing weight with children and their families: a qualitative approach. *J Sch Health*, 2011. **81**(3): p. 128-37.
29. Story, M., D. Neumark-Stzainer, N. Sherwood, et al., Management of child and adolescent obesity: attitudes, barriers, skills, and training needs among health care professionals. *Pediatrics*, 2002. **110**(1 Pt 2): p. 210-4.
30. Turner, K., J. Shield, and C. Salisbury, Practitioners' views on managing childhood obesity in primary care: a qualitative study. *The British Jof Gen Pract*, 2009. **59**(568): p. 856-862.
31. Miller, W. and S. Rollnick, *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people for change*. 2002, New York: The Guilford Press.
32. Lozano, P., H. McPhillips, B. Hartzler, et al., Randomized trial of teaching brief motivational interviewing to pediatric trainees to promote healthy behaviors in families. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*, 2010. **164**(6): p. 561-6.
33. Department of Health., *A Healthy Weight for Ireland 2016–2025. Obesity Policy and Action Plan 2016*, Stationary Office: Dublin.
34. Laws, R., K. Hesketh, K. Ball, et al., Translating an early childhood obesity prevention program for local community implementation: a case study of the Melbourne InFANT Program. *BMC Public Health*, 2016. **16**: p. 748.
35. Staniford, L.J., J.D. Breckon, R.J. Copeland, et al., Key stakeholders' perspectives towards childhood obesity treatment: A qualitative study. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 2011. **15**(3): p. 230-244.
36. Watson, P., L. Dugdill, K. Pickering, et al., Service evaluation of the GOALS family-based childhood obesity treatment intervention during the first 3 years of implementation. *BMJ Open*, 2015. **5**(2).

- 1
2
3 37. Dierckx de Casterle, B., C. Gastmans, E. Bryon, et al., QUAGOL: a guide for qualitative data
4 analysis. *Int J Nurs Stud*, 2012. **49**(3): p. 360-71.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Supplementary Material 1: Completed TIDieR checklist



Template for Intervention
Description and Replication

The TIDieR (Template for Intervention Description and Replication) Checklist

Information to include when describing an intervention and the location of the information

Item number	Item	
	BRIEF NAME	
1.	Provide the name or a phrase that describes the intervention.	'W82GO-community' – a multi-component, family-focused childhood weight management pilot programme delivered in the community setting.
	WHY	
2.	Describe any rationale, theory, or goal of the elements essential to the intervention.	The W82GO-community programme is a family-focused programme grounded in behavioural change theory (transtheoretical model and social cognitive theory) and aims to reduce obesity in children with BMI \geq 98th percentile, improve children's dietary intake, physical activity levels and weight status while also increasing children's quality of life and psychosocial health. Using the social cognitive theory the programmes aims to motivate children and their families to engage in positive behaviours that are achievable. The transtheoretical model is incorporated from initial contact, when the service is first introduced to the family and their level of interest is assessed.
	WHAT	
3.	Materials: Describe any physical or informational materials used in the intervention, including those provided to participants or used in intervention delivery or in training of intervention providers. Provide	The W82GO-community programme includes: (1) The W82GO-community pilot programme was delivered by a multi-disciplinary team using a manual developed to support community-based healthcare professionals to deliver the programme in their

1 information on where the materials can be accessed (e.g. online
2 appendix, URL).
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

area. It does so through the provision of a guide to setting up a team
and preparing the delivery of the programme; a framework for
individual sessions that allows for session preparation and planning
including programme presentations on disc; materials, including
template letters and evaluation forms that can be adapted to suit the
local context and information on additional resources that are
available to support the team

- (2) W82GO leaflet outlining the programmes goals and core elements to be distributed to families during recruitment
- (3) W82GO family information booklet including goal setting and additional resources and tips were distributed to all families attending the programme

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 **4.** Procedures: Describe each of the procedures, activities, and/or
22 processes used in the intervention, including any enabling or support
23 activities.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Recruitment: heights and weights were measured in school by public health nurses (PHNs) using standardised procedures. Weight and height data was subsequently used to calculate body mass index (BMI) and children were classified as obese if their BMI plotted ≥ 98 th BMI percentile for age and gender using the UK90 recommended cut-off points for treatment or referral which are currently used in Irish practice. Parents of children meeting this eligibility criterion were contacted by their school PHN to inform them of their child's weight status and those who indicated an interest in attending the programme were subsequently invited to attend an initial screening assessment.

This individualised initial assessment assessed eligibility before programme commencement. This assessment was carried out by a multidisciplinary team

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

to rule out underlying medical conditions. In addition, indicators of health literacy, health beliefs and physical and environmental variables that might act as barriers to change were recorded.

Following the initial assessment six group sessions took places over six weeks and group booster sessions occurred at three, six and nine months. During these group sessions parents and their children received an educational session for the first hour. Children were taken out to complete physical activity for the last 30 minutes while parents received an extra educational session. At 12 months another individualised final assessment took place to document any changes and make plans for sustainment.

WHO PROVIDED

5. For each category of intervention provider (e.g. psychologist, nursing assistant), describe their expertise, background and any specific training given.

The W82GO community-programme was delivered by a multidisciplinary team of community health professionals including dietitians, physiotherapists, public health nurses, psychologists, health promotion officers, area medical officers, administrators and local area management. These health professionals had varying levels of experience of dealing with childhood obesity and as a result were invited to take part in a training programme prior to programme commencement. Training included a needs assessment, a one day educational training course and two days of clinical shadowing with an experienced *W82GO* programme practitioner at Temple Street Children's University Hospital in Dublin, Ireland. Each community practitioner was also supplied with a user manual which outlined the programme and detailed the content for both phases.

Public health nurses in one of the sites received motivational interviewing training specific to childhood obesity as part of routine training in the area already being conducted in that area.

HOW

6. Describe the modes of delivery (e.g. face-to-face or by some other mechanism, such as internet or telephone) of the intervention and whether it was provided individually or in a group.

The W82GO-community programme involved face-to-face sessions and included a mixture of group and individualised sessions as outlined above.

WHERE

7. Describe the type(s) of location(s) where the intervention occurred, including any necessary infrastructure or relevant features.

Initial assessments took place in community healthcare offices. Subsequent group sessions were delivered on weekdays in the afternoon at a local sports or community centre.

WHEN and HOW MUCH

8. Describe the number of times the intervention was delivered and over what period of time including the number of sessions, their schedule, and their duration, intensity or dose.

The programme was run in two sites (Site A and Site B) over 12 months. The individual assessment lasted approximately one and half to two hours. The initial intensive phase consisted of 6 weekly group sessions for both the child and his/her parent/carer and these occurred over one afternoon a week and lasted approximately one and a half to two hours. The three booster sessions at three, six and nine months lasted approximately one to one and a half hours. During these group sessions parents and their children received an educational session for the first hour. Children were taken out to complete physical activity for the last 30 minutes while parents received an extra educational session. Upon completion of the 12 month programme children and their parents/carer return for a final assessment lasting approx. one and half to two hours. This

model of implementation is in keeping with the transtheoretical model of behaviour change.

TAILORING

9. If the intervention was planned to be personalised, titrated or adapted, then describe what, why, when, and how. All families received the same intervention.

MODIFICATIONS

- 10.† If the intervention was modified during the course of the study, describe the changes (what, why, when, and how). Two sites delivered the pilot programme to their respective communities. Site A decided to separate children and parents from the start of the group sessions because they felt children of this age would not gain anything nor were likely to understand the educational sessions. Children received a full physical activity session instead while parents received the educational session alone. Owing to low numbers attending the programme in Site B programme staff chose not to go ahead with the final assessment at 12 months and instead conducted the final assessments during the third booster session.

HOW WELL

11. Planned: If intervention adherence or fidelity was assessed, describe how and by whom, and if any strategies were used to maintain or improve fidelity, describe them. Fidelity of intervention delivery was assessed using trainer self-reports and exit interviews.
- 12.‡ Actual: If intervention adherence or fidelity was assessed, describe the extent to which the intervention was delivered as planned. In Site A, the programme was delivered in a more interactive manner (i.e. without the use of programme slides). Site B followed the manuals as planned.

