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ABSTRACT

Objectives:
The NHS has been moving towards integrated care for the best part of two decades to address the growing financial and service pressures created by an ageing population. Integrated healthcare systems (IHSs), which join up health and social care services, have been established to manage the care of individuals with complex chronic conditions but with varied success. It is therefore imperative to conduct a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) to identify and understand the factors that influence their successful functioning, and ascertain the factor with the greatest influence, in order to ensure positive outcomes when establishing future IHSs.

Methods:
Articles were analysed from the following six databases: Healthcare Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Nuffield Trust, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), PubMed, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Evidence and Health Systems Evidence (HSE). Those deemed relevant after title and abstract screening were procured for subsequent review of the full-text article.

Results:
Thirty-three finalised articles were analysed in this SLR to provide a comprehensive overview of the factors that influence the functioning of IHSs. Factors were stratified into six key categories: organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, leadership ability of staff, economic and political factors. Leadership was deemed to be the most influential factor due to its intrinsic and instrumental role in influencing the other key factors.

Conclusions:
The findings of this SLR may serve as a guide to developing tailor-made recommendations and policies that address the identified key factors and thereby improve the functioning of present and future IHSs. Furthermore, due to both its overarching influence and the inadequacy of literature in this field, there is a strong case for further research exploring leadership development specifically for IHSs.
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STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This is an in-depth systematic literature review uncovering important factors that can be applied when developing policies pertinent to the effective functioning of IHSs in the NHS.
- The selection of studies was based on a specific eligibility criteria, which ensured that the articles in this study were specific to the NHS and IHSs.
- The literature search was conducted across six electronic databases enabling good breadth for selection of papers.
INTRODUCTION

The ever-changing healthcare needs of the UK population present a constant challenge for the National Health Service (NHS). An ageing population has shifted the focus from preventing premature death due to acute illness to managing complex chronic conditions, which requires a coordinated and collaborative effort between families, carers and the health and social care systems.[1] The growing financial and service pressures facing the NHS cannot be tackled without transforming how health and social care are delivered.[2] Thus, old models of care, which have focussed primarily on providing episodic treatment for acute illness, must be replaced with new patient-centred models that integrate health and care services to meet the needs of today’s patient demographic.[1] Constant evaluation of these models is crucial to ensure the constituent organisations synergise together and fulfil the larger systemic goals of the NHS.

Integrated care has been a feature of NHS policy for the best part of two decades. The term was first described in ‘The New NHS’ in 1997, and several integrated healthcare systems (IHSs) have since been introduced to join up health and social care services, such as Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) in 2017 and the current form of Integrated Care Systems (ICSs), which were introduced in the NHS Long Term Plan in 2019. However, despite two decades of initiatives by successive governments, system-wide integration has not yet been achieved. Progress to date has been slow and has not delivered all of the expected benefits for patients, the NHS or local authorities.[3]

A number of factors can act as facilitators and barriers to the successful functioning of IHSs.[1] As the NHS advances further towards integrated care, it is necessary to identify and study these factors to harness the facilitators and address the barriers. A comprehensive understanding of these factors, in particular the factor with the most influence, will enable their optimisation, thereby ensuring positive outcomes when establishing future IHSs.

BACKGROUND TO THEORY:

What is Integration and Integrated Care?

Over 175 competing definitions for ‘integration’ and ‘integrated care’ exist within literature,[4] reflecting what Kodner describes as ‘an imprecise hodgepodge’.[5] Nonetheless, one of the earliest and most robust definitions from a review by Kodner and Spreeuwenberg states that:

‘Integration is a coherent set of methods and models on the funding, administrative, organisational, service delivery and clinical levels designed to create connectivity, alignment and collaboration within and between the cure and care sectors. The goal of these methods and
models is to enhance quality of care and quality of life, consumer satisfaction and system efficiency for patients with complex, long term problems cutting across multiple services, providers and settings. The result of such multi-pronged efforts to promote integration for the benefit of these special patient groups is called ‘integrated care’. [6]

In essence, ‘integration’ involves bringing organisations together with the ultimate aim of improving outcomes and service experience for patients who require access to multiple health and care services through the practice of ‘integrated care’ at various levels. Parallels can be drawn between healthcare integration and the merger of corporate entities who seek to achieve a competitive advantage by synergising - that is, creating a whole that is more effective than the sum of its parts. Integrated care can provide higher quality care by minimising the fragmentation caused by these entities operating independently of each other. Reducing systemic duplications, inefficiencies and non-value steps in the patient journey allows for improved outcomes at a lower cost.[1, 7]

What are Integrated healthcare systems (IHSs)?

The term IHS has been used to denote the working together of different healthcare organisations as a single cohesive body with the aim of addressing population health needs. This is not to be confused with Integrated Care Systems (ICSs), which are the latest among initiatives to integrate care in the NHS. By this definition, an ICS is an integrated healthcare system; however, integrated healthcare systems aren’t limited exclusively to ICSs and can refer to any integrated body tasked with delivering integrated care such as STPs.

METHODOLOGY

Protocol:
The structure for this systematic literature review (SLR) was based on the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis) framework, which was developed according to published guidance by the EQUATOR (Enhancing the Quality and Transparency Of health Research) Network.[8]

Eligibility criteria:
To be included in the SLR, articles needed to address factors that influence the functioning of IHSs relevant to the NHS. For this reason, articles were excluded that pertain to the private healthcare sector, the business sector and international IHSs. Articles were limited to the English language to be legible by the authors.

This review considered literature published in the years 1997-2020, as ‘The New NHS’, published on the 8th December 1997, represents one of the earliest examples of literature calling to ‘replace the internal market with integrated care’, thereby serving as the starting point for research activity on the topic of integration in the NHS.[9]
| INCLUSION                                                                 | EXCLUSION                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Articles relevant to the healthcare sector                               | Articles relevant to other sectors such as the business sector             |
| Articles in the context of IHSs                                          | Articles that did not address IHSs within the healthcare sector             |
| Articles relevant to IHSs within the UK                                  | Articles that pertain to International IHSs                                |
| Articles published after 1997                                            | Articles published prior to 1997                                          |
| Articles with a full text accessible for thorough analysis               | Articles that only had an accessible abstract, not allowing for thorough analysis |
| Articles relevant to the NHS                                             | Articles relevant to the private healthcare sector                        |
| Articles written in the English language                                 | Articles not written in the English language                              |

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for articles selected in this study

Information sources:
The search was implemented on 08/04/2020 across six electronic databases: Healthcare Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Nuffield Trust, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), PubMed, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Evidence, and Health Systems Evidence (HSE).

To supplement the comprehensive literature search, a ‘snowball’ technique was adopted, whereby the reference list for all relevant articles was scanned to identify further relevant articles.

