



ImpResPAC

Implementation Research
Proposal Appraisal Criteria

A quantitative tool to appraise the conceptual and methodological
quality of implementation research proposals



This is an interactive
PDF with active links

- ImpResPAC introduction – 03
- ImpResPAC statistics – 04
- ImpResPAC domains – 05
- ImpResPAC domain items – 06
- ImpResPAC user instructions – 07
- Calculating the global ImpResPAC score – 09
- ImpResPAC example – 10
- ImpResPAC tool – 11
- ImpResPAC worksheet – 18
- ImpResPAC references – 19
- ImpResPAC glossary – 20
- ImpResPAC development team – 24
- Acknowledgements – 25
- Contact us – 25



Contents:
Click on a title to
navigate to its page



Contents page:
Click icon to navigate
back to the contents page



Website links:
All underlined text
are URL references



ImpResPAC worksheet:
Click icon to view the
ImpResPAC worksheet



Linked pages:
Click **bold text** to see
related information



Search this guide:
Press Ctrl+F and enter
your search terms

ImpResPAC introduction



High-quality implementation research is fundamental to improving the adoption, implementation and sustainment of evidence-based interventions in healthcare.

Despite many similarities between what constitutes a high-quality implementation research proposal and research proposals in other scientific fields, important differences exist that need to be considered when designing and appraising the conceptual and methodological quality of implementation research proposals.

The Implementation Research Proposal Appraisal Criteria (ImpResPAC) is a comprehensive and in-depth quantitative appraisal tool to evaluate the conceptual and methodological quality of implementation research proposals in healthcare. ImpResPAC includes 10 domains, based on the [Implementation Science Research Development \(ImpRes\) tool](#) and supplementary guide which were developed to support research teams to design high-quality implementation research in healthcare.

The content and refinement of ImpResPAC was informed by an international Expert Advisory Panel (EAP), consisting of 68 experts who have made a significant contribution to the conceptual and methodological advancement of implementation science.

The protocol detailing the development and application and psychometric evaluation of ImpResPAC is published and describes the three-stage sequential mixed-methods design: [Sweetnam C, Goulding L, Davis RE, et al. Development and psychometric evaluation of the Implementation Science Research Project Appraisal Criteria \(ImpResPAC\) tool: a study protocol. BMJ Open 2022;12:e061209. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-061209.](#)

The manuscript detailing the results of the ImpResPAC study is currently being written up for publication.

ImpResPAC statistics



The content and refinement of ImpResPAC was informed by an **Expert Advisory Panel (EAP)** consisting of **68 experts**

ImpResPAC contains:

**71 domain items,
organised across
10 domains**

**370+
cumulative
years**

EAP experience reviewing
implementation research
funding proposals

**730+
cumulative
years**

EAP expertise in
implementation science

83% of the EAP agreed or
strongly agreed
ImpResPAC provides a comprehensive,
transparent and fair appraisal of the
conceptual and methodological quality
of implementation research proposals.

79%
Appropriate
of the EAP agreed or strongly
agreed that ImpResPAC is
appropriate/acceptable/feasible
to be used by

74%
Acceptable
reviewers
to appraise the conceptual
and methodological quality
of implementation
research proposals.

64%
Feasible

91%
Appropriate
of the EAP agreed or strongly
agreed that ImpResPAC is
appropriate/acceptable/feasible
to be used by

86%
Acceptable
researchers
and *practitioners*
to appraise the conceptual
and methodological quality
of their implementation
funding proposals.

81%
Feasible

83%
Appropriate
of the EAP agreed or strongly
agreed that ImpResPAC is
appropriate/acceptable/feasible
to be used by

76%
Acceptable
educators
to appraise the conceptual
and methodological quality of
implementation research proposals
submitted as part of implementation
capacity building initiatives.

71%
Feasible

ImpResPAC domains


ImpResPAC is a comprehensive and in-depth quantitative appraisal tool to evaluate the conceptual and methodological quality of implementation research proposals in healthcare.

05

ImpResPAC contains 10 distinct, but interrelated, domains.

Each domain represents a core element of implementation research.

ImpResPAC domains are weighted equally.



Click on domains to view the ImpResPAC tool

ImpResPAC domain items

Each **ImpResPAC** domain contains several items. Each item is indicative of high-quality implementation research.

Example domain item from the **implementation research characteristics** domain:

The proposed study explicitly seeks to address an implementation problem; it clearly identifies and describes both the associated **quality** and/or coverage of care gap, and the **evidence-based intervention** selected to address the problem.

ImpResPAC domain items are weighted equally.



ImpResPAC

user instructions

ImpResPAC application and scoring instructions

Given the diversity and scope of implementation research, it is possible that one or more ImpResPAC domains, and all associated items, may not be applicable. Only consider the domains that are applicable to the proposed study in question. Similarly, not every ImpResPAC domain item, in applicable domains, may be applicable. Only consider the domain items applicable to the proposed study in question.