** **Authors** - use N/A if an item is not applicable for the intervention being described. **Reviewers** – use ‘?’ if information about the element is not reported/not sufficiently reported.

† If the information is not provided in the primary paper, give details of where this information is available. This may include locations such as a published protocol or other published papers (provide citation details) or a website (provide the URL).

‡ If completing the TIDieR checklist for a protocol, these items are not relevant to the protocol and cannot be described until the study is complete.

* We strongly recommend using this checklist in conjunction with the TIDieR guide (see *BMJ* 2014;348:g1687) which contains an explanation and elaboration for each item.

For peer review only - <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml>

1 * The focus of TIDieR is on reporting details of the intervention elements (and where relevant, comparison elements) of a study. Other elements and methodological features of studies are
2 covered by other reporting statements and checklists and have not been duplicated as part of the TIDieR checklist. When a **randomised trial** is being reported, the TIDieR checklist should be
3 used in conjunction with the CONSORT statement (see www.consort-statement.org) as an extension of **Item 5 of the CONSORT 2010 Statement**. When a **clinical trial protocol** is being
4 reported, the TIDieR checklist should be used in conjunction with the SPIRIT statement as an extension of **Item 11 of the SPIRIT 2013 Statement** (see www.spirit-statement.org). For
5 alternate study designs, TIDieR can be used in conjunction with the appropriate checklist for that study design (see www.equator-network.org).
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

For peer review only

COREQ Checklist for Qualitative Research:

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Pg. 6
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	Pg. 1, 6 & 7
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Pg. 1, 6
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Pg. 1,6
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Pg. 6
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Pg. 3
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Pg. 15
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	Pg. 1,3,6
Domain 2: study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	Pg. 6-7
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Pg. 6
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Pg. 6
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	Pg. 7
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Pg. 7
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Pg. 6
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	NA
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Pg. 7
<i>Data collection</i>		

17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Pg. 6
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	NA
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Pg. 6
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes
21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	Pg. 6
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Pg. 6
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Pg. 7
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	N/A
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Pg. 7
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Pg. 7
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	NA
<i>Reporting</i>		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Pg. 8-13
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Pg. 8-13
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Pg. 8-13
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Discussion of major and minor themes Pg. 8-13

BMJ Open

Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a community-based, multidisciplinary, family-focused childhood weight management programme in Ireland: A qualitative study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-016459.R3
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Jul-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Kelleher, Emily; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Harrington, Janas; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Shiely, Frances; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Perry, Ivan; University College Cork, Epidemiology and Public Health Mc Hugh, Sheena; University College Cork, Epidemiology & Public Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research, Health services research, Public health
Keywords:	Implementation, barriers, facilitators, childhood, obesity, community

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Title:
4

5 Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a community-based, multidisciplinary, family-focused
6 childhood weight management programme in Ireland: A qualitative study
7
8

9
10 Corresponding Author:
11

12 Emily Kelleher, MPH BSc, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, 4th Floor, Western Gateway Building,
13 University College Cork, Ireland. Email: emily.kelleher@ucc.ie Tel: 00353 (21) 4205517
14
15

16
17 Authors:
18

19 Emily Kelleher, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
20
21

22 Janas M Harrington, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
23
24

25 Frances Shiely, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork and HRB Clinical
26 Research Facility, Mercy University Hospital, Grenville Place, Cork, Ireland
27
28

29 Ivan J Perry, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
30
31

32 Sheena M McHugh, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Ireland
33
34

35 Keywords:
36

37 Implementation; barriers; facilitators; childhood; obesity; community; treatment
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT:

Objective: To explore the barriers and facilitators experienced by those implementing a government-funded, community-based, childhood weight management programme.

Design: Qualitative using semi-structured interviews.

Setting: Two geographical regions in the south and west of the Republic of Ireland.

Participants: 29 national and local level stakeholders responsible for implementing the programme including professionals from dietetics, psychology, public health nursing, physiotherapy, health promotion and administration.

Methods: Framework analysis was used to identify barriers and facilitators which were mapped onto six levels of factors influencing implementation outlined by Grol and Wensing: the innovation, the individual professional, the patient, the social context, the organisational context, and the external environment.

Results: Most barriers occurred at the level of the organisational context. For all stakeholders, barriers arose due to the multidisciplinary nature of the programme, including the lack of role clarity and added complexity of working in different locations. Health professionals' low-perceived self-efficacy in approaching the subject of weight with parents and parental resistance to hearing about their child's weight status were barriers to programme implementation at the individual professional and patient levels, respectively. The main facilitators of implementation, occurring at the level of the health professional, included stakeholders' recognition of the need for a weight management programme and personal interest in the area of childhood obesity. Having a local lead and supportive colleagues were further implementation drivers.

Conclusions: This study highlights the complexities associated with implementing a multidisciplinary childhood weight management programme, particularly translating such programmes to a community setting. Our results suggest the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, the provision of sufficient practical training and resources, and organisational support play pivotal roles in overcoming barriers to change. This evidence can be used to develop an implementation plan to support the translation of interventions into real world settings.

KEYWORDS:

Implementation; barriers; facilitators; childhood; obesity; community

ARTICLE SUMMARY**Strengths and limitations**

- This is one of few qualitative studies, and the first in Ireland, that explored the factors that hampered and facilitated the implementation of a community-based, multi-component childhood weight management programme from a wide range of stakeholder perspectives.
- While interviewing a wide range of stakeholders provided a thorough overview of the relevant issues, the themes that emerged were relatively homogenous across disciplines which added to the authority of the findings.
- Data were analysed using a systematic approach and an adapted version of the implementation model by Grol and Wensing was used to classify the barriers and facilitators into levels.
- Using a preconceived framework runs the risk of prematurely excluding other ways of organising the data. However, data was analysed inductively first before mapping onto the Grol and Wensing Framework.

BACKGROUND:

Childhood obesity is a worldwide public health concern and there is now widespread agreement that the complex aetiology of the issue requires a multifaceted approach to treatment [1-3]. International recommendations agree that initiatives to reduce and manage childhood obesity should be family-focused and combine healthy eating, physical activity and behavioural components [2, 4, 5]. In 2016, the World Health Organisation published their report of the commission on ending childhood obesity within which they echo these recommendations but also add that they should be delivered by “*multi-professional teams with appropriate training and resources*” [5]pg.11. These recommendations, however, have been largely based on small-scale studies conducted in controlled settings with specialised staff, thus limiting their applicability and generalizability to ‘real-world’ settings such as communities or hospitals [2].

1
2
3 In public health, once interventions have undergone innovation testing and demonstrated efficacy the next
4 steps include replication and 'scale-up' to larger populations in 'real-world' settings [6]. There are relatively
5 few examples of published studies reporting on the pragmatic application of effective childhood obesity
6 treatment programmes [7, 8]. While implementation issues such as engagement, local context, staffing and
7 funding are likely to be common across many public health interventions [8], little is documented about the
8 experience of those implementing childhood weight management programmes and even fewer studies detail
9 the factors influencing implementation [9]. For example, a lack of providers trained in evidence-based care for
10 childhood obesity was listed by delegates attending a recent conference in the United States as a major barrier
11 to treatment implementation [3]. Furthermore, with the majority of families declining referral and up to 75%
12 of families discontinuing care, poor engagement with families has proven to be a significant challenge facing
13 teams tasked with implementing such programmes [10, 11].

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 When introduced under less-controlled conditions, insight into the factors influencing implementation is
26 crucial. Therefore, the aim of this study was to explore and categorise the barriers and facilitators experienced
27 by those implementing a government-funded, community-based, multi-component childhood weight
28 management pilot programme to inform their eventual scale up.