Search:
The search strategy was developed through consensus-based discussion and agreement between all authors. The final search string was as follows:

("Integrated Health" OR "Integrating Health" OR "Integrated Care") AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)
The search query was tailored to the specific requirements of each database. The adapted electronic search strings for each database can be found in Appendix A.

Selection of sources of evidence:
Initially, all authors independently screened only the title and abstract (or background in white papers) of each article to preclude the waste of time and energy from reviewing full-text articles that fail to meet the eligibility criteria. To ensure consistency among all authors, a pilot screening was initially completed in which each author screened the same 200 articles independently. From this, all reviewers independently agreed on all but 4 articles; however this was resolved upon discussion to clarify the eligibility criteria, which was then amended to increase specificity and clarity. Consequently, the pilot ended in comprehensive agreement on the eligibility criteria and resulted in the reviewers having the same view on which papers should be accepted or rejected.

All articles deemed relevant after title and abstract screening were procured for subsequent review of the full-text article. The full-text articles were then assessed for eligibility and a proportion were excluded, resulting in a final selection of studies to be included in the SLR.
The overall search resulted in 33 finalised articles to be included in the SLR. The flow of records in the search process is conveyed in Figure 1:

Figure 1: Process of identifying search results, screening, assessing for eligibility and inclusion.

Data extraction chart:
The following key identifiable information was extracted from each article: the author(s), year of publication, title, database the article was retrieved from, journal, study type, DOI or URL. The articles were also stratified under the following headings: needs identified, barriers identified,
facilitators identified and recommendations. The findings were reported in a ‘Data Extraction Chart’ table format (see Appendix B).

All authors jointly extracted the data from each article using ‘Google Sheets’, discussed the results and continuously iterated the data extraction chart. The main revision to the headings included the addition of ‘Recommendations’ as articles often framed influential factors in the form of recommended actions to improve IHSs.

Characteristics of sources of evidence:
Table 2 describes the categories into which the data from each article was inserted, accompanied by the year of publication, database and study type.

| Characteristic                        | Number (n = 33) | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| **Publication year**                  |                 |                |
| 1997-2004                             | 0               | 0.0            |
| 2005-2009                             | 2               | 6.1            |
| 2010-2014                             | 11              | 33.3           |
| 2014-2019                             | 17              | 51.5           |
| >2020                                 | 3               | 9.1            |
| **Study Type**                        |                 |                |
| Qualitative Study                     | 9               | 27.3           |
| Report                                | 15              | 45.5           |
| Scoping Narrative Literature Review   | 1               | 3.0            |
| Systematic Literature Review          | 5               | 15.2           |
| Case Study                            | 3               | 9.1            |
| **Database**                          |                 |                |
| EMCARE                                | 3               | 9.1            |
| HMIC                                  | 7               | 21.2           |
| BNI                                   | 1               | 3.0            |
| HSE                                   | 2               | 6.1            |
| EMBASE                                | 1               | 3.0            |
| CINAHL                                | 3               | 9.1            |
| Nuffield Trust                        | 6               | 18.2           |
| PubMed                                | 5               | 15.2           |
RESULTS:

Barriers and facilitators were each discussed by over 60% of papers, while recommendations addressing key factors to improve IHSs were put forward by 48.5%. Of the papers selected, only 6.1% were published prior to 2010 with 93.9% published following this date, coinciding with the shift of strategy regarding integrated care by the UK government outlined in ‘The NHS Long Term Plan’. [10]

In each article, the identified factors that influence the functioning of healthcare systems were categorised into the following: 1) Organisational Culture, 2) Workforce Management, 3) Inter-organisational collaboration, 4) Leadership Ability of Staff, 5) Economic, and 6) Political factors. The factors were identified within each article as either needs, barriers, facilitators or recommendations and are labelled in the table accordingly.

See Appendix B to view the ‘Data Extraction Chart’ displaying all relevant outcomes data for each article in a table format.

See Appendix C to view the ‘Synthesis of Results’ displaying all findings from each article stratified by the identified categories of factors that influence the functioning of IHSs in the NHS.

Summary of evidence:

The factors identified from this SLR of 33 articles broadly fell within the following categories: organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, leadership ability of staff, economic factors and political factors.

Organisational Culture

82% of articles cited issues relating to organisational culture, including the need for leaders to communicate a shared vision to achieve integration.[11-16] which demands a mutual understanding of and commitment to the vision across the organisations involved.[17] Differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, status inequalities, professional cultures, working practices and priorities can lead to divides between staff from
different organisations, creating conflict and a ‘blame culture’ that stifles integrated working.[18-22] Fostering an ethos of learning and self-reflection was also shown to yield positive outcomes.[19, 21, 23]

**Workforce Management**
Factors relating to workforce management were expressed in 76% of articles, such as the need to provide staff with adequate incentives to ‘buy into’ the integration process.[24, 25] Staff need to be trained for the new roles of work they may need for integrated work,[26] and leaders must encourage staff to take ‘ownership’ of new service models by involving them in decision making.[18, 27] Meanwhile, overworking staff to meet increased workloads can reduce motivation to collaborate with other sectors to provide services and can yield high staff turnover and, consequently, poorer outcomes.[18, 20]

**Inter-organisational Collaboration**
70% of articles demonstrated the necessity of elements relating to inter-organisational collaboration. These included: inter-professional teamwork involving both top down and bottom up communication,[17, 18, 28] the formation of good working relationships built on trust,[19, 28, 29] and the presence of shared information technology (IT) platforms between organisations that enable easy data sharing and communication between them.[13, 14, 17-19, 24, 30, 31] The lack of ongoing planned communication between members of partnering organisations due to contact often being limited to forms and emails with minimal face-to-face contact was often cited as a barrier to collaboration.[20]

**Leadership Ability of Staff**
82% of articles addressed leadership ability of staff, outlining that successful integration requires a combination of clear leadership and governance from senior managers at the macro level with strong involvement of frontline staff as clinical leaders at the micro level.[14, 28, 31-34] together with local authority figures acting as local leaders.[12, 16, 24, 26] Integrated care succeeds when leaders set clear, ambitious and measurable goals,[30] identify and scale innovation from pilot programmes and establish governance structures that drive faster change.[21] Leaders also need to commit to implementing change,[12, 19] and act as role models by using their emotional intelligence to build high quality relationships with team members and allegiances with other leaders.[21, 27, 35] In addition, challenges such as the pressure and stress faced in leadership roles, high turnover and lack of stability among the leadership workforce,[21] emphasised the need to support leaders - an essential component to successfully implementing integrated care.[13] Furthermore, integrated care relies on ‘systems leadership’, [11, 27, 36] as opposed to organisational leadership.[23, 37] Interestingly, leadership was discovered to play an instrumental role in shaping culture, managing the workforce and fostering inter-organisational collaboration, indicating its significant capacity in influencing the functioning of IHSs.
**Economic Factors**

