

## Data supplement

## Appendix DS1

## Vote counting of the identified influences on implementation

Implementation influence	Identified in <i>n</i> papers (%)
1. Staff skills to deliver the intervention	9 (82)
2. Applicability of the intervention (to service users)	8 (73)
3. Match with staff values, attitudes – does it clash with preferred treatment approach and culture of the team, staff preference?	8 (73)
4. Staff knowledge to deliver the intervention	7 (64)
5. Time constraints	7 (64)
6. Ongoing support and supervision	5 (45)
7. Outcome expectancy (efficacy) – do staff think the intervention will work? Etc	5 (45)
8. Cost–benefit of intervention (financial)	5 (45)
9. Cost–benefit (efficacy, risk etc) – perception of advantage, risks, regret for doing or not doing the intervention	5 (45)
10. Match with the organisational culture – does it link with values, attitudes of the organisation, is it supported etc	4 (36)
11. Match with current practice – is the intervention breaking routines and habits? Are there contradictory practices or guidelines.	4 (36)
Conflict with usual routines and roles	
12. Lack of resources	4 (36)
13. Flexibility/modifiability – can the intervention be adapted to fit the local context and situation	4 (36)
14. Guideline/intervention availability including availability of a manual or guide	3 (27)
15. Confidence in the intervention – lack of confidence in the developer, approach, evidence based, credibility of the intervention and source.	3 (27)
16. Lack of reimbursement or incentives to do the intervention	3 (27)
17. Complexity of the intervention – is the intervention simple or complex	3 (27)
18. Reversibility and trialability – are the changes permanent or can they be trialled	3 (27)
19. Service-user involvement including in the design of the intervention	2 (18)
20. Outcome expectancy (observability) – time needed before the results become apparent, are the results observable	2 (18)
21. Role match – does the intervention challenge the social roles and professional identity of staff	2 (18)
22. Intervention is too rigid, cook book and biased	2 (18)
23. The intervention challenges staff autonomy	2 (18)
24. Quality of design of the intervention	2 (18)
25. Degree to which the action done by the team, organisation or individual is disruptive or radical	2 (18)
26. Stressful nature of the intervention	2 (18)
27. Time needed to keep up to date with the intervention	1 (9)
28. Is the source of the intervention internal or external to the organisation	1 (9)
29. Forgetting the intervention (content) – forgetting the content of the intervention	1 (9)
30. Forgetting the intervention (action) – forgetting to do the intervention	1 (9)
31. Divisibility – being able to separate out components of the intervention to implement at different times	1 (9)
32. Centrality – does the intervention effect a central or peripheral activity	1 (9)
33. Duration of change and how long will it take	1 (9)
34. How much attention does the intervention require	1 (9)
35. Will staff observe others doing the intervention	1 (9)
36. Lack of trained supervisors	1 (9)
37. Lack of opportunities for co-working	1 (9)
38. Adaption of the intervention for sensory impaired groups	1 (9)
39. Does the intervention allow for patient preference	1 (9)