29 30 31 32 33 **METHODS:**

34 35 36 **Intervention and context**

37
38 Although trends appear to be stabilising in Ireland, prevalence of childhood obesity remains high [12].
39 Currently, in Ireland, almost one in four children are either overweight or obese [13] and there is no
40 standardised community-based weight management programme available to those children with obesity.
41 Community programmes are usually provided on an ad-hoc basis and are rarely evaluated or sustained. In an
42 attempt to identify a universal treatment the Irish Health Service Executive (HSE) planned to pilot the *W82GO-*
43 *community* programme in two communities. This programme had previously demonstrated effectiveness in
44 the hospital setting [14]. Its effectiveness in the community setting was to be assessed with the intention of
45 nationwide rollout should the programme demonstrate a positive impact on body mass index (BMI). The
46 Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) checklist [15] was used to specify the details of
47 programme delivery and is included in Supplementary file 1.

1
2
3 In summary, *W82GO* aims to improve nutrition, increase physical activity and facilitate behaviour change over
4 one year [14]. It was designed as a hospital-based, family-focused, multidisciplinary programme grounded in
5 behavioural change theory and was modelled on best practice recommendations [2, 5, 16]. The primary goal
6 was a reduction in Body Mass Index Standard Deviation Score and has previously been found to be effective
7 when delivered in a hospital out-patient setting [14].
8
9

10
11
12 The *W82GO* programme involves an initial individual assessment to ascertain family eligibility followed by two
13 phases. Families were eligible for the programme if the child was between 5-7 years old; was obese (BMI
14 ≥ 98 th centile); had no limitations to engaging in physical activity; was not taking medication known to affect
15 body weight; and had at least one parent/carer who was able to attend each of the programme sessions.
16 Siblings were also welcome to attend the sessions. Phase 1 involved an initial intensive phase consisting of six
17 weekly group sessions for both the child and his/her parent/carer. These sessions lasted approximately one
18 and a half to two hours and incorporated educational and practical sessions to increase physical activity,
19 improve nutrition and increase sleep. Upon completion of phase 1, children returned with their parents/care-
20 givers for three booster group sessions at three, six and nine months. These sessions aimed to encourage the
21 family to continue with lifestyle change and to manage any barriers to change. Finally, at 12 months, the
22 children and their parents/care-givers returned for a final individual assessment to document any changes and
23 make plans for sustainment.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 For the current study, *W82GO* was adapted and implemented in two community sites (Site A and Site B) from
38 April 2015 for 12 months and subsequently renamed *W82GO-community*. Both sites were chosen as they were
39 part of a national pilot growth measurement programme and included a mix of rural and urban towns in the
40 west and south of Ireland. Initial assessments took place in community healthcare offices while subsequent
41 group sessions were delivered on weekdays in the afternoon at a local sports or community centre. The
42 programme was offered free of charge and was delivered by existing community health professionals including
43 dietitians, psychologists, public health nurses, physiotherapists, health promotion officers, area medical
44 officers and administrators. These health professionals were brought together as a team and asked to deliver
45 this programme as part of their existing roles. Table 1 outlines their specific responsibilities during programme
46 implementation. All staff were invited to take part in a training programme prior to programme
47 commencement. Training included a needs assessment, a one day educational training course and two days of
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

clinical shadowing with an experienced *W82GO* programme practitioner at the National Children's University Hospital where it was developed. Each community practitioner was supplied with a user manual which outlined the programme and detailed the content for both phases.

Table 1 Health professional roles during the implementation of *W82GO*-community

Health Professional	Role in implementation of <i>W82GO</i> -community
National Manager (n=1)	Overseeing implementation of <i>W82GO</i> -community in both community sites
Local Manager (n=2)	Overseeing implementation of <i>W82GO</i> -community at local level. Local manager in Site B was involved in referring to the programme.
Physiotherapists (n=4)	Involved in initial assessments and delivering programme material
Dietitians (n=5)	Involved in initial assessments and delivering programme material
Psychologists (n=3)	Involved in initial assessments and delivering programme material
Public Health Nurses (n=13)	Referral to the programme
Area Medical Officers (n=4)	Involved in initial assessments
Health Promotion Officers (n=4)	Delivering programme material
Administration (n=2)	Involved in contacting parents re programme sessions

Study design and sample

A qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews was utilised. We adopted a purposive approach to sampling, inviting stakeholders with knowledge and experience of planning, coordinating or delivering *W82GO*-community. To ensure representation from each stakeholder group and given the small number of individuals in each, we invited all stakeholders to participate (n=38, see table 1). All stakeholders were contacted by email in the first instance and followed up by telephone contact during which the researcher outlined the study aims and methodology.

Data collection

All participants were invited to take part in face-to-face interviews. However, due to time and scheduling difficulties a mixture of telephone and face-to-face interviews were conducted between August 2015 and February 2016 (during programme implementation). To ensure consistency all interviews were conducted by a single trained qualitative researcher (EK), using a semi structured topic guide. Participants knew the interviewer as an independent programme evaluator conducting this research as part of her PhD training. The topic guide was developed based on relevant literature and focused on seven issues: (1) awareness of the

1
2
3 issue of childhood obesity and existing healthy lifestyle programmes, (2) perceived value of and interest in
4 community evidence-based treatment programmes, (3) communication of the *W82GO-community* pilot
5 programme; (4) specific role in implementing *W82GO-community*; (5) barriers and enablers to
6 implementation; (6) perceived successes and challenges experienced and finally (7) recommendations for the
7 future roll-out of childhood weight management programmes in Irish communities. Core topics were the same
8 across stakeholders and particular probes were added for specific stakeholder groups depending on their role
9 during the programme. For example public health nurses were specifically asked to report on the barriers and
10 facilitators to referral. Prompts and probes were used throughout the interviews to stimulate discussion. Prior
11 to each interview, participants were informed about the purpose of the study, that participation was voluntary
12 and that they could terminate the interview at any stage for any reason. Signed informed consent was
13 obtained before each interview, which lasted on average 45 minutes. Interviews were digitally recorded and
14 transcribed verbatim. Data collection and analysis was iterative. Data saturation was judged to have been
15 reached between interviews 20 and 25. However during recruitment, other stakeholders had expressed an
16 interest in sharing their experience and so were given the opportunity to participate. The data from these
17 interviews overlapped with the existing coding framework and thus contributed to the main themes. Ethical
18 approval was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the Cork Teaching Hospitals.

34 35 **Data Analysis**

36
37 Framework analysis was used to analyse the data [17]. This approach enabled the investigation of a priori
38 objectives while also allowing new themes to emerge from the data. One researcher (EK) transcribed and
39 coded each transcript while another (SMH) undertook initial coding of a selection of transcripts. Similarities
40 and differences between the coding labels and definitions were discussed and the coding framework was
41 refined and applied to the remaining interviews. While this process was conducted at an early stage of the
42 analysis, the coding process was iterative; emergent codes were added to the framework and contributed to
43 the development of themes across the interviews. Codes were synthesised and grouped according to the
44 dominant emergent themes. Themes were also analysed across stakeholder groups to identify similarities and
45 differences across disciplines and positions. These themes were mapped onto a framework developed by Grol
46 and Wensing (2004) which specifies six levels of factors that facilitate or impede implementation success: the
47 innovation; the individual professional, the patient; the social context; the organisational context; and the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

economic and political environment [18]. Mapping emergent themes to the framework at this stage of the analysis ensured that we did not impose a predefined structure or terminology on participants' accounts. This well-established framework (Table 2) was chosen because it describes how barriers and facilitators can be identified, categorised, and used for the development of tailor-based implementation strategies to facilitate desired change [18], in this instance implementing the *W82GO-community* programme. Discrepancies on the mapping of themes were discussed until consensus was reached. NVivo (QSR v10) was used to manage data analysis.

Table 2 Barriers to and incentives for change at different levels of healthcare^a

Level	Barriers / Incentives
Innovation	Advantages in practice, feasibility, credibility, attractiveness, accessibility
Individual Practitioner	Awareness, knowledge, attitude, motivation to change, behavioural routines
Patient	Knowledge, skills, attitude, compliance
Social Context	Opinion of colleagues, culture of the network, collaboration, leadership
Organisational Context	Organisation of care processes, staff, capacities, resources, structures
Economic and Political Context	Financial arrangements, regulations, policies

^a*Grol and Wensing's multilevel model*[18]

RESULTS

Participant characteristics

We contacted 38 stakeholders and recruited 29 interviewees (7 face-to-face, 22 telephone) from a range of disciplines and professions, yielding a response rate of 76% (Table 3).