Economic factors, such as low levels of funding and staff, often with inadequate training, were cited as factors in 61% of articles,[26] and the need to devise long-term plans with an appropriate level of funding was expressed.[11, 20] Providing a manageable caseload without overstretching human resources is also a crucial success factor,[26] as it was in the case of Coastal Locality in Torbay and South.[28] Barriers created by payment methods such as Payment by Results (PbR) that incentivise activity in hospitals over other providers and the reluctance of commissioning organisations to pool budgets were also identified.[18, 23, 25]

**Political Factors**

Political influences were expressed in 52% of articles, examples of which include the fragmented strategic direction from national government with conflicting leadership approaches by different government entities,[25, 17, 18, 26] together with difficulties in agreeing budgets and uncertainty regarding the level of integration that is desired.[38] Furthermore, failures of policy makers to evaluate and learn from the pitfalls of existing policies and translate published evidence into political action proved limiting.[38] The need for policy makers to evaluate existing policies and tailor them to the particular healthcare context served were cited as key to achieving successful integration.[38]

**DISCUSSION**

After synthesising the results, the categories of factors identified were ascertained to be under the responsibility of either leaders within IHSs (organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, leadership ability of staff) or policymakers above (economic and Political factors).

These categories of factors were also found to overlap with the congruence model (outlined in Figure 2), used by managers to evaluate organisational alignment and identify barriers and facilitators to fulfilling the organisation’s defined goals.[39] Issues pertaining to culture, inter-organisational collaboration and leadership ability of staff correspond with the ‘environment’ and ‘informal organisation’ components of the model, workforce management issues with ‘individual’, ‘task’ and ‘formal organisation arrangements’, and economic and political factors with ‘resources’ and ‘history’. Ultimately, as is the case with IHSs, the model highlights how each of these distinct components are both fundamental to the successful functioning of an organisation in their own right, yet are highly interdependent with one another.
An interpretivist approach was employed to draw meaning from the overview of factors presented in the SLR and wider literature. Leadership was interpreted to be the most influential factor due to its intrinsic and instrumental role in influencing other key factors, namely organisational culture, workforce management and inter-organisational collaboration, as depicted in Figure 3 below.
Both Charles et al. and Tweed et al. argued the need for ‘systems leadership’ over ‘organisational leadership’ to create the system-wide change required for integrated care.[11, 27] Charles et al. describes that systems leadership requires leaders to create a positive organisational culture by ‘communicat(ing) a shared vision and purpose’; they need to manage their workforce through ‘frequent personal contact with others and resolv(ing) conflicts’, and they need to facilitate organisational collaboration by ‘build(ing) trust and rapport with partner organisations to move away from competition and towards forming long-term collaborative relationships’. [11]

Tweed et al. developed on this further by introducing a model of ‘connecting’ (Figure 4) to create an allegiance based upon qualitative research involving the active participation of leaders achieving transformational change. The responsibilities of leaders are included in this model: leading with ‘purpose’ and ‘vision’, shaping organisational culture, and managing the workforce in a ‘relational’ manner ‘through practice’ by collaborating between organisations. [27]

![Diagram](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

Figure 4: Visual representation of the ‘Connecting’ model [27]

Corporate examples can further contextualise the role of leadership in bringing together organisations, facilitating positive culture, and inspiring the workforce. Indeed, Reinhoudt, describes the failure of corporate mergers as being mostly the result of misaligned leadership. [40] Leaders are critical in facilitating post-merger integration by promoting organisational and cultural alignment.[41] and they can also encourage employees to accept and embrace structural changes.[42]
The SLR also identified economic and political factors to be crucial in the function of IHSs. These were interpreted to be largely in the hands of governments and policy makers who determine the strategic direction of integration, resource availability and payment mechanisms. It was further interpreted that the capacity to amend these factors is relatively inflexible, while leadership and its overarching factors can be optimised despite any systemic economic and political constraints. Thus, leadership is not only the most influential factor, but also the factor with the greatest capacity to be influenced.

Furthermore, a gap lies in this field of literature. Evans et al. noted that, while ‘Leadership Approach’ and ‘Clinician Engagement and Leadership’ are among the most important capabilities shaping the capacity of organisations to implement integrated care, they have not been consistently studied.[32] As such, there is much value to be gained by undertaking further research to explore deeper the role leadership plays in influencing its attributed factors.

LIMITATIONS
When analysing the selected full-text articles, the authors found issues discussed in literature to be multi-faceted, leading to overlap between the factors identified when synthesising the results. Interpretation and categorisation of these factors may have been subject to individual bias.

17 articles were excluded from this study due to the full texts being unobtainable. These were excluded after title and abstract screening, resulting in a proportion of papers and their contribution on factors influencing IHSs being forgone and thus limiting the extent of the SLR. Therefore, it is recommended that future researchers invest in payments to journals to be given access to the full scope of articles.

In addition, the inclusion of grey literature in the search uncovered challenges such as the lack of extensive search tools for these papers which resulted in web searching - a method that is not as thorough as the use of databases.

7 of the search terms may have differed results as they were new concepts and can be referred to by multiple names.

CONCLUSION
This SLR presented an overview of a multitude of key factors that influence the functioning of IHSs in the NHS relating to organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, the leadership ability of staff, economic and political factors. Within ICSs in the NHS, ‘system leadership’ was found to be vital to achieve the transformational change required to integrate care and meet the ideals of The NHS Long Term Plan.[10]

The findings of this SLR may help to lay the bedrock upon which tailor-made recommendations can be developed in practice and policy to address and optimise these factors within present and future IHSs in the NHS. In addition, there is a strong case for further research exploring leadership development, due to its overarching influence on the other categories of factors and the identified gap within the literature that pertains to this field.
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Figure 1: Process of identifying search results, screening, assessing for eligibility and inclusion.

165x176mm (72 x 72 DPI)
Figure 2 - Congruence Model [39]
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Figure 3: The instrumental role of leadership in influencing other key factors in integrated care

Organizational Culture

Collaboration Between Organisations

Workforce Management
Figure 4: Visual representation of the ‘Connecting’ model [27]
Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC.