For each applicable item, consider whether the proposed study partially or fully addresses the content of the domain item. Based on the percentage of domain items that are partially or fully addressed, a score of 1-5 is assigned to each ImpResPAC domain.



1

Very Poor

Very few applicable items
are partially or fully addressed
(0-20%*)

2

Poor

Few applicable items are partially
or fully addressed
(21-40%*)

3

Fair

Some applicable items are
partially or fully addressed
(41-60%*)

4

Good

Most applicable items are
partially or fully addressed
(61-80%*)

5

Excellent

Almost all applicable items are
partially or fully addressed
(81-100%*)

* Please note the above suggested percentage cut-off ranges are for guidance only.

Partially versus fully addressed domain items

The distinction between ‘partially’ and ‘fully’ accounts for the fact that many domain items contain more than one element. Therefore, it is possible that research proposals may ‘partially’ or ‘fully’ address the content elements of each domain item.

Example of an ImpResPAC item containing more than one element

Proposed adaptations and modifications (above and beyond partial application), including extensions and the innovative use of chosen implementation theories, models and frameworks (TMFs), are clearly and comprehensively described, and an explanation is provided.

Research teams may address one element in the above ImpResPAC item (e.g., adaptations and modifications to TMFs are clearly and comprehensively described) but not the other (e.g., an explanation is not provided).

Note: Some ImpResPAC domain items reference specific terms, tools and methods that are indicative of excellent conceptual and methodological elements of implementation research. It is possible that a proposal fully addresses an ImpResPAC domain item without explicitly referring to the terms, tools and methods referenced in ImpResPAC. In such cases, we recommend that ImpResPAC users use their judgement to determine whether a proposal fulfils the criteria.

Calculating the global ImpResPAC score

1

Very Poor

2

Poor

3

Fair

4

Good

5

Excellent

Given the fact that not every ImpResPAC domain will be applicable in every implementation research proposal, we suggest that you calculate the global ImpResPAC **median** score, **range** and **interquartile range** of the applicable domain scores. This will allow you to compare the conceptual and methodological quality of implementation research proposals with varying numbers of applicable domains.

The overall global ImpResPAC median score will range from 1-5, with higher scores indicating higher quality implementation research proposals.

Example of how to calculate the global ImpResPAC median score:

First, place the domain scores in ascending order. Then, identify the middle value. This is the global ImpResPAC median score. If the number of applicable domains is even, then the global ImpResPAC median score is the average of the middle two domain scores.

• Domains scored: 1, 2, 3, ③, ④, 4, 4, 4

Global ImpResPAC median score: 3.5 (Fair/Good)

• Range: 3 (1-4)

• Interquartile Range: 1.5

Note: In addition to calculating the global ImpResPAC median score, we recommend that you consider individual domain scores. This is important because there may be instances in which the global ImpResPAC median score may be inflated by a number of ImpResPAC domains that score very highly, but consist of a number of ImpResPAC domains that score very poorly.


ImpResPAC is intended to measure the conceptual and methodological quality of implementation research proposals in healthcare, rather than as a measure of reporting quality. As such, if domain(s) and/or item(s) deemed not to be applicable are not assessed, this should be viewed negatively. If being used for high-stakes assessment (e.g., funding decisions), we suggest that clarification is sought from research teams regarding ImpResPAC domain(s) and/or item(s) not addressed.



Linked pages:
Click **bold text** to see related information

ImpResPAC **example**

 10



Implementation research characteristics	4
Implementation theories, models and frameworks	4
Implementation determinants	3
Implementation strategies	3
Service and patient outcomes	N/A
Implementation outcomes	4
Unintended consequences	1
Economic evaluation	N/A
Stakeholder involvement and engagement	4
Patient and public involvement and engagement	2
Global ImpResPac median score: 3.5 (Fair/Good)	



Click domains to view
the ImpResPAC tool



Project title:

Implementation research characteristics

	Not applicable	Not addressed	Partially/fully addressed
The proposed study explicitly seeks to address an implementation problem; it clearly identifies and describes both the associated quality and/or coverage of care gap, and the evidence-based intervention selected to address the problem.			
Clear and strong justification is provided to support the selection of the evidence-based intervention to be implemented to address the quality and/or coverage of care gap (e.g., prior efficacy and/or effectiveness studies, patient preference). Literature and/or local data used to support the evidence-based intervention to be implemented is up to date and has been critically appraised.			
Implementation and wider study aims and objectives are explicitly and clearly articulated, and align with the proposed study design, methods, measures, outcomes and analysis plan.			
Issues relating to scientific and health equity have been thoroughly considered and described in detail. Existing inequities in the quality and/or coverage of care gap have been considered with the aim of achieving equity and avoiding exacerbating existing inequities.			
Design and methods of the proposed study are clearly stated and comprehensively described (e.g., qualitative, semi-structured interviews) and align appropriately with the aims and objectives of the proposed study.			
The conceptual linkages between all elements of the proposed study (i.e., the evidence-based intervention , implementation determinants , implementation strategies , mechanisms of action and outcomes) are comprehensively depicted in a programme theory , logic model or theory of change .			
Stage(s) of implementation of the proposed study and the associated activities planned at each stage are described in detail.			
Planned adaptations and modifications to the evidence-based intervention are clearly described. Reasons (e.g., available resources), goals (e.g., to reduce costs) and the process of adaptations and modifications are clearly described. ¹ Core components of the evidence-based intervention are retained. Clear intention to explore the impact of planned adaptations and modifications to the evidence-based intervention on service and patient outcomes and implementation outcomes is stated.			
Clear intention to document unplanned adaptations and modifications to the evidence-based intervention that arise is described. Clear intention to explore the impact of unplanned adaptations and modifications on service and patient outcomes and implementation outcomes is stated.			
How the proposed study will contribute to the conceptual and/or methodological advancement of the field is clearly articulated.			
Taking into consideration the expertise and capacity of the research team, the proposed study can be accomplished within the available timeframe, requested budget and resources.			

Domain score - implementation research characteristics



Implementation theories, models and frameworks

	Not applicable	Not addressed	Partially/fully addressed
Clear and strong justification is provided to support the selection of implementation theories, models and frameworks (TMFs). For example, by citing appropriate literature (e.g., the TMFs have been applied successfully to similar interventions), using implementation TMF criteria selection tools (e.g., T-CaST) ² and/or using data from implementation site(s) (e.g., pilot data identifying relevant/important factors of implementation, which map well onto a particular implementation TMF). If pre-existing implementation TMFs are not applied, and the study aims to develop an implementation TMF, clear and strong justification is provided.			
The chosen implementation TMF(s) inform(s) and structure(s) all relevant aspects of the proposed study (e.g., study design, aims and objectives, outcomes, analysis, interpretation of results).			
If implementation TMFs are to be partially applied , clear and strong justification is provided.			
Proposed adaptations and modifications (above and beyond partial application) including extensions and the innovative use of chosen implementation TMFs are clearly and comprehensively described, and an explanation is provided.			
If more than one implementation TMF is selected, the unique contribution of each, and the benefits of combining them is described, and how they will be integrated is explained.			
Constructs/domains of implementation TMFs are proposed to be evaluated, using appropriate methods (quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods). If proposed to be measured quantitatively, psychometrically robust (e.g., valid and reliable) and pragmatic (i.e., practical) instruments are to be utilised, where available.			

Domain score – implementation theories, models and frameworks

Implementation determinants

	Not applicable	Not addressed	Partially/fully addressed
The context in which the proposed study is to take place and implementation determinants , including contextual determinants (theorised and/or identified to influence implementation) are clearly described.			
The proposed study aims to identify implementation determinants , operating at different levels, either pre-, during and/or post-implementation, as appropriate to address the study aims and objectives.			
Relevant stakeholders (e.g., those responsible for implementation/delivery and those expected to benefit) have been, or will be, involved in the identification of implementation determinants .			
Clear and detailed description of the methods to be used to identify (e.g., interviews, document analysis) and/or evaluate (e.g., quantitative instruments) implementation determinants is provided.			
Clear intention to document changes to the context (e.g., policy change) that arise during implementation is described.			

Domain score – implementation determinants



Implementation strategies

Not applicable Not addressed Partially/fully addressed

The **implementation strategies** proposed to be used are described in sufficient detail to allow replication and evaluation (i.e., **named, defined, specified/operationalised** and **actor, action, target, temporality, dose** specified).³ If appropriate, **implementation strategies** proposed to be used are conceptually linked to an existing implementation strategy taxonomy (e.g., ERIC **implementation strategy** compilation,⁴ Strategies to support the use of research in clinical practice taxonomy⁵).

The **implementation strategies** proposed to be used have been, or will be, selected and tailored to address **implementation determinants**. **Implementation determinant-implementation strategy** linkages and the hypothesised mechanisms through which **implementation strategies** are expected to work are explicitly stated using, for example, causal pathway models or mechanism mapping.

The process (e.g., **implementation determinant** identification → **implementation determinant** prioritisation → **implementation strategy** selection and tailoring) and methods (e.g., concept mapping, conjoint analysis) proposed to be used to select and tailor **implementation strategies** are clearly described.

Relevant stakeholders (e.g., those responsible for implementation/delivery and those expected to benefit) have been, or will be, involved in the selection and tailoring of the proposed **implementation strategies**.

Implementation strategy selection and tailoring is theoretically, empirically (if evidence is available) and/or pragmatically (e.g., feasibility) justified.

The **proximal outcome** (e.g., increased screening rate), and **implementation outcome(s)** (e.g., screening feasibility) that are targeted for improvement by the proposed **implementation strategy** are explicitly stated.