Table 3 Stakeholders recruited from Site A and Site B

	Site A	Site B	National	Total
National Manager	NA	NA	1	1
Local Manager	1	1	x	2
Physiotherapists	2	1	1	4
Dietitians	3	x	x	3
Psychologists	1	1	x	2
Public Health Nurses	6	3	x	9
Area Medical Officers	x	2	x	2
Health Promotion Officers	3	1	x	4
Administration	1	x	1	2
Total	17	9	3	29

Barriers and Facilitators

For all participants, barriers arose due to the multidisciplinary nature of the programme, including the lack of understanding of other disciplines, lack of role clarity as well as the added complexities of working in different locations. Participants' recognition of the need for a childhood obesity programme and their own personal interest in the area were the main drivers of implementation while the presence of a local lead and supportive colleagues were further enabling factors. Views on the main barriers and facilitators to implementation were consistent across stakeholders; despite different disciplinary backgrounds, they had common experiences as implementers adding to the authority of the findings. Table 4 presents the perceived barriers and facilitators from the perspective of the stakeholders mapped onto the six implementation levels with quotations to illustrate each level.

Table 4 Perceived Barriers and Facilitators to the Implementation of W82GO in the Community

Levels	Quotations to illustrate the identified levels
The Innovation	
Credibility	(+) <i>"I suppose because it was attached to an acute hospital and because there was a consultant paediatrician and you had a lot of disciplines and a lot of very competent professionals involved, and that it had been successful when delivered there. That was the main reason I believed in the programme I suppose", W82GO003</i>
Attractiveness (i.e. Multidisciplinary nature)	(+) <i>"I do think the MDT approach was superb. I think that is you're going to do something for a child who is obese then you need it." W82GO018</i>
Transferability (i.e. different population, different resource issues)	(-) <i>"You are talking about a different cohort of families. Families who are already in the system. They are used to going in for appointments. You're talking about a group who've already had difficulties identified by their GP or whoever so by the time they are going for the group they are already sold, they are used to it and they are used to that sort of setting which is very kind of fast and quick-paced and very focused", W82GO002</i>
Relevance (e.g. too medicalised)	(-) <i>"I think the area medical officer, the medical input I think is probably optional or at least part-time. It's of less importance. It medicalised this community programme a bit too much", W82GO021</i>
The Individual Professional	
Awareness of the problem / Recognition of need	(+) <i>"It is a problem, most definitely. I think it's a time bomb that went off over the past 10 years and that we are behind it. Way behind it and the sooner we get going and get doing something the better", W82GO013</i>
Personal interest and motivation	(+) <i>"So that enthusiasm and that dedication made it happen, it was key to its success", W82GO011</i>
Low self-efficacy	(-) <i>"I wouldn't be especially skilled in assessing children you know with obesity and that kind of thing... Or talking to parents about it... I was concerned about my own ability to, to get up to speed fairly quickly", W82GO015</i>

Attitudes (i.e. Multidisciplinary perspectives)	(-) "I suppose the other main challenge was the multidisciplinary nature of the programme. I think the challenges of it is when you put together a team obviously from all different backgrounds not with different agendas but with different experiences and knowledge and different perspectives", W82GO026
The Patient	
Parental Resistance (weight misperception and denial)	(-) "I think there was a denial that there was anything wrong with their child, or that their child was overweight. There was a total denial about that because the population in general look like their child. Their child may be a little bit above of what the normal population looks like, but they didn't see that as an issue at all", W82GO028
The Social Context	
Supportive colleagues	(+) "Once she came on board there was two of us, it was a lot easier to share the workload and if I couldn't be there for a day she could be there for it so I suppose that definitely took the load off and she also acted as a sounding board you know? If there was something I wasn't sure of I could say what do you think about this and vice-versa, you know what I mean?", W82GO016
Leadership	(+) "I mean if we didn't have her pulling all those people and bits together it wouldn't have worked. She did a great job in I think the co-ordination role cause I think running something like this with people dispersed across a whole county and city then you need a project manager on the ground.", W82GO017
Collaboration between national and local teams	(-) "I did feel there was a very big gap once the decision had been made nationally to roll this out, there was a very big gap between us on the ground and them, there was no consultation or collaboration with people on the ground and I think that's where the problem was", W82GO003
The Organisational Context	
MDT Structure (logistics)	(-) "I suppose one of the challenges definitely is that the health professionals are all in different places", W82GO004
Resources	(-) "I guess time constraints 'cause a lot of people were pressurised for time. Like even ourselves we wouldn't have been able to go to every session and I would have liked to have gone but we just couldn't. We didn't have the time. We didn't have the staff to be able to attend so i think time and resource pressures were the main concerns", W82GO013
Training	(-) "It (the training) was as if they were trying to sell us the programme when you know we were already there. We were already sold. I mean we knew why it was important... because of the obesity issue so there was no need to go over all that again. They should have just focused on how to actually implement and deliver the programme", W82GO011
External Environment	
Lack of existing services	(+) "There is nothing out there so that's where it was great to have something like W82GO. That if you did see a child that you know there was something. Some sort of pathway"
Media	(+) "There was a huge media campaign ongoing around the time we were implementing the programme which got some parents thinking and talking. I mean those things do have a big impact. Things like Operation Transformation that's aired in January have a huge impact. I think we need more media on the impact of childhood obesity and not just the long-term impacts", W82GO003 (-) "I think maybe it's (obesity) hyped up a little bit in the media. I think maybe that in itself could be making things difficult for parents to come forward. We don't have any other disease related issue hyped up as much you know? If you had a child with obesity you would be feeling a small bit cringe like. You'd be wanting to find somewhere private to get some help like you know", W82GO020
Stigma	(-) "Wouldn't have their child come to a programme in case they'd be labelled overweight or obese. There is a stigma and just from hearing again I wasn't in the parents room, but just from hearing other colleagues feedback it's the parents fear of feeling judged and

	<i>blamed</i> ”,W82GO002
--	--------------------------

(+) Facilitators, (-) Barriers.

The Innovation

In terms of the *W82GO-community* pilot programme (innovation), while stakeholders believed it came from a credible source having been developed by one of the national children’s hospitals in Ireland, many had doubts over its accessibility and about how well it would transfer to the community setting. This uncertainty resulted in feelings of unease and community practitioners were hesitant to get involved initially. One stakeholder explained how she worried at length about what impact the programme would have on existing services and how feasible it was to run in the community; *“The setting is different. We were taking a programme that was from an acute setting into the community - that possibly was where the breakdown happened because you didn't have the same services. You didn't have people on site. There was travel, there was all these other logistics that weren't thought about when they were moving an acute programme to the community”*, W82GO021. In particular, stakeholders believed they were dealing with a very different cohort of families than the hospital-based programme as described by the following quote; *“You've a very different kind of child coming into the hospital than you do in the general community. You've a very different kind of parent. Even if you had a parent who was resistant to hearing about their child being overweight, if they are attending hospital appointments regularly they are obviously already engaged about their child's health... so I believe that's a major barrier straight away that they possibly didn't have to face in the hospital you know?”*, W82GO010.

In addition to the differences in the target group, stakeholders believed the programme was too medicalised for the community setting and some felt it did not fit with their perception of a healthy lifestyle programme. This was due to the number of health professionals involved and in particular, the involvement of medical staff. Furthermore, many stakeholders thought the collection of clinical markers of disease and medical history during the initial assessments was unnecessary. As one stakeholder described; *“the initial assessments were totally irrelevant. I mean when I heard that bloods were being taken I thought oh for God sake. You know we were supposed to be running a community-based education intervention where the focus should be on changing lifestyles. It's not our job to be diagnosing other problems”*, W82GO005.