92x87mm (72 x 72 DPI)
Appendix A: Search Strings

HMIC:

(“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 2000 - Current

Nuffield Trust:

(“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits:

Years: 1997-2020

Content Type: Report, Journal Article

CINAHL:

NHS AND (“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: December 1997 - April 2020, English Language

PubMed:

NHS AND (“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 08/12/1997-08/04/2020, English Language

NICE Evidence:

NHS AND (“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 2000-2020
HSE:

(“Integrated Health” OR “Integrating Health” OR “Integrated Care”) AND (Factor OR Perform OR Success OR Fail)

Limits: 2000-2020
### Appendix B: Data Extraction Chart

| Author | Year of Publication | Title | Database | Journal | Study Type | DOI/URL | Needs Identified | Barriers Identified | Facilitators Identified | Recommendations |
|--------|---------------------|-------|----------|---------|------------|---------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Alison Tweed, Andrew Singfield, Julia RA Taulor, Lucy Gilbert, Paul Mount | 2018 | Creating Allegiance: Leading transformatonal change within the NHS | EMCA RE | BMJ Leader | Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.1136/leader-2018-000088 | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders should be non-partisan integrators rather than assign themselves to an organisation - have an allegiance to the system. | 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders should build high quality relationships involving emotional intelligence and positive role modelling. | 3) Organisational Culture - Shared visions (espoused theories) need to be outlined and translated into everyday practice and visions of previous leaders or schemes must be erased. | 4) Workforce Management - Connecting through practice: involving frontline staff and all stakeholders in decisions and key pieces of the transformation to integrated care. |
| Anna Charles, Lillie Wenzel, Matthew Kershaw, Chris Ham, Nicola Walsh | 2018 | A Year of Integrated Care Systems: Reviewing the journey so far | N/A - Snowball | The King’s Fund | Report | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/2018-09/Yea-r-of-integrat-ed-care-systems.pdf | 1) Political - The legislative context does not support system working. | 2) Political - Regulation and oversight is not aligned. | 3) Organisational Culture - A legacy of competitive behaviours. | 4) Organisational Culture - A meaningful local identity. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Collaborative relationships. | 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Partnerships with local authorities. | 3) Workforce Management - Integrate at different levels of the system. |
4) Organisational Culture - Frequently changing language and the lack of a clear narrative.
5) Economic - Leaders face competing demands.
6) Economic - Funding pressures.
7) Workforce Management - Established models of integrated working.
8) Economic - Stability of local finances and performance.
9) Economic - Funding to support transformation.
10) Political - A permissive and supportive national programme.

1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inadequate collaboration continues to result in poor quality, efficiency and effectiveness of care.
2) Organisational Culture - Culture of impatience and cynicism.
3) Workforce Management - Inadequate workforce planning.
4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved.

1) To further research specific policy analysis domains, i.e. investigate policy formation, policy implementation or service delivery outcomes in integrated or co-ordinated health and social care services.
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5) Political - Complex governance arrangements. | 6) Economic - Difficulties in agreeing budgets. | 7) Political - Lack of understanding of what the drivers and essential requirements are for successful integration between health and social care and how to use policy to steer care organisations through this change. |   |   |   |   |
1) Political - Pressure by national and local policymakers to demonstrate the success of new integration initiatives at a stage too early in the programme's implementation.

2) Economic - Acute/community trusts or social services departments suffered from significant financial deficit and were subject to 'special measures', which diverted senior management attention away from Pioneer activity.

3) Economic - The growing demand for costly A&E services by patients at a time when integration seeks to reduce usage – diverts resources and slows the pace of transformation.

4) Political - Strategic direction from the national government is fragmented. Differences in approach: DCLG reportedly favouring more locally devolved responsibility, while DH/NHSE adopt a more 'command and control' approach.

5) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Health care and social care have different regulatory frameworks and the regulator does not examine systems such as integrated services, instead only

6) Workforce Management - Experienced staff.

7) Economic - Uncommitted funding.

8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Good leadership and vision was also identified as critical at all levels from local authority councillors through to senior managers, supported by appropriate governance structures.

9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated information system between organisations to enable sharing of patient/service user records or having suitable facilities for cross-agency and/or multi-disciplinary teams.

10) Organisational Culture - Trust and shared values that are largely developed locally.

11) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Being part of a national Pioneer programme, which provided an impetus for local professionals to work together to improve care locally.
looking at individual organisations.

6) Workforce Management - Integration was less of a priority where stakeholders had urgent competing demands (e.g. meeting 4-hour waiting time A&E targets).

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Some Pioneers were very complex with a large number of stakeholders and/or a large geographic footprint, which made partnership working more complex in terms of size, communication, governance, etc.

8) Collaboration between Organisation - Inadequate local engagement/'buy-in' of the independent, community and voluntary sectors, in part, because they were often required to compete against each other for contracts, making working together particularly challenging.

9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inadequate local engagement/'buy-in' of the mental health sector, due in part to the legacy of underfunding and 'Cinderella' status of the sector.

10) Inter-organisational Collaboration - In some Pioneers with multiple partners, a sense that...
transformation could happen only at the pace of the ‘slowest’, most conservative or risk averse stakeholder.

11) Economic - PbR incentives for acute providers to increase activity against providing more care outside hospital.

12) Economic - Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a larger one.

13) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Information sharing was seen as critical, but the level of integration of information and intelligence needed was technically difficult to achieve across multiple IT platforms and with obstructive information governance regulations.

14) Organisational Culture - Differences between the health and social care sectors in terms of language and conceptions of health and wellbeing, professional cultures and working practices.

15) Organisational Culture - Different priorities between professions: e.g. the people of most concern to social workers were not
necessarily the same as those of most concern to GPs.

16) Organisational Culture - ‘Blame culture’ within and across local health and social care sectors located responsibility for failures in integration elsewhere in the system.

17) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of agreement on priorities among local system leaders.

18) Workforce Management - Multiple challenges of engaging frontline staff

19) Organisational Culture - Scepticism about NHS initiatives that had previously been seen to ‘come and go’.

20) Organisational Culture - Previous initiatives did not live up to expectations leading to demoralisation.

21) Workforce Management - Difficulties recruiting staff particularly in certain areas of the country.

22) Workforce Management - High staff turnover (especially following health care reforms) negatively affected longer-term strategic planning and
service provision aiming for integration.

23) Organisational Culture - Promoting a 'play-it-safe' work culture can be detrimental to 'barrier busting'.

24) Existing approaches to training professionals do not produce trainees equipped for integrated working, and not enough trainees to meet demand.
| Carolyn Wilkins | 2020 | An Allied Approach to Success in Oldham | HMIC Municipal Journal Qualitative Study | URL: https://www.themj.co.uk/an-allied-approach-to-success-in-oldham/216693# |
|-----------------|------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Chris Ham, Judith Smith and Elizabeth Eastmure | 2011 | Commissioning integrated care in a liberated NHS | Nuffield Trust Report | URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/commissioning-integrated-care-in-a-liberated-nhs |

1) **Political - Co-operative council** with an understanding of communities which helps to target resources and further develop interventions.