The proposed monitoring (e.g., **fidelity of delivery and/or receipt**) and evaluation (e.g., impact on **intermediate outcomes, implementation outcomes** and/or **proximal outcomes**) of **implementation strategies** are clearly described.

Planned **adaptations** and **modifications** to the **implementation strategy** are clearly described. Reasons (e.g., available resources), goals (e.g., to reduce costs) and the process of adaptations and modifications are clearly described.⁶ **Core components** of the implementation strategy are retained. Clear intention to explore the impact of planned **adaptations** and **modifications** to the **implementation strategy** on **service** and **patient outcomes** and **implementation outcomes** is stated.

Clear intention to document unplanned **adaptations** and **modifications** to the **implementation strategy** that arise is described. Clear intention to explore the impact of unplanned **adaptations** and **modifications** to the **implementation strategy** on **service** and **patient outcomes** and **implementation outcomes** is stated.

Domain score - implementation strategies



Service and patient outcomes

Not applicable Not addressed Partially/fully addressed

The proposed study includes the evaluation of service and/or patient outcome(s) as appropriate to address the study aims and objectives.			
Clear and explicit evidence that relevant stakeholders (e.g., those responsible for implementation/delivery and those expected to benefit) were involved, or will be involved, in the identification and selection of relevant and important service and/or patient outcomes to be evaluated.			
The method(s) (qualitative/quantitative/mixed-methods) to be used to evaluate service and/or patient outcome(s) are clearly described and appropriate to address the study aims and objectives.			
The proposed measurement method(s), level(s) of measurement/analysis, timing and frequency of service and/or patient outcome(s) data collection are appropriate to address the study aims and objectives. The time horizon over which service and patient outcomes are to be evaluated is clearly stated.			
The degree of focus placed on evaluating service and/or patient outcomes (i.e., the effectiveness of the selected evidence-based intervention) is guided by the strength of evidence for the intervention in question, the extent of planned adaptations and modifications to the evidence-based intervention and/or implementation strategy , and the context in which implementation is to take place. ⁷			
Where quantitative service and/or patient outcomes instrument(s) are proposed to be used to assess service and/or patient outcomes , justification for selection of an existing instrument or development of a new instrument is reported. Psychometric properties (e.g., validity and reliability) and/or pragmatic (i.e., practical) qualities and/or previous application to the population of interest are stated to justify the selection of an existing instrument or development of a new instrument. If a new instrument is being developed, there is clear intention to evaluate its psychometric properties .			
A clear and detailed description of the service and/or patient outcomes data analysis plan is presented. How the service and/or patient outcomes are to be treated (e.g., as a predictor variable) and how service and/or patient outcomes will be analysed (e.g., correlational analysis) relative to other constructs (e.g., implementation outcomes) is clearly stated. For qualitatively evaluated service and/or patient outcomes , how data will be analysed and interpreted (e.g., thematic analysis) is clearly stated.			

Domain score - service and patient outcomes



Implementation outcomes

	Not applicable	Not addressed	Partially/fully addressed
The proposed study includes the evaluation of one or more implementation outcomes as appropriate to address the study aims and objectives.			
Clear and explicit evidence that all relevant stakeholders (e.g., those responsible for implementation/delivery and those expected to benefit) were involved , or will be involved , in the identification and selection of relevant and important implementation outcomes to be evaluated.			
Each implementation outcome to be evaluated is clearly stated and an operational definition provided. ⁸			
The method(s) (qualitative/quantitative/mixed methods) to be used to evaluate implementation outcomes are clearly described and appropriate to address the study aims and objectives.			
The proposed measurement method(s), level(s) of measurement/analysis, timing and frequency of implementation outcome data collection are appropriate to address the study aims and objectives. ⁸ The time horizon over which implementation outcomes are to be evaluated is clearly stated.			
Where quantitative implementation outcome instruments are proposed to be used to assess implementation outcomes , justification for the selection of an existing instrument or development of a new instrument is reported. Psychometric properties (e.g., validity and reliability) and/or pragmatic (i.e., practical) qualities and/or previous application to the population of interest are stated to justify the selection of an existing instrument or development of a new instrument. If a new instrument is being developed, there is a clear intention to evaluate its psychometric properties .			
A clear and detailed description of the implementation outcome data analysis plan is presented. How the implementation outcomes are to be treated (e.g., as a predictor variable) and how implementation outcomes will be analysed (e.g., correlational analysis) relative to other constructs (e.g., implementation determinants) is clearly stated. ⁸ For qualitatively evaluated implementation outcomes , how data will be analysed and interpreted (e.g., thematic analysis) is clearly stated.			