Individual Professional

While stakeholders both applauded and recognised the need for a multidisciplinary approach to the treatment of childhood obesity, it created significant barriers to programme implementation. The variety of community health professionals involved in the implementation of *W82GO-community* with differing perspectives and priorities led to role uncertainty and in some cases a perception of disrespect between disciplines. One stakeholder captures this theme in the following quote; *"I suppose the other main challenge was the multidisciplinary nature of the programme. I think the challenge is when you put together a team obviously from all different backgrounds not with different agendas but with different experiences and knowledge and different perspectives"*, W82GO026. Stakeholders described how *"there was quite a lack of understanding of the various discipline roles and responsibilities and some were even unsure of what some disciplines did"*, W82GO012. This lack of understanding sometimes resulted in tension between disciplines and created a challenging environment to work in. Others recalled feeling concerned about where they fit into the programme and believed a structured programme plan outlining specific roles and responsibilities was lacking.

Another key barrier that emerged at the level of the individual professional was their low perceived self-efficacy in dealing with childhood obesity and/or working with this young age group. In particular, many stakeholders reported their fear of approaching the subject with parents given the risk of upsetting them or *"rocking the boat"*. One stakeholder reported that *"it's something you want to do something about but it can be very difficult to approach the subject with parents. It's a very sensitive issue"*, W82GO001. In our study, stakeholders in Site A received motivational interviewing workshops for childhood obesity. This training equipped these stakeholders with increased skills and confidence in working with families on weight management issues. As one stakeholder described, post motivational interviewing training she wasn't *"frightened of dealing with them [parents] at all", It's kind of second nature to me now... I know the buzz words, I know exactly what to say to them. And body language, the whole lot"*, W82GO002. Others felt it was quite *"alien"* to work with children aged 5-6 years and believed they had not the appropriate training to do so.

Despite these barriers, all stakeholders were aware that childhood obesity was an issue in their respective communities and recognised the urgent need for treatment; *"Yeah I think it's a time bomb that went off over*

1
2
3 *the past ten years and that we are behind it, way behind and the sooner we get going and doing whatever we*
4 *can the better”, W82GO012. Furthermore, stakeholders’ personal interest in tackling the issue, and their*
5 *motivation and dedication to seeing the programme through were what many believed to be the main drivers*
6 *behind programme completion; “It went ahead due to a lot of determination and not because it was easily*
7 *implementable... if that’s a word”, W82GO014.*

13 **Patient**

14
15
16 Low programme uptake was a key issue during implementation. Many stakeholders believe that obesity has
17 become the norm in society and as a result *“people don’t recognise overweight people as being in that actual*
18 *overweight category because it’s become normal to be surrounded by overweight people”, W82GO021. In*
19 *terms of the W82GO-community pilot programme, almost all stakeholders indicated that although children*
20 *measured as obese on the growth charts their parents seemed unaware of any excess weight and once*
21 *informed, many refused to accept that their child was obese. As a result of this misperception parents did not*
22 *realise or accept the need for treatment. Speaking of her experience, one stakeholder described how “other*
23 *parents just didn’t reply or didn’t get in touch because they believed everything was ok and there wasn’t a*
24 *problem with their child. They didn’t need any programme. I think that definitely was a huge problem out there*
25 *in the community setting”, W82GO012. Because of this low recognition amongst parents, many stakeholders*
26 *recalled the resistance they faced when trying to discuss the issue with them and their fear prior to making*
27 *contact with parents. One stakeholder explained how some parents would “be really angry so you’re taking*
28 *angry phone calls in the evening. You know when you come in from a day’s work so it was really difficult”,*
29 *W82GO002.*

44 **Social Context**

45
46 Local level stakeholders believed there was a certain level of *“naïvety”* at national level about the reality of
47 rolling out the pilot programme on the ground. They felt consultation during the planning stage was lacking
48 and that national-level stakeholders had *“little experience of the practical aspects of childhood obesity”* as *“no*
49 *one was actually working with obese children or even groups on a day to day basis”, W82GO004. As a result*
50 *unrealistic expectations and timeframes prevailed, particularly during the recruitment phase. This led to*
51 *frustration and confusion among local-level health professionals during implementation.*

1
2
3 Communication between national and local level stakeholders was considered poor. However, the presence of
4 a local lead facilitated the exchange between staff on the ground and management at national level and was
5 seen by almost all stakeholders as crucial for programme implementation. Furthermore, stakeholders felt that
6 because of the multidisciplinary approach of the programme *“you needed someone on the ground”*; if they did
7 not have a local lead *“pulling all those people and bits together, it wouldn't have worked because running*
8 *something like this with people dispersed across a whole county and city is difficult”*, W82GO005. The presence
9 of supportive colleagues and management were identified as further enabling factors.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Organisational Context**

18
19 The multidisciplinary structure of the programme also created barriers at the organisational level. In addition
20 to differing individual perspectives and priorities, the added complexities of working in different locations
21 created difficulties during programme implementation. In many cases stakeholders didn't *“work at the same*
22 *site... or even the same town which was a challenge”* as it *“took up a lot of time organising between schedules*
23 *and travelling to meet and go through practicalities”*, W82GO007.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 In addition to these challenges, at the organisational level, stakeholders reported that implementation was
31 hampered due to insufficient resources (i.e. staff and time) and training. It was reported that two other
32 proposed areas withdrew from the pilot programme because of the lack of staff and leadership on the ground
33 to run the programme. Stakeholders felt that they had very different resource issues to the hospital-based
34 teams who are *“within the confines of a hospital... so they would or should have the same vision or focus...
35 whereas we can see now with a community based programme the professionals can be very different in their
36 training, they can have a different ethos in the departments within their community. It's very individual. We
37 have different line managers and different resources to deal with”*, W82GO011. Some stakeholders *“didn't
38 want to get involved because of existing workloads”*, and the lack of extra resources or allocated time to
39 implement the pilot. Furthermore, while acknowledging the little time hospital staff had to develop
40 community-specific training, local-level stakeholders felt they needed more *“practical and tailored”*
41 information. Many described the training they received as *‘too general’* and stated that *“it would have been
42 very helpful to have had more practical tips on how to actually run the programme session to session with this
43 age group”*, W82GO012.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

External Environment

In the Grol and Wensing model, the 'economic and political context' refers to financial arrangements, regulations and policies - themes which did not emerge during our research. Therefore, the sixth level was renamed 'external environment' to include wider societal perspectives and determinants.

In terms of the external environment, the lack of existing services to treat and manage childhood obesity meant many stakeholders were excited to come on board and implement this new initiative. One stakeholder described *"waiting for years for something to happen in this area"*, W82GO005. The media was recognised as both a barrier and a facilitator to programme implementation. While stakeholders believed TV and radio campaigns have the potential to raise awareness they felt that the issue is *"also getting very bad press"* and being *"hyped up a little bit"* which in itself may make it more difficult for parents to come forward. Additionally, staff felt that the stigma surrounding childhood obesity and weight management programmes created a significant barrier to programme implementation as they believed many parents were reluctant to attend or even talk about the issue of weight for fear of singling out or *'labelling'* their child.

Vision for the future

In terms of the future scale up of *W82GO-community*, the majority of stakeholders recommend establishing dedicated childhood obesity teams within the community, *"ideally people who are located at least in the same town"*, who can offer a range of interventions for different levels of need. One stakeholder described *"a tiered effect, for example there could be a level one which could be a generic workshop or talk that you could roll-out in lots of schools. A level two then would be a seminar for parents and level three would be a group programme. Level four then could be actual specific one on one interventions"*. Having a tiered approach would enable the team to match the level of need with the family and allow families to choose where on the scale they would best fit.