2) **Organisational Culture - Positive and trusting relationships.**

3) **Organisational Culture - A culture of innovation, creativity and empowerment and not micro-management based on old fashioned contractual approaches.**

4) **Intrinsic value of leadership - System leaders who work together to support frontline practitioners to overcome bureaucratic barriers.**

1) **Economic - Needs assessment and service specification is time, effort and resource consuming.**

2) **Economic - Using PMS and APMS contracts to facilitate payments.**

2) **Intrinsic value of leadership - Managerial leadership in combination with clinician leadership.**
1) Workforce Management - Lack of awareness of roles and services: uncertainty about which roles are carried out by which social service provider and how best to contact these individuals.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Often numbers in practice diaries and on websites are out of date, so staff have to ask the patient directly what social care they receive and how to contact relevant departments, slowing down both communication and any attempts at collaborative working.

3) Workforce Management - Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Communication between primary care and social care is logistically challenging, as doctors are busy with patients during the day and social care staff are working in the community, making joint conversations about patients nearly impossible.
5) Organisational Culture - All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of regular contact: most GPs and PMs explained regular contact with social care teams is necessary for effective information transfer and a multidisciplinary approach to patient care. However, currently, contact is through forms and emails with minimal face-to-face contact, which professionals find inefficient and a barrier to continuity of care.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inefficient MDT meetings.

8) Economic - Low staffing levels.

9) Workforce Management - Inadequate training of staff.
|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10) Economic - Insufficient funding. |   |   |   |   |
| 11) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Interoperability between information systems: the lack of shared information systems. |   |   |   |   |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **DOH** 2008 | The Evidence Base for Integrated Care | **HMIC** | **DOH** | **Report** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| URL: | https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130124044156/http://www.dh.gov.uk/prod_consum_dh/groups/dh.digitalassets/@dhv/en/documents/digitalassets/dh_089371.pdf |   |   |   |

1) Workforce Management - The objectives of integration need to be made explicit.

2) Workforce Management - Begin integration at the frontline, which impacts directly on the patient experience; based on this, the most apt organisational supports for service provision might be identified.

3) Workforce Management - The right incentives: it is important that frontline staff recognise and buy into the integration process.

4) Organisational Culture - A culture of quality improvement.

5) Organisational Culture - A history of trust between partner organisations.

6) Organisational Culture - Personnel who are open to collaboration and innovation.

7) Organisational Culture - Awareness of local cultural differences: organisational cultures evolve separately over decades.
|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Local leaders who are supportive of integration. |
| 9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Effective and complementary communications and IT systems. |
| 10) Political - Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes. |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| 1) Organisational Culture - The need to develop a culture in which people are comfortable and competent in working across organisational boundaries to serve the needs of patients more effectively and strive continuously to improve the quality of care. |
| 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Staff working within integrated care must have (or develop) emotional intelligence and empathy in dealing with patients and users, be willing to work in teams with shared accountability, and be prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care. |
| 1) Economic - Financial incentives do not encourage collaboration. |
| 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Financial incentives do not encourage collaboration. |
| 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of shared data. |
| 4) Organisational Culture - Lack of shared accountability. |
1) Organisational Culture - At macro level there is a general lack of strategic vision towards integrated care from a systems perspective.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - At meso level, the historical fragmentation of organizations poses a strong challenge towards care coordination.

3) Intrinsic value of leadership - At the micro level, a lack of clinical leadership and buy-in hinders the needed multidisciplinary and collaborative work.

1) Workforce Management - Balance between: collective leadership and local autonomy; integrated commissioning and integrated provision; NHS leadership and local authority engagement; local variation and programme-wide consistency; investment in design and support for ongoing implementation and change.

2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Systems leadership. NHS leaders have relatively little training or experience in managing systems as opposed to organisations.

1) Organisational Culture - Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning.

2) Workforce Management - A clear, timetabled route map, together with roles of the programme management team and its resources were seen as valuable enablers.

1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Better Information Systems.

2) Organisational Culture - Strategic Alignment.

3) Workforce Management - Improving data collection, continuous monitoring and evaluation, feedback looping to professionals.

4) Workforce Management - Incentives and training healthcare professionals in communication and team-work skills.
1) Workforce Management - Governance by hierarchy (ownership) or a mode that is close to a hierarchy (through long-term contractual relationships).

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Full integration compared with arrangements of different autonomous insurers and providers reduces costs of information, negotiation, contracting, control, and adaptation and is hence more efficient.

3) Economic - Finance by capitation. Payment per member for coverage for all care provided by the IHCDS (typically in an annual contract with monthly payments), as the principal reimbursement method acts as a powerful pricing strategy that generates substantial savings.

4) Economic - Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives.

5) Workforce Management - Maintaining acute provider viability while reducing hospital admissions.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Balancing competition and collaboration.

