

Using the Consolidated Framework of Implementation Research and Implementation outcomes to develop interview scripts: methodological insights from the Mental Health in Primary Health Care project (SMAPS) Implementation assessment research



Authors: Ilana Eshriqui, Luciana Cordeiro, Ana Alice Freire de Sousa, Daiana Bonfim, Letícia Yamawaka de Almeida

BACKGROUND

The SMAPS is developed in three Brazilian states aiming to support mental health care in Primary Health Care (PHC), using the Health Care Planning method (HCP) and MI-mhGAP training as central implementation strategies.

Aim: To present the process to prepare qualitative data collection scripts used to interview multiple levels of SMAPS stakeholders in an implementation assessment research.

METHODS

Scripts to different levels of stakeholders were constructed through a collaboration between researchers and SMAPS proponents, considering the potential of each question to inform:

- Implementation outcomes
- Implementation determinants according to
- Consolidated Framework of Implementation Research (CFIR).

RESULTS

- Scripts were constructed considering four levels of SMAPS stakeholders, who perform different roles in state and municipality government levels (Figure 1).
- When asked to different stakeholder levels, the same question shows potential to inform different implementation outcomes.
- Questions for Innovation delivers and receivers show potential to capture more implementation outcomes than for high and mid-leaders' levels.
- All questions show potential to inform the same CFIR determinants independently of stakeholder level.

QUESTIONS	IMPLEMENTATION OUTCOMES							DETERMINANTS (CFIR)				
	ACCEPTABILITY	ADOPTION	APPROPRIATENESS	FEASIBILITY	FIDELITY	PENETRATION	SUSTAINABILITY	INTERVENTION	INNER SETTING	OUTER SETTING	INDIVIDUALS	PROCESS
Tell me about your experience with the Health Care Planning Method	●●●●	●●●●	●●●●	●●●●	●●●●	●●			●		●	●
How did the arrangements to develop the SMAPS here?	●		●						●			
What is health managers' role at SMAPS?		●			●	●			●			●
Was there any change in mental health care since the beginning of SMAPS? If so, do you believe changes will be permanent?		●	●●●●	●●	●●●●	●●●●	●●	●	●			●
Would you say that the SMAPS addresses mental health needs? How far?	●	●	●●●●	●●		●		●	●			
How do you believe it will be the mental health care in PHC after the end of this SMAPS's phase ?							●●●●	●	●	●	●	●
How did you take your role on SMAPS?	●●	●●							●			●
What are your roles on SMAPS?	●	●			●●				●		●	●
How were chosen people who assume stakeholder roles on SMAPS?	●	●			●		●		●		●	●
What were challenges of SMAPS management and implementation?				●●●●			●	●	●		●	●
What factors contribute or could contribute to the SMAPS implementation?				●●	●●			●	●	●	●	●
What do you think of resources and activities offered by SMAPS?	●●	●●	●●	●●	●●	●		●				●
How was the engagement of local management and health services in SMAPS?	●●●●	●●●●		●●●●		●●●●			●		●	●
Did you do the mi-MhGap training? What is your opinion about this tool? Were your expectations met?			●●	●●		●●		●	●		●	
Have you been following the planning and the actions that were implemented? Comment.		●●	●	●●	●●	●●		●	●			●
How is your relationship with the other SMAPS stakeholders in state and municipality levels?				●	●	●			●		●	●
How was the engagement of professionals from this health service in SMAPS?	●	●		●	●	●	●		●		●	●
How is the planning and implementation of actions in this health service going?	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●		●	●

Figure 1. Examples of scripts' questions and their relation with CFIR determinants and implementation outcomes of interest.

CONCLUSION

Beyond being useful to guide research analysis, implementation outcomes and CFIR are useful to construct implementation research scripts and to train the interviewers.