DISCUSSION

This study identifies the barriers and facilitators to implementing a community-based weight management programme from the perspective of stakeholders tasked with delivering such a programme. While community-based weight management programmes have become an important response to the obesity epidemic given their potential reach and accessibility for families, the majority are based on small, efficacy trials [2] and little is

1
2
3 known about the factors influencing their implementation in real-world settings. Our findings suggest that
4 more consideration is needed during the planning stages, including the creation of a structured programme
5 plan outlining specific roles and responsibilities. Local-level stakeholders believe they should be involved in this
6 process as they have practical experience of working with families on the ground in their respective
7 communities. In addition to their experience, the stakeholders we interviewed are keen to get involved in
8 community-based weight management treatment provided the appropriate training and resources have been
9 allocated. Within their 10 year framework for action, the Irish Government recognise the need for additional
10 resources to be assigned and seek to *“mobilise the health services to better prevent and address overweight
11 and obesity through effective community-based health promotion programmes”*[19] as well as providing
12 training and skills development. Given this renewed commitment by the Irish Department of Health to
13 empower community teams and communities, the road ahead looks promising.
14

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 A key barrier to the implementation of *W82GO-community* was perceived parental resistance which occurred
26 at the patient level but is also intrinsically linked to the external environment where the increasing
27 normalisation of overweight and obesity coexists with a stigma that surrounds the issue. Stakeholders
28 delivering the programme described parental resistance occurring at every stage of the implementation
29 process and suggested that parents did not appear to recognise the issue in their own children. As a result
30 stakeholders believed that parents did not see the need for treatment or refused to accept that their child was
31 carrying excess weight. While parental attitudes reported in this study were based on the perceptions of staff,
32 a lack of parental awareness regarding their child’s weight and resistance towards discussing weight issues has
33 been documented in previous research [20-24]. This may be due in part to the belief that obesity has become
34 the norm in society, a point which was suggested by stakeholders in this study, and previously outlined in the
35 literature [25]. It is also possible that parental resistance stems from the stigma that is associated with excess
36 weight and obesity [8, 21-23] or the negative media attention obesity has received. The framing of coverage by
37 media may affect people’s views about the causes of childhood obesity and the most appropriate strategies
38 for addressing the problem [26]. Our findings highlight the need, at a policy level, for positive awareness-
39 raising campaigns to encourage parental recognition of healthy childhood growth and development, in
40 addition to knowledge regarding the importance of identifying obesity early in childhood.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Low perceived self-efficacy in approaching the subject of weight with parents was a barrier facing staff during
4 implementation. Stakeholders in this study see the need for a childhood weight management programme in
5 their communities and acknowledge their professional responsibility to get involved. However, they appear
6 uncomfortable and unequipped to do this. This is consistent with previous research which found that low
7 perceived skills and low perceived self-efficacy hamper the implementation of such programmes [20, 27-30]. In
8 our study motivational interviewing workshops equipped stakeholders in Site A with increased skills and
9 confidence in working with families on weight management issues. Motivational interviewing is a goal-
10 orientated, patient-centred approach based on the use of communication skills to understand individuals'
11 motivation for behaviour change [31] and has been found to be useful when applied in health care settings
12 [32]. We therefore consider it important that healthcare professionals involved in the implementation of
13 obesity programmes receive this training prior to programme commencement.
14
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 The multidisciplinary structure of the programme emerged as both a barrier to and facilitator of
26 implementation and spread across many of the levels outlined by Grol and Wensing. While acknowledged that
27 it was required to treat such a complex health issue, it resulted in lack of role clarity, a lack of understanding of
28 specific discipline roles, and led to difficulties in scheduling. This may in part be due to the structure and
29 governance of community health services within Ireland. While there is a vision for multidisciplinary working
30 set out in multiple policy documents and an emphasis on integrated care [33], the system is not set-up to
31 support the concept. Stakeholders believe a simple roundtable introduction whereby practitioners could share
32 their professional background and outline their specific role within the project would have helped overcome
33 this ambiguity. They suggest it is a simple but often overlooked detail. Furthermore, stakeholders feel the
34 establishment of a local lead was critical in assisting multidisciplinary working while also facilitating discussion
35 between national and local level. Laws et al. also highlight the importance of having key local individuals
36 responsible for driving and coordinating research translation [34].
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Finally, an important finding from this research was the inherent problems in a '*one size fits all*' approach to
50 community-based treatment. Stakeholders in our study suggest a tiered approach may be more suitable,
51 beginning with a brief intervention which intensifies based on a child's degree of obesity, the family's
52 motivation, and the capacity of the community and/or healthcare provider. This finding is in line with a
53 suggestion from Staniford et al. who suggest that future interventions should tailor treatment according to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participants' age, degree of obesity and their readiness or confidence to change [35]. In addition to tailoring a
4
5 programme to the individual, programmes need to be adapted for the community setting. Stakeholders in our
6
7 study raised concerns that the W82GO programme, having been developed in a hospital setting, was too
8
9 medicalised for community practice. In particular, the lengthy assessment process which in some cases
10
11 involved blood tests and the presence of medically trained doctors, was unnecessary for a community-based
12
13 lifestyle programme. This finding is consistent with previous research conducted by Watson et al. who
14
15 evaluated a family-based childhood obesity treatment intervention and found they needed to modify the
16
17 assessment process by replacing community paediatrician assessments with parent/carer self-completion forms
18
19 for reasons of time and cost [36]. To develop a full picture of treatment, future research should examine what
20
21 aspects of the programme work, for whom, in what context and why.

22
23 While this study provides important insight into the implementation of childhood obesity programme in the
24
25 community, several limitations should be acknowledged. According to de Casterlé *et al.*, (2012) "*using a*
26
27 *preconceived framework runs the risk of prematurely excluding alternative ways of organising the*
28
29 *data*"[37]pg.362. However, data was analysed inductively first before mapping emergent themes onto the Grol
30
31 and Wensing Framework. In subsequent phases of analysis we adapted the framework to capture the
32
33 influence of the external environment on implementation. Social desirability bias is a risk when stakeholders
34
35 are known to the researcher conducting the interviews. In this case the stakeholders knew the researcher as
36
37 the programme evaluator. However, we do not believe this bias had an effect as stakeholders were keen to
38
39 "*tell their story*". It is also important to note that parental attitudes reported in this study were based on the
40
41 perceptions of staff delivering the programme. Other studies have identified differences between parents,
42
43 staff and children in terms of their attitudes towards childhood obesity treatment [35]. We are conducting
44
45 further research with parents and children to understand the factors influencing their decisions to engage or
46
47 disengage with obesity treatment.

48 49 **CONCLUSION**

50
51
52 In light of the dearth of knowledge available on the translation of multi-component childhood weight
53
54 management programmes to community settings, this study highlights the barriers and facilitators to
55
56 implementing such programmes from a wide range of community healthcare and admin perspectives. Our
57
58 results suggest the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, the provision of sufficient practical training
59
60

1
2
3 and resources, and organisational support play pivotal roles in overcoming barriers to change. Furthermore,
4
5 our findings on the challenges of multidisciplinary working and translating hospital programmes to community
6
7 settings are applicable to the implementation of interventions beyond that of childhood weight management.
8
9 This evidence should be used to develop implementation plans to improve the translation of interventions into
10
11 real world settings.

12 13 **STATEMENTS:**

- 14
15
16 • Authors' contributions

17
18 The authors responsibilities were as follows: EK: was responsible for the design and conduct of the research,
19
20 and writing of the manuscript. SMH: was involved in data analysis and reviewed drafts of the manuscript. EK,
21
22 SMH, JH, FS and IJP made critical revisions to the paper and gave final approval of the version to be submitted.
23

- 24
25
26 • Acknowledgements

27
28 We are grateful to the stakeholders who agreed to be interviewed for the study, without them this research
29
30 would not have been possible.

- 31
32
33 • Competing interests

34
35 The authors declare that they have no competing interests

- 36
37
38 • Funding

39
40 Source of support: E Kelleher is funded by the Health Research Board SPHeRE/2013/1. The Health Research
41
42 Board (HRB) supports excellent research that improves people's health, patient care and health service
43
44 delivery. We aim to ensure that new knowledge is created and then used in policy and practice. In doing so, we
45
46 support health system innovation and create new enterprise opportunities. Dr Sheena McHugh is funded by
47
48 the Centre for Ageing Research and Development in Ireland (CARDI), now the Ageing Research and
49
50 Development Division within the Institute of Public Health in Ireland (IPH).