Gwyn Bevan; Katharina Janus 2011

Why hasn't integrated health care developed widely in the United States and not at all in England?
| Hermina Harnagea, Yves Couturier, Richa Shrivastava, Felix Girard, Lise Lamothe, Christophe Pierre Bedos, Elham Emami | Barriers and facilitators in the integration of oral health into primary care: a scoping review | HMIC | BMJ Open | Scoping Review | DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016078 | 1) Political - Lack of political leadership and healthcare policies and a poor understanding of the population and low prioritisation on the political agenda as well the absence of appropriate policies at the macro level.  
2) Economic - The cost of integrated services, human resources issues (workload of personnel, staff turnover, time constraints and scarcity of various trained human resources such as care coordinators, public health workforce and allied professionals) and deficient administrative infrastructure (the absence of health records, cross- 
3) Workforce Management - Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management [including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)] and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference).  
4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Geographical  
5) Workforce Management - Good management and information systems. In a well-organized IHCDS, tight management controls its bureaucratic costs (which can otherwise result in hierarchy failure), sophisticated data management enables it to react quickly to developments in health care and markets, and standardisation in care management facilitates health care provision and thereby economises on transaction costs.  
6) Workforce Management - Durability and size. | 1) Economic - Supportive policies and resource allocation: financial support from governments, stakeholders and non-profit organisations at the macro level.  
2) Workforce Management - Interprofessional education.  
3) Workforce Management - Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management [including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)] and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference).  
4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Geographical |
| Jenna M. Evans, Agnes Grudniewicz, G. Ross Baker, Walter P. Wodchis | 2016 | Organization and Capabilities for Integrating Care: A Framework for Improvement | HSE | International Journal of Integrated Care | Systematic Literature Review | Systematic Literature Review | DOI: 10.5334/jic.2416 | 1) Workforce Management - Basic Structures and Design: Physical Structures, Human and Material Resources, Organizational Design, Governance, Accountability, and Information Technology. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leadership and Strategy: Leadership Approach, Clinician Engagement and Leadership, Strategic Focus on Improvement. 3) Workforce Management - Discipline-oriented education and lack of competencies. 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of continuity of care and services: unstructured mechanism for care coordination at the micro level and lack of practice guidelines and types of practice at the meso level. Discontinuity in the integrated care process associated with poor referral systems, deficient interface and poor connection between public health section, primary care and academic institutions. 5) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations. 6) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader in building teamwork and communities' capacities.
| John Deffenbaugh | 2018 | Becoming an integrated (accountable) care system | EMCA RE | British Journal of Health Care Management | Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.12968/bjhc.2018.4.4.175 | 1) Economic - An agreed allocation of resources and risk sharing system to achieve maximum results across the system. 2) Organisational Culture - Common priorities: move from what's in it for their organisation mindset to how they can help other organisations be successful. 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Overarching strategy. 4) Organisational Culture - Getting into the shoes of others. 5) Organisational Culture - Agreed objectives. 6) Organisational Culture - Common narrative. 7) Workforce Management - Engaging and Performance Measurement. 3) Organisational Culture - Social and Psychological Context: Readiness for Change, Organisational Culture, and Work Environment. 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Processes: Partnering, Teamwork, Delivering Care, and Improving Quality. | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - System leadership is harder than organisational leadership - there are conflicting performance measures. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders need to see the larger picture, be more reflective and shift focus from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future. 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders understanding the motivation of partners enabling unconditional commitment, collective ownership - debts, income etc. | 1) Organisational Culture - Stop clashes and set a common goal (no PBR from NHSI conflicting with CCGs from NHSE) - end artificial divides. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Long-term perspective needs to be maintained and the stakeholders must be motivated. 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leadership roles must change to become facilitators of change (no more competition). |
| Judith Smith, Gerald Wistow, Holly Holder & Matthew Gaskins | 2019 | Evaluating the design and implementation of the whole systems integrated care programme in North West London: why commissioning proved (again) to be the weakest link. | BMC Health Services Research | Systematic Literature Review | DOI: 10.1186/s12913-019-4013-5. | 1) Organisational Culture - Social and cultural differences including those related to knowledge, organisation and power. 2) Political - The Health and Social Care Act 2012 re-emphasised the role of competition and implicitly encouraged more extensive use of for-profit and third sector providers alongside mainstream NHS-managed services. Yet there has been a parallel emphasis on collaboration and integration so Commissioners have therefore had to explore ways of balancing apparently contradictory pressures: to promote provider competition through contracting and procurement, while simultaneously securing collaborative service delivery through strategic purchasing. | 1) Workforce Management - Define specifically what changes to services are intended. 2) Workforce Management - Convene stakeholders to plan for and support implementation continuously. 3) Workforce Management - See outcomes as something for which commissioners and providers are jointly accountable. |
| Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care | PubMeds | BMC Health Services Research Report | DOI: 10.1186/s12913-020-4950-z |
|---|---|---|---|

1) Political - Conceptual challenges: lack of clarity on what constitutes integrated care. When drafting and implementing integrated care, there are three fundamental questions that should be considered by every policymaker: (1) how the integration will be organised; (2) what kind of integration is intended; (3) what outcome is intended. Because of the conceptual complexity and ideological choices, it is particularly difficult to determine when and to what degree integration of care is a success.

2) Political - Empirical challenges: when drafting policy on integrated care, policymakers are likely to make use of the available empirical evidence. There are at least three different sources of such evidence. First, policymakers might learn from places where policies on integrated care have already been put into place. Second, policymakers can make use of the available research literature. Third, policymakers can gather their own data. However, each of these sources of evidence can pose substantial challenges. Successfully transferring policy requires not just learning about particular policy (such as by reading...

3) Political - Tailor policy to the particular context in which it will be implemented. The successful integration of a given policy in a particular health care context might not be automatically transferrable to another health care context. Policymakers should critically assess the available scientific literature and look at examples of places where comparable policies have been implemented. One cannot simply copy policy from somewhere else and expect it to work. Policymakers should preferably not only learn about what happened in other places, but instead learn from other places.
policy documents), but also learning from particular policies. Policymakers can make use of an increasing amount of existing and published evidence from research, however, how to translate this knowledge into political action is far from evident. Also, while many case studies have been published there may be publication or reporting bias, whereby successful networks are more likely to be published than unsuccessful ones.

3) Economic - Resource challenges: integrated care is often believed to allow for 'improved efficiency of services, and reduced overall cost', however there is research suggesting that creating integrated care and health care collaborations might actually require a great investment of resources before there is any efficiency pay-off. The resources needed are: (1) expertise, (2) time, and (3) funding.

4) Economic - Be committed to investing the resources needed to genuinely run and evaluate a policy. Research shows how successfully promoting integration may require resources such as time, expertise, and funding. As we have argued, policy-makers who fail to invest the necessary amount of money might afterwards incorrectly conclude that a particular policy implementation does not work.

5) Organisational Culture - Provide the stakeholders with sufficient freedom and autonomy. Research shows that successful integration cannot be fully mandated and requires a willingness from stakeholders and a relationship of trust between them.

6) Political - Consider beforehand how the actual implementation of the policy can be evaluated: Despite there being empirical challenges, a lot can be learned from the example of other countries and the experiences of other policy makers. There is also the option of setting up pilot projects or policy experiments to gather relevant feedback. Finally, policy makers should also consider the installation and use of feedback mechanisms to gain insight into the implementation of policy once it is underway.
| #  | 1. Political | 2. Political | 3. Economic | 4. Intrinsic value of leadership - Distributed leadership. |
|----|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
|    | Supportive regulation. | Flexible administrative reorganisation. | Funding realignment. | Managerial leadership. |
|    | organisational culture institutionalised through policies and procedures. | Striving towards an open culture for discussing possible improvements for care partners. | | Visionary leadership. |
|    | Linking cultures. | Organisational culture institutionalised through policies and procedures. | | Clinical leadership. |
|    | Trust (on colleagues, caregivers and organisations). | Entrenched organisational culture institutionalised through policies and procedures. | | Organisational leadership for providing optimal chronic care. |
|    | Inter-organisational collaboration - Information sharing. | Entrenched organisational culture institutionalised through policies and procedures. | | Distributed leadership. |
|    | Planned/organised meetings. | Entrenched organisational culture institutionalised through policies and procedures. | | Managerial leadership. |

**Mahiben Maruthappu** 2016

**Enablers and Barriers in Implementing Integrated Care**

| N/A - Snowball | Health Systems and Reform | Report | DOI: 10.1093/23286604.2015.1077301 |
|---------------|--------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|

**1) Organisational Culture - A change of culture is required, at both clinical and management levels, without which may lead to a lack of shared vision and**

**2) Planned/organised meetings.**

**BMJ Open**
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problems in the long-term sustainability of integration.