Domain score – implementation outcomes

Unintended consequences

	Not applicable	Not addressed	Partially/fully addressed
Clear and detailed discussion of the intention to explore whether anticipated and unanticipated unintended consequences (including anticipated drawbacks, unexpected benefits and unexpected drawbacks) occur as a result of implementation. ⁹			
If relevant, anticipated unintended consequences , particularly if negative, are stated and described.			
The intention to explore unintended consequences (both anticipated and unanticipated) from different stakeholder perspectives (e.g., patients, healthcare providers) and at different levels (e.g., individual, team, organisation) is described.			
The method(s) proposed to be used to detect, measure, analyse and better understand why unintended consequences (both anticipated and unanticipated) occur are clearly described (e.g., semi-structured interviews with those responsible and/or affected by implementation). The phase(s) of implementation (e.g., during, post-implementation) that detection of unintended consequences is planned is clearly stated.			
Ethical, moral and practical implications of how to respond to both anticipated and unanticipated unintended consequences (e.g., de-implementation or adaptation and/or modification to the evidence-based intervention and/or implementation strategy), to prevent or mitigate their effects, are described.			

Domain score – unintended consequences



Economic evaluation

Not applicable Not addressed Partially/fully addressed

The economic evaluation research question(s) and the type of economic evaluation (including relevant costs and consequences) proposed to be used are clearly articulated. The alternatives being compared (e.g., the evidence-based intervention compared to standard practice and/or different implementation strategies) are clearly described.			
The perspective(s) (e.g., societal or health system perspective) of the economic evaluation is clearly stated and justified in relation to the context of the research and the time horizon over which costs and consequences are to be evaluated.			
There is a clear statement of which outcomes are to be quantified and/or qualitatively explored where relevant (e.g., patient/population health outcomes, improvement in healthcare delivery processes/provider outcomes, spillovers/unintended cost impacts to non-targeted populations and sites) and these are appropriate to the aims and objectives of the economic evaluation and informed by stakeholder involvement.			
The proposed design of the economic evaluation, where appropriate, has built in an allowance for describing/reporting the distributional implications of implementation (e.g., reducing health disparities).			
The approach to measurement of costs (including quantification and valuation of resources to be used for implementation strategies and evidence-based intervention) is clearly stated, including reference to appropriate data sources and methods.			
Clear and explicit recognition of implementation strategy costs, including those in the initial implementation phase and those related to sustainment and scale-up, if applicable.			
If relevant to the wider research aims and study design, the economic evaluation allows the incremental costs and consequences specific to the implementation strategy and/or evidence-based intervention to be separately determined.			
The planned approach to summarising implementation cost-effectiveness (e.g., use of incremental cost-effectiveness ratios , cost-benefit ratios , net monetary benefit) is clearly stated and appropriate.			
The approach to sensitivity analysis to evaluate the robustness of conclusions to uncertainty (including those relating to sampling error) around the value of key implementation, clinical, epidemiological and economic parameters is clearly stated and appropriate.			

Domain score - economic evaluation



Stakeholder* involvement and engagement

	Not applicable	Not addressed	Partially/fully addressed
Clear and explicit evidence that relevant stakeholders were meaningfully involved in developing the study proposal (e.g., shaping research questions) and, if appropriate, are members of the research team (e.g., as co-applicants or as members of a study steering/advisory group).			
Clear and explicit evidence of the intention to meaningfully engage and/or involve stakeholders in all relevant later stages of the study (e.g., interpreting and disseminating research findings).			
The purpose, anticipated benefits and impact of planned engagement and/or involvement activities are clearly described. The level of engagement and/or involvement are appropriate to meet the purpose of engagement and/or involvement activities.			
The proposed study is informed by feedback from stakeholders, including their preferences and priorities. It strives to be a meaningful partnership between researchers and relevant stakeholders.			
Planned engagement and/or involvement methods are appropriate, clearly described, and promote meaningful engagement and/or involvement .			
There is a clear plan to give feedback to stakeholders engaged and/or involved in the proposed study on the impacts of their engagement and/or involvement .			

Domain score – stakeholder involvement and engagement

Patient and public involvement and engagement

	Not applicable	Not addressed	Partially/fully addressed
Clear and explicit evidence that relevant patients, service users, carers and/or members of the public were meaningfully involved in developing the study proposal (e.g., shaping research questions) and, if appropriate, are members of the research team (e.g., as co-applicants or as members of a study steering/advisory group).			
Clear and explicit evidence of the intention to meaningfully engage and/or involve patients, service users, carers and/or members of the public, in all relevant later stages of the study (e.g., undertaking interviews with research participants, interpreting and disseminating research findings).			
The purpose, anticipated benefits and impact of planned engagement and/or involvement activities are clearly described. The level and nature of engagement and/or involvement activities are appropriate to meet the purpose of engagement and/or involvement activities.			
The proposed study is informed by feedback from patients, service users, carers and/or members of the public, including their preferences and priorities. It strives to be a meaningful partnership between researchers and relevant patients, service users, carers and/or members of the public.			
Planned engagement and/or involvement methods are appropriate, clearly described, and promote meaningful engagement and/or involvement .			
There is a clear plan to give feedback to patients, service users, carers and/or members of the public engaged and/or involved in the proposed study on the impacts of their engagement and/or involvement .			