- 51
52
53 • Data Sharing

54
55 Topic guides which were used in the interviews are available as additional supporting files. However, signed
56
57 confidentiality agreements prevent us from sharing transcripts.

- Ethics approval

Ethical Approval was granted by the Clinical Research Ethics Committee of the Cork Teaching Hospitals.

References

1. Flynn, M., D. McNeil, B. Maloff, et al., Reducing obesity and related chronic disease risk in children and youth: a synthesis of evidence with 'best practice' recommendations. *Obes Rev*, 2006. **7 Suppl 1**: p. 7-66.
2. Oude Luttikhuis, H., L. Baur, H. Jansen, et al., Interventions for treating obesity in children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 2009(1): p. Cd001872.
3. Wilfley, D., A. Staiano, M. Altman, et al., Improving access and systems of care for evidence-based childhood obesity treatment: Conference key findings and next steps. *Obesity* (Silver Spring), 2016.
4. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Weight management: lifestyle services for overweight or obese children and young people. Clinical Guideline, 47. 2013, NICE: London.
5. World Health Organisation., Report of the Commission on Ending Childhood Obesity. 2016, WHO Document Production Services: Geneva, Switzerland.
6. Nutbeam, D. and A. Bauman, Evaluation in a Nutshell: a practical guide to the evaluation of health promotion programs. Vol. 2. 2013, Australia: McGraw-Hill Education.
7. Welsby, D., B. Nguyen, B. O'Hara, et al., Process evaluation of an up-scaled community based child obesity treatment program: NSW Go4Fun(R). *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**: p. 140.
8. Lucas, P., K. Curtis-Tyler, L. Arai, et al., What works in practice: user and provider perspectives on the acceptability, affordability, implementation, and impact of a family-based intervention for child overweight and obesity delivered at scale. *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**: p. 614.
9. Stamatakis, K., C. Vinson, and J. Kerner, Dissemination and Implementation Research in Community and Public Health Settings, in *Dissemination and Implementation Research in Health: Translating Science to Practice*, R. Brownson, G. Colditz, and E. Proctor, Editors. 2012, Oxford University Press: New York.
10. Skelton, J. and B. Beech, Attrition in paediatric weight management: a review of the literature and new directions. *Obes Rev*, 2011. **12**(5): p. e273-81.
11. Kelleher, E., M. Davoren, J. Harrington, et al., Barriers and facilitators to initial and continued attendance at community-based lifestyle programmes among families of overweight and obese children: a systematic review. *Obes Rev*, 2016.
12. Keane, E., P. Kearney, I. Perry, et al., Trends and prevalence of overweight and obesity in primary school aged children in the Republic of Ireland from 2002-2012: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 2014. **14**(1): p. 974.
13. Layte, R. and C. McCrory, Growing Up in Ireland. Overweight and Obesity among 9-year olds. 2011, Department of Children and Youth Affairs: Dublin.
14. O'Malley, G., A. Brinkley, K. Moroney, et al., Is the Temple Street W82GO Healthy Lifestyles Programme effective in reducing BMI SDS? . *Obes Facts*, 2012. **5**(Suppl. 1): p. 178-234
15. Hoffmann, T., P. Glasziou, I. Boutron, et al., Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ*, 2014. **348**: p. g1687.
16. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Obesity. Guidance on the prevention of overweight and obesity in adults and children. Clinical Guideline, 43. 2015, NICE: London.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
17. Ritchie, J. and J. Lewis, *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students & researchers*. 2003, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
18. Grol, R. and M. Wensing, What drives change? Barriers to and incentives for achieving evidence-based practice. *Med J Aust*, 2004. **180**(6 Suppl): p. S57-60.
19. Department of Health., *A Healthy Weight for Ireland. Obesity Policy and Action Plan: 2016–2025*. 2016: Dublin.
20. Gerards, S.M., P. Dagnelie, M. Jansen, et al., Barriers to successful recruitment of parents of overweight children for an obesity prevention intervention: a qualitative study among youth health care professionals. *BMC Fam Pract*, 2012. **13**: p. 37.
21. Grow, H., C. Hsu, L. Liu, et al., Understanding family motivations and barriers to participation in community-based programs for overweight youth: one program model does not fit all. *J Public Health Manag Pract*, 2013. **19**(4): p. E1-e10.
22. Visram, S., T.D. Hall, and L. Geddes, Getting the balance right: qualitative evaluation of a holistic weight management intervention to address childhood obesity. *J Public Health (Oxf)*, 2012.
23. Newson, L., R. Povey, A. Casson, et al., The experiences and understandings of obesity: families' decisions to attend a childhood obesity intervention. *Psychol Health*, 2013. **28**(11): p. 1287-305.
24. Shiely, F., N. Hon Yan, E. Berkery, et al., The association between weight perception and BMI: Report and measurement data from the growing up in Ireland cohort study of 9 year olds. *Int J Obes*, 2016.
25. Binkin, N., A. Spinelli, G. Baglio, et al., What is common becomes normal: the effect of obesity prevalence on maternal perception. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis*, 2013. **23**(5): p. 410-6.
26. Barry, C., M. Jarlenski, R. Grob, et al., News Media Framing of Childhood Obesity in the United States From 2000 to 2009. *Pediatrics*, 2011.
27. Moyers, P., L. Bugle, and E. Jackson, Perceptions of school nurses regarding obesity in school-age children. *J Sch Nurs*, 2005. **21**(2): p. 86-93.
28. Steele, R., Y. Wu, C. Jensen, et al., School nurses' perceived barriers to discussing weight with children and their families: a qualitative approach. *J Sch Health*, 2011. **81**(3): p. 128-37.
29. Story, M., D. Neumark-Stzainer, N. Sherwood, et al., Management of child and adolescent obesity: attitudes, barriers, skills, and training needs among health care professionals. *Pediatrics*, 2002. **110**(1 Pt 2): p. 210-4.
30. Turner, K., J. Shield, and C. Salisbury, Practitioners' views on managing childhood obesity in primary care: a qualitative study. *The British J of Gen Pract*, 2009. **59**(568): p. 856-862.
31. Miller, W. and S. Rollnick, *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people for change*. 2002, New York: The Guilford Press.
32. Lozano, P., H. McPhillips, B. Hartzler, et al., Randomized trial of teaching brief motivational interviewing to pediatric trainees to promote healthy behaviors in families. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*, 2010. **164**(6): p. 561-6.
33. Department of Health., *A Healthy Weight for Ireland 2016–2025. Obesity Policy and Action Plan 2016*, Stationary Office: Dublin.
34. Laws, R., K. Hesketh, K. Ball, et al., Translating an early childhood obesity prevention program for local community implementation: a case study of the Melbourne InFANT Program. *BMC Public Health*, 2016. **16**: p. 748.
35. Staniford, L.J., J.D. Breckon, R.J. Copeland, et al., Key stakeholders' perspectives towards childhood obesity treatment: A qualitative study. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 2011. **15**(3): p. 230-244.
36. Watson, P., L. Dugdill, K. Pickering, et al., Service evaluation of the GOALS family-based childhood obesity treatment intervention during the first 3 years of implementation. *BMJ Open*, 2015. **5**(2).

- 1
2
3 37. Dierckx de Casterle, B., C. Gastmans, E. Bryon, et al., QUAGOL: a guide for qualitative data
4 analysis. *Int J Nurs Stud*, 2012. **49**(3): p. 360-71.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Supplementary Material 1: Completed TIDieR checklist



Template for Intervention
Description and Replication

The TIDieR (Template for Intervention Description and Replication) Checklist

Information to include when describing an intervention and the location of the information

Item number	Item	
	BRIEF NAME	
1.	Provide the name or a phrase that describes the intervention.	'W82GO-community' – a multi-component, family-focused childhood weight management pilot programme delivered in the community setting.
	WHY	
2.	Describe any rationale, theory, or goal of the elements essential to the intervention.	The W82GO-community programme is a family-focused programme grounded in behavioural change theory (transtheoretical model and social cognitive theory) and aims to reduce obesity in children with BMI \geq 98th percentile, improve children's dietary intake, physical activity levels and weight status while also increasing children's quality of life and psychosocial health. During initial assessments the families' attitudes and behaviours related to health promotion are identified and specific and achievable goals are set. In attaining these goals, a number of sub-behaviours are promoted including self-efficacy, self-monitoring and self-management. At every stage of the process the team aims to empower the family to recognise and make the necessary changes to bring about positive lifestyle changes and motivate them to maintain these changes.