2) Economic - For integrative care to be successful, a long-term plan with adequately protected support and funding must be provided. Financial incentives must be directed toward integrated pathways and designed to redistribute incentives to stakeholders.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Without an infrastructure framework, the coordination of care is stifled; for example, robust shared electronic patient record platforms, which can be accessed by all those involved in providing care to the target patient population.

4) Economic - Identification of target population.

5) Economic - Adequate financing.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - IT infrastructure.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Leadership coalition.

8) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Involvement of primary, community and social care.

9) Workforce Management - Evaluation models.

10) Organisational Culture - Common values.

11) Organisational Culture - Changing clinical cultures.

12) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical Leadership.
Clinical advice and leadership: a report from the NHS Future Forum.

| NHS Future Forum | 2011 | Clinical advice and leadership: a report from the NHS Future Forum. | HMIC | N/A | Report URL: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213750/dh_127542.pdf |
|------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated information systems need to be developed, commissioned and implemented.

2) Workforce Management - Data about quality and outcomes of care is collected, shared and used in a transparent way to support informed patient choice and continuous improvement.

3) Organisational Culture - A duty to promote research and innovation and the use of research evidence.

4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Substantial multi-professional clinical leadership embedded within it including visible leadership for key groups and conditions, for example children, women, older people, mental health and learning disabilities.

5) Workforce Management - Continuing professional development.

6) Intrinsic value of leadership - All
organisations, particularly new ones, should ensure that appropriate leadership development and support are in place.

7) Workforce Management - Responsible officers continuing to be in place to support doctors in improving care and ensuring their fitness to practice through revalidation.

8) Organisational Culture - Strong and visible clinical and professional leadership at all levels, focused on increasing trust and encouraging positive behaviour.

| NHS Leadership Academy | Leadership in Integrated Care Systems (ICSs) | N/A - Snowball | Social Care Institute for Excellenc e: Future of Care | Report | URL: https://www.scie.org.uk/integrated-care/leadership/systems#future info |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders in ICSs need to be skilled at: a) identifying and scaling innovation (e.g. from pilots) b) having a strong focus on outcomes and population health c) building strong relationships with other leaders, and often working with them informally to develop joint priorities and plans d) establishing governance structures which drive faster change, often going 1) Workforce Management - Strategies and agendas that are imposed by NHS England on local areas rather than being clinically-led and driven by local need. 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of coordination and alignment at national level between NHS England and NHS Improvement. 3) Workforce Management - Complex accountability structures and configurations. 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Different performance regimes and 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Stability in senior leadership positions across organisations. 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Relationships before structures: drawing on established working relationships built over the years. 3) Workforce Management - Involving staff and service users. 4) Organisational Culture - Having the security to make long-term plans. 5) Organisational Culture - Trust and delegation of autonomy from the centre: a permissive, not prescriptive, approach and national guidance that provides a broad, enabling framework. 1) Leadership Style - Leadership programmes and professional development opportunities. 2) Organisational Culture - Peer support including mechanisms for ‘buddying up’. 3) Workforce Management - Local champions who will push and progress the work, and ‘win hearts and minds’. 4) Workforce Management - Skilled external facilitation, to help deliver complex programmes. 5) Organisational Culture - The creation of ‘safe spaces’ for leaders to meet with peers and share problems and solutions. |
where the commitment and energy is strongest
e) setting the overall outcomes and expectations on behaviours, but handing day-to-day decision-making to others
f) supporting the development of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs)
g) designing and facilitating whole-systems events and workshops to build consensus and deliver change
h) understanding and leading cultural change
i) building system-wide learning and evaluation frameworks
j) fostering a learning culture across the whole system.
cultures, including between the NHS and local authorities.
e) Political - Lack of a coherent view of whole population needs.
5) Political - Sheer volume of bureaucracy involved in getting service changes through.
6) Political - Insufficient development, support and peer support for leaders.
7) Workforce Management - Insufficient development, support and peer support for leaders.
8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Capacity and capability of local leaders, pressure and stress in these roles, uncertainty about the future.
9) Intrinsic value of leadership - People in leadership roles finding the job lonely and feeling isolated.
10) Organisational Culture - A culture of blame towards leaders.
11) Intrinsic value of leadership - High turnover of the leadership workforce, resulting in loss of experience and skills.
12) Intrinsic value of leadership - Confusion about where the decision-making power lies.
13) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical leadership especially
| Nick Goodwin and Judith Smith | 2011 | The Evidence Base for Integrated Care | N/A - Snowball | The King’s Fund and the Nuffield Trust: Developing a National Strategy for the Promotion of Integrated Care | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/Evidence-base-integrated-care2.pdf | challenged by bureaucratic constraints.  
14) Organisational Culture - Performance management and assurance processes that are not aligned to learning and self-reflection.  
15) Organisational Culture - A sense that the goalposts keep moving with priorities, funding and expectations changing. |

| Nick Goodwin, Judith Smith, Alisha Davies, Claire Perry, Rebecca Rosen, Anna Dixon, Jennifer | 2012 | Integrated care for patients and populations: Improving outcomes by working together | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/integrated-care-patient-centred-populations-improving-outcomes-working | 1) Organisational Culture - NHS management is permission based and has a risk averse approach where innovation is needed.  
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Divide between primary/secondary, health/social care: different contracts, employment, free/means tested.  
3) Workforce Management - Approaches that measure experiences of patients, service users and carers in relation to integrated care.  
1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Setting a clear, ambitious and measurable goal to improve the experience of patients and service users, implement change at scale and pace. |
| Dixon, Chris Ham | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Absence of robust electronic sharing record. |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                    | 3) Economic - Weak commissioning payment based on episodic care at hospital, PBR incentivises more activity in hospitals, mitigating against other providers, competition within the market and choice and regulation focuses on organisation performance not collective system leading to single outcomes framework |
|                    | 4) Workforce Management - Need for GPs to adapt to provide services at a larger scale. |
|                    | 5) Economic - New payment incentives and local currencies. |
|                    | 6) Economic - Commission services based on outcomes rather than items of delivery. |