Domain score – patient and public involvement and engagement

*Stakeholders: stakeholders in this domain include healthcare providers, managers, commissioners, policy makers etc.



ImpResPAC worksheet

18

Project title:

Once you have appraised an implementation research proposal using ImpResPAC and assigned scores for all applicable domains, we recommend that you populate this table with domain scores. This will allow you to calculate the **global ImpResPAC score** (see page 09) for recommendations regarding scoring. Given the fact that not every ImpResPAC domain will be applicable in every implementation research proposal, we suggest that you calculate the median, range and interquartile range of the applicable domain scores. This will allow you to compare the conceptual and methodological quality of implementation research proposals with varying numbers of applicable domains.

Populating the table will also allow you to consider individual domain scores in addition to the global ImpResPAC score. This is important because there may be instances in which the global ImpResPAC score may be inflated by a number of ImpResPAC domains that score very highly but consist of a number of ImpResPAC domains that score very poorly.



Click on domains to view the ImpResPAC tool

Implementation research characteristics	
Implementation theories, models and frameworks	
Implementation determinants	
Implementation strategies	
Service and patient outcomes	
Implementation outcomes	
Unintended consequences	
Economic evaluation	
Stakeholder involvement and engagement	
Patient and public involvement and engagement	
Global ImpResPAC median score:	
Range:	
Interquartile range:	

I have appraised an implementation research proposal using ImpResPAC, what next?

- If you are a **reviewer** using ImpResPAC to inform funding decisions, considering the global ImpResPAC score as well as **individual domain scores will allow you to identify and differentiate between poor and excellent implementation research proposals**. This will allow you to **provide feedback** to research teams to either **explain a funding decision or to strengthen an implementation research proposal**.
- If you are an **educator** using ImpResPAC to appraise the conceptual and methodological quality of implementation research proposals submitted as part of an implementation teaching or training initiative, this will allow you to **score and provide detailed feedback to students**.
- If you are a **researcher** or **practitioner** using ImpResPAC to appraise the conceptual and methodological quality of your implementation funding proposals, this will allow you to identify any areas of weakness that ought to be addressed prior to submission.

ImpResPAC references

¹ Content based on Stirman et al. [The FRAME: an expanded framework for reporting adaptations and modifications to evidence-based interventions.](#) Implement Sci. 2019;14(1):58.

² Content refers to Birken et al. [T-CaST: an implementation theory comparison and selection tool.](#) Implement Sci. 2018;13(1):143.

³ Content based on Proctor et al. [Implementation strategies: recommendations for specifying and reporting.](#) Implement Sci. 2013;8:139.

⁴ ERIC: Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change. Content refers to Powell et al. [A refined compilation of implementation strategies: results from the Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change \(ERIC\) project.](#) Implement Sci. 2015;10:21.

⁵ Content refers to Boaz et al. ['It depends': what 86 systematic reviews tell us about what strategies to use to support the use of research in clinical practice.](#) Implement Sci. 2024;19(1):15.

⁶ Content based on Miller et al. [The FRAME-IS: a framework for documenting modifications to implementation strategies in healthcare.](#) Implement Sci. 2021;16(1):36.

⁷ Content based on Curran et al. [Reflections on 10 years of effectiveness-implementation hybrid studies.](#) Front Health Serv. 2022;2:1053496.

⁸ Content based on Lengnick-Hall et al. [Six practical recommendations for improved implementation outcomes reporting.](#) Implement Sci. 2022;17(1):16.

⁹ Content based on Toma et al. [A balanced approach to identifying, prioritising and evaluating all potential consequences of quality improvement: modified Delphi study.](#) BMJ Open. 2019;9(3):e023890.