WHAT

1
2 **3.** Materials: Describe any physical or informational materials used in the
3 intervention, including those provided to participants or used in
4 intervention delivery or in training of intervention providers. Provide
5 information on where the materials can be accessed (e.g. online
6 appendix, URL).
7
8
9

The *W82GO-community* programme includes:

- (1) The *W82GO-community* pilot programme was delivered by a multi-disciplinary team using a manual developed to support community-based healthcare professionals to deliver the programme in their area. It does so through the provision of a guide to setting up a team and preparing the delivery of the programme; a framework for individual sessions that allows for session preparation and planning including programme presentations on disc; materials, including template letters and evaluation forms that can be adapted to suit the local context and information on additional resources that are available to support the team
- (2) W82GO leaflet outlining the programmes goals and core elements to be distributed to families during recruitment
- (3) W82GO family information booklet including goal setting and additional resources and tips were distributed to all families attending the programme

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 **4.** Procedures: Describe each of the procedures, activities, and/or
31 processes used in the intervention, including any enabling or support
32 activities.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Recruitment: heights and weights were measured in school by public health nurses (PHNs) using standardised procedures. Weight and height data was subsequently used to calculate body mass index (BMI) and children were classified as obese if their BMI plotted ≥ 98 th BMI percentile for age and gender using the UK90 recommended cut-off points for treatment or referral which are currently used in Irish practice. Parents of children meeting this eligibility criterion were contacted by their school PHN to inform them of their child's weight status and those who indicated an interest in attending the

programme were subsequently invited to attend an initial screening assessment.

This individualised initial assessment assessed eligibility before programme commencement. This assessment was carried out by a multidisciplinary team to rule out underlying medical conditions. In addition, indicators of health literacy, health beliefs and physical and environmental variables that might act as barriers to change were recorded.

Following the initial assessment six group sessions took place over six weeks and group booster sessions occurred at three, six and nine months. During these group sessions parents and their children received an educational session for the first hour. Children were taken out to complete physical activity for the last 30 minutes while parents received an extra educational session. At 12 months another individualised final assessment took place to document any changes and make plans for sustainment.

WHO PROVIDED

5. For each category of intervention provider (e.g. psychologist, nursing assistant), describe their expertise, background and any specific training given.

The W82GO community-programme was delivered by a multidisciplinary team of community health professionals including dietitians, physiotherapists, public health nurses, psychologists, health promotion officers, area medical officers, administrators and local area management. These health professionals had varying levels of experience of dealing with childhood obesity and as a result were invited to take part in a training programme prior to programme commencement. Training included a needs assessment, a one day educational training course and two days of clinical shadowing with an experienced W82GO programme practitioner at Temple Street Children's University Hospital in

Dublin, Ireland. Each community practitioner was also supplied with a user manual which outlined the programme and detailed the content for both phases.

Public health nurses in one of the sites received motivational interviewing training specific to childhood obesity as part of routine training in the area already being conducted in that area.

HOW

6. Describe the modes of delivery (e.g. face-to-face or by some other mechanism, such as internet or telephone) of the intervention and whether it was provided individually or in a group.

The W82GO-community programme involved face-to-face sessions and included a mixture of group and individualised sessions as outlined above.

WHERE

7. Describe the type(s) of location(s) where the intervention occurred, including any necessary infrastructure or relevant features.

Initial assessments took place in community healthcare offices. Subsequent group sessions were delivered on weekdays in the afternoon at a local sports or community centre.

WHEN and HOW MUCH

8. Describe the number of times the intervention was delivered and over what period of time including the number of sessions, their schedule, and their duration, intensity or dose.

The programme was run in two sites (Site A and Site B) over 12 months. The individual assessment lasted approximately one and half to two hours. The initial intensive phase consisted of 6 weekly group sessions for both the child and his/her parent/carer and these occurred over one afternoon a week and lasted approximately one and a half to two hours. The three booster sessions at three, six and nine months lasted approximately one to one and a half hours. During these group sessions parents and their children received an educational session for the first hour. Children were taken out to complete physical activity

for the last 30 minutes while parents received an extra educational session. Upon completion of the 12 month programme children and their parents/carer return for a final assessment lasting approx. one and half to two hours. This model of implementation is in keeping with the transtheoretical model of behaviour change.

TAILORING

9. If the intervention was planned to be personalised, titrated or adapted, then describe what, why, when, and how.

All families received the same intervention.

MODIFICATIONS

10.‡ If the intervention was modified during the course of the study, describe the changes (what, why, when, and how).

Two sites delivered the pilot programme to their respective communities. Site A decided to separate children and parents from the start of the group sessions because they felt children of this age would not gain anything nor were likely to understand the educational sessions. Children received a full physical activity session instead while parents received the educational session alone.

Owing to low numbers attending the programme in Site B programme staff chose not to go ahead with the final assessment at 12 months and instead conducted the final assessments during the third booster session.

HOW WELL

11. Planned: If intervention adherence or fidelity was assessed, describe how and by whom, and if any strategies were used to maintain or improve fidelity, describe them.

Fidelity of intervention delivery was assessed using trainer self-reports and exit interviews.

12.‡ Actual: If intervention adherence or fidelity was assessed, describe the extent to which the intervention was delivered as planned.

In Site A, the programme was delivered in a more interactive manner (i.e. without the use of programme slides). Site B followed the manuals as planned.

** **Authors** - use N/A if an item is not applicable for the intervention being described. **Reviewers** – use '?' if information about the element is not reported/not sufficiently reported.

1 † If the information is not provided in the primary paper, give details of where this information is available. This may include locations such as a published protocol or other published
2 papers (provide citation details) or a website (provide the URL).

3 ‡ If completing the TIDieR checklist for a protocol, these items are not relevant to the protocol and cannot be described until the study is complete.

4 * We strongly recommend using this checklist in conjunction with the TIDieR guide (see *BMJ* 2014;348:g1687) which contains an explanation and elaboration for each item.

5
6 * The focus of TIDieR is on reporting details of the intervention elements (and where relevant, comparison elements) of a study. Other elements and methodological features of studies are
7 covered by other reporting statements and checklists and have not been duplicated as part of the TIDieR checklist. When a **randomised trial** is being reported, the TIDieR checklist should be
8 used in conjunction with the CONSORT statement (see www.consort-statement.org) as an extension of **Item 5 of the CONSORT 2010 Statement**. When a **clinical trial protocol** is being
9 reported, the TIDieR checklist should be used in conjunction with the SPIRIT statement as an extension of **Item 11 of the SPIRIT 2013 Statement** (see www.spirit-statement.org). For
10 alternate study designs, TIDieR can be used in conjunction with the appropriate checklist for that study design (see www.equator-network.org).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

COREQ Checklist for Qualitative Research:

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Reported on Page #
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Pg. 6
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	Pg. 1, 6 & 7
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	Pg. 1, 6
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Pg. 1,6
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	Pg. 6
<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Pg. 3
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Pg. 15
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	Pg. 1,3,6
Domain 2: study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	Pg. 6-7
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Pg. 6
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Pg. 6
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	Pg. 7
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	Pg. 7
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Pg. 6
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	NA
16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Pg. 7
<i>Data collection</i>		

17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	Pg. 6
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	NA
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Pg. 6
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	Yes
21. Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	Pg. 6
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Pg. 6
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Pg. 7
25. Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	N/A
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Pg. 7
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	Pg. 7
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	NA
<i>Reporting</i>		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Pg. 8-13
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Pg. 8-13
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Pg. 8-13
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Discussion of major and minor themes Pg. 8-13