Term	Definition	Reference
The Actor [in relation to implementation strategies]	The stakeholder(s) who enacts the strategy.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24289295/
The Action [in relation to implementation strategies]	Dynamic verb statements that indicate actions, steps or processes, and sequences of behavior.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24289295/
Adaptation [in relation to the evidence-based intervention and/or implementation strategies]	A process of thoughtful and deliberate alteration to the design or delivery of an intervention, with the goal of improving its fit or effectiveness in a given context. Related to but distinct from modification .	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31171014/
Adaptation [in relation to theories, models and frameworks]	A process of thoughtful and deliberate alteration to a theory, model or framework, with the goal of improving its fit or appropriateness in a given context.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31171014/
Context	The set of circumstances or unique factors that surround a particular implementation effort.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19664226/
Contextual determinants	A sub-category of implementation determinants associated with the context in which implementation efforts are to take place, including for example organisational culture and climate, financial resources and social relations and support. See implementation determinants .	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30909897/
Core components	The essential and indispensable elements of an evidence-based intervention and/or implementation strategies.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19664226/
Cost-benefit ratios	A ratio used in a cost-benefit analysis to summarise whether an evidence-based intervention is a worthwhile use of resource. The ratio is calculated by dividing monetised benefits by monetised costs.	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/cost-benefit-analysis/Cost-benefit
Defined [in relation to implementation strategies]	The conceptual definition of the implementation strategy and the operational definition of any discrete components.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24289295/
De-implementation	The discontinuation or abandonment of practices that are not proven to be effective, are less effective or less cost-effective than an alternative practice, or are potentially harmful.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34819122/
Dose [in relation to implementation strategies]	The dosage or intensity of the strategy.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24289295/
Economic evaluation	The analysis of the costs and effects of alternative interventions that may be given to a defined population in order to support decision-making about reimbursement or implementation of the preferred interventions.	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/economic-evaluation/
Engagement [in research]	Where information and knowledge about research is provided and disseminated.	https://www.nihr.ac.uk/explore-nihr/campaigns/supporting-patient-and-public-involvement-in-research.htm
Evidence-based intervention	Interventions with proven efficacy and effectiveness (i.e., evidence-based).	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18287916/

Term	Definition	Reference
Fidelity of delivery	The degree to which an intervention was implemented as it was prescribed in the original protocol or as it was intended by the program developers.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20957426/
Fidelity of receipt	The extent to which participants actively engage with, interact with, are receptive to, and/or use materials or recommended resources.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15855283/
Framework	A structure, overview, outline, system or plan consisting of various descriptive categories, e.g., concepts, constructs or variables, and the relations between them that are presumed to account for a phenomenon. Frameworks do not provide explanations; they only describe empirical phenomena by fitting them into a set of categories.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25895742/
Health equity	Health equity means that everyone has a fair and just opportunity to be as healthy as possible. This requires removing obstacles to health such as poverty and discrimination, and their consequences, including powerlessness, lack of access to good jobs with fair pay, quality education, housing, safe environments and healthcare.	https://www.rwjf.org/en/insights/our-research/2017/05/what-is-health-equity-.html
Implementation determinants	Factors that obstruct or enable changes in targeted professional behaviours or healthcare delivery processes. These factors have been referred to as barriers and enablers, barriers and facilitators, or problems and incentives. Factors believed or empirically shown to influence implementation outcomes. See contextual determinants .	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25112492/ https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30909897/
Implementation cost	Costs related to the development and execution of the implementation strategy that targets one or more specific evidence-based interventions.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35090508/
Implementation outcomes	The effects of deliberate and purposive actions to implement new treatments, practices and services.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20957426/
Implementation strategies	Methods or techniques used to enhance the adoption, implementation, and sustainability of a clinical program or practice.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22310560/
Implementation cost-effectiveness	The cost-effectiveness of an implementation project or strategy. This would be measured with reference to the incremental cost of the implementation strategy (compared to its alternatives) and the incremental effect of the strategy on implementation outcomes and/or health-related outcomes.	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/cost-effectiveness-analysis/
Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios	A summary measure representing the economic value of an intervention, compared with an alternative (comparator).	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/incremental-cost-effectiveness-ratio-icer/
Intermediate outcome	Preconditions for attaining desired service delivery and clinical outcomes.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20957426/
Interquartile range	The length of the interval between the 25th and 75th percentiles and describes the range of the middle half of the distribution.	https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/mathematics/interquartile-range
Involvement [in research]	An active partnership between stakeholders with researchers that influences and shapes research.	https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/briefing-notes-for-researchers-public-involvement-in-nhs-health-and-social-care-research/27371
Logic model	A logic model is a graphic depiction (road map) that presents the shared relationships among the resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact for your intervention.	https://www.cdc.gov/evaluation/logicmodels/index.htm

Term	Definition	Reference
Mechanism of action [in relation to implementation strategies]	The processes or events through which an implementation strategy operates to affect desired implementation outcomes.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29868544/
Median	The middle value of a set of numbers with half of the values less than the median and half the values greater than the median.	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK470533/
Model	A deliberate simplification of a phenomenon or a specific aspect of a phenomenon.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25895742/
Modification [in relation to the evidence-based intervention and/or implementation strategies]	Any changes made to interventions, whether deliberately and proactively (adaptation), or in reaction to unanticipated challenges that arise in a given session or context. Related to but distinct from adaptation .	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31171014/
Named [in relation to implementation strategies]	The naming or labelling of implementation strategies.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24289295/
Net Monetary Benefit	A summary statistic that represents the value of an intervention in monetary terms when a willingness to pay threshold for a unit of benefit (for example a measure of health outcome or Quality-Adjusted Life Year (QALY) is known.	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/net-monetary-benefit/
Opportunity cost	The opportunity cost of an intervention is what is foregone as a consequence of adopting a new intervention.	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/opportunity-cost/
Partially applied [in relation to theory, model, and framework application]	Not applied in its entirety, either at a domain or construct level.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35155336/
Patient outcomes	Satisfaction, function and symptomatology.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20957426/
Perspective	The point of view adopted when deciding which types of costs and health benefits are to be included in an economic evaluation. Typical viewpoints are those of the patient, hospital/clinic, healthcare system or society.	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/perspective/
Pragmatic quality [in relation to quantitative outcome instruments]	Instruments that are practical (i.e., not burdensome, brief, reliable, valid and sensitive to change).	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36318228/
Programme theory [in relation to economic evaluation]	An account (often diagrammatic) of the intervention's components together with a narrative about the structures, behaviours, processes and contextual features that will be needed to achieve the aims and actions of the intervention.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25616279/
Proximal outcome	The product of the implementation strategy that is realised because of its specific mechanism of action, the most immediate, observable outcome in the causal pathway.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29868544/
Psychometric properties [in relation to quantitative outcome instruments]	Refers to the validity and reliability of a measurement tool. Also see reliability and validity .	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/psychometric-properties/

Term	Definition	Reference
Quality [in relation to healthcare]	Safe, effective, patient-centered, timely, efficient and equitable.	https://www.ahrq.gov/talkingquality/measures/six-domains.html
Range	The difference between the lowest and highest values.	https://www.mathsisfun.com/definitions/range-statistics-.html
Reliability	The quality of measurement in terms of consistency and/or repeatability. There are many different types of reliability e.g., test-retest reliability, inter-rater reliability. Related to but distinct from validity .	https://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/reliable.php
Sensitivity analysis	Used to illustrate and assess the level of confidence that may be associated with the conclusion of an economic evaluation.	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/sensitivity-analysis/
Service outcomes	Efficiency, safety, effectiveness, equity, patient-centeredness and timeliness.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20957426/
Specified/operationalised [in relation to implementation strategies]	The description of implementation strategies that ensures that implementation strategies are discussed at a common level of granularity, are rateable across multiple dimensions, and are readily comparable.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24289295/
Steering/advisory group	Groups that help to develop, support, advise and monitor the project. The group often includes people who use services, carers, researchers and other health and social care professionals, who can provide relevant advice.	https://www.nihr.ac.uk/glossary/
The action Target [in relation to implementation strategies]	Target(s) according to conceptual models of implementation and unit of analysis for measuring implementation outcomes.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24289295/
Temporality [in relation to implementation strategies]	When the implementation strategy is used.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24289295/
Theory	A set of analytical principles or statements designed to structure our observation, understanding and explanation of the world.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25895742/
Theory of change	A comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context. It is focused in particular on mapping out what a program or change initiative does (its activities or interventions) and how these lead to desired goals being achieved.	https://www.theoryofchange.org/what-is-theory-of-change/
Time horizon	The time horizon used for an economic evaluation is the duration over which health outcomes and costs are calculated.	https://yhec.co.uk/glossary/time-horizon/
Unintended consequences	Outcomes that are not planned or intended at the time of an intervention/as a result of an intervention. They can be positive or negative.	https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19773653/
Validity	The quality of measurement in terms of whether a measure truly captures what it claims to capture (related to but distinct from reliability). There are many different types of validity, e.g., content validity, construct validity. Related to but distinct from reliability .	https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16872117

ImpResPAC development team

Louise Hull, PhD

Senior Research Fellow
Centre for Implementation Science,
King's College London, UK

Chloe Sweetnam, MSc

Accounts Supervisor
Petauri Kinect,
New York, US

Rachel Davis, PhD

Research Scientist
Evidera, Inc PPD, part of Thermofisher
Scientific, UK

Zarnie Khadjesari, PhD

Associate Professor in Health Sciences
School of Health Sciences,
University of East Anglia

Lucy Goulding, PhD

Senior Evaluation and Insights Manager
UCLPartners, UK

Andy Healey, PhD

Senior Health Economist
Centre for Implementation Science,
King's College London, UK

Ioannis Bakolis, PhD

Professor of Public Mental Health and Statistics
Centre For Implementation Science,
King's College London, UK

Annette Boaz PhD

Professor of Health and Social Care
Policy Institute,
King's College London, UK

Nick Sevdalis, PhD

Academic Director
Centre for Behavioural and Implementation
Science Interventions,
Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine,
National University of Singapore

Acknowledgements

Funding acknowledgements

This project was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration South London (NIHR ARC South London) at King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and King's Improvement Science; a specialist team of improvement scientists and researchers based at King's College London. King's Improvement Science is funded by King's Health Partners (Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, King's College London, and South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust) and the Guy's and St Thomas' Foundation. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Thank you

We would like to thank the ImpResPAC Expert Advisory Panel for their time and generosity in sharing their extensive experience and expertise. Their feedback has been invaluable in refining the content of ImpResPAC.

Contact us

For more information on ImpResPAC, please contact Dr Louise Hull

Email: louise.hull@kcl.ac.uk