R Humphries 2015 Integrated health and social care in England – Progress and prospects EMCA RE Health Policy Report DOI: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2015.04.010

| 1) Organisational Culture - In contrast to the 'Pioneer' programme which has encouraged locally driven, bottom-up innovation, NHS England has adopted a much more prescriptive and top-down approach to the delivery of the Better Care Fund which is driven by an imperative to reduce emergency hospital admissions. |
| 2) Economic - The personal commissioning programme is an entirely different approach again which rests on the ability of individuals rather than organisations to integrate their own care. It remains to be seen how the inevitable tensions between these very different policy levers and |
| 1) Economic - A new settlement that brings together all health and care funding into a single, ring fenced budget and overseen by a single local commissioner. |
| Implementation styles will play out. |
|-------------------------------------|
| 1) Workforce Management - Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods. |
| 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of performance management role (indirect influence). |
| 3) Economic - Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned. |
| 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems. |
| 5) Political - Inconsistencies in national policy. |
| 6) Intrinsic value of leadership - Variable progress in different localities dependent on local leadership. |

| 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Active medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice. |
| 2) Workforce Management - Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients. |
| 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record. |
| 4) Organisational Culture - High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders. |
| 5) Economic - When transfer of work between organisations does not cause issues with payments. |
| 6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Planned increase in provider competition. |
| 7) Organisational Culture - Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care. |
| 8) Workforce Management - Staff commitment and belief that integration is doing the right thing. |
| 9) Workforce Management - Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. |

| 1) Organisational Culture - Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs. |
| 10) Intrinsic value of leadership | Skilled leaders with ability to win hearts and minds of frontline staff. |
| 11) Organisational Culture | Taking an incremental approach on progress. |
| 12) Inter-organisational Collaboration | Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support. |

Richard Gleave 2009
Across the pond - Lessons from the US on Integrated Healthcare
Nuffield Trust
Nuffield Trust
Case Study
URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/across-the-pond-lessons-from-the-us-on-integrated-healthcare

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care.
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Risk needs to be shared in Inter-organisational Collaboration rather than assigned individually.

Sara Shaw, Rebecca Rosen and Benedict Rumbold 2011
What is integrated care?
Nuffield Trust
Nuffield Trust
Report
URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/whatis-integrated-care-

1) Economic - Situate performance measures within wider health and care systems: acknowledge the level and combination of strategies used based on the challenges faced in obtaining appropriate
1) Organisational Culture - Recognise that major change is needed, ensure a clear and agreed vision from GPs to specialists.

2) Economic - Work simultaneously with commissioners and service providers so that quality and budgeting is fulfilled.

3) Workforce Management - Make a clear case for change.

4) Workforce Management - Engage with stakeholders when developing integrated systems.

---

| Sara Shaw, Ros Levenson 2011 | Towards integrated care in Trafford | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/towards-integrated-care-in-trafford-final.pdf |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Quality care for local communities and user groups and consider the contextual factors that affect development and delivery. |
| 2) Workforce Management - Standardised, validated tools and indicators that measure integration across different settings relative to a set of models, structures and processes. |
| 3) Workforce Management - Improvement through audit of medical records, analysis of register data on hospitalisation rates, self assessment for managers, annual surveys, questionnaires for clinical leaders, qualitative interviews with executives, leaders, staff and managers. |

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Facilitate local leadership that has good knowledge of the workings of the local systems.

1) Economic - Size/structural factors were key to integration success: the area was sufficiently small (n=36,251) to allow triage, assessment and referral in one multi-disciplinary team (MDT), whereas in the largest locality had 72,692 registered residents so the single MDT initially had much more caseloads which became unmanageable.

2) Organisational Culture - The small size allowed relationships to develop over time; indeed, there is a history of collaboration there (e.g. between GPs and community hospital teams and between health and social care).

3) Intrinsic value of leadership - A strong role of shared, bottom-up leadership. Frontline clinicians in the Coastal Locality were notable for having trusting and friendly relationships between team leads (Physio, Nurses and Matrons, Social Care).

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - The integrated system appointed GPs as locality clinical directors, which was a key factor as they helped link the GP community directly into the ICO, thereby overcoming barriers between the acute and primary sectors.

5) Organisational Culture - There was a commitment to learning by leaders. The Coastal leads
insisted on collecting their own performance data despite being asked to discontinue doing so and devised their own performance management system (measuring performance). Priority to measure performance; there was a willingness in Coastal to genuinely question the process and outcomes of integrated care.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - The partnering and the organisation of inter-professional teamwork and joint care planning as critical determinants of success, especially informal partnership which relies on trusting relationships at all levels. A balance of top-down and bottom-up committees and system-wide steering functions facilitated the emergence over time of trusting relationships and iteratively evolving teams at locality level. This in turn allowed for better service delivery.

1) Political - The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance.

2) Organisational Culture - Need for a shared understanding of the purpose of the joint venture and a mutual understanding of, and

1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Divide between social care staff and medical staff: differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, and status inequalities.

2) Organisational Culture - The mismatch in cultures, behaviours and understanding of services creates a divide between the disciplines. Organisational boundaries resulted in staff feeling pressured, and the process

Sian E. Maslin-Prothero, Amy E. Bennion

2010

Integrated team working: a literature review

HSE

International Journal of Integrated Care

Systematic Literature Review

URL: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2863237/

1) Political - The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance.

2) Organisational Culture - Need for a shared understanding of the purpose of the joint venture and a mutual understanding of, and

1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Divide between social care staff and medical staff: differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, and status inequalities.

2) Organisational Culture - The mismatch in cultures, behaviours and understanding of services creates a divide between the disciplines. Organisational boundaries resulted in staff feeling pressured, and the process
commitment to, the vision of the venture across the organizations involved.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - It is important for integrated services to work together across agency boundaries; this has been facilitated by the removal of structural constraints through the Health Act 1999, which permitting pooled budgets and integrated provision.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated teams must be able to exchange knowledge easily between agencies; effective shared information technology (IT) systems are key to the success of integrated working.

5) Organisational Culture - Need for the development of a shared culture.

6) Workforce Management - Establishment of new roles to support new ways of working

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Exhibiting a past history of joint working.

8) Political - Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms of collaborative working led to unrealistic expectations being placed on staff.

3) Workforce Management - A lack of clarity of purpose for integration, and a failure to agree partnership outcomes.

4) Workforce Management - The lack of understanding and clarity of others' roles, leading to conflict between team managers.

5) Workforce Management - Imbalance of power and poor communication.

6) Workforce Management - Short-term contract working, lack of clear career structure, and limited opportunities for promotion (unless they left the service) created a dilemma: a trade-off between present job satisfaction and future career progression for staff in integrated care teams.

7) Economic - Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available.
| Stephanie Best | 2016 | Facilitating integrated delivery of services across organisational boundaries: Essential enablers to integration | HMIC British Journal of Occupational Therapy Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.1177/0261022616688019 |
| 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Horizontal communication. |
| 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of support. |
| 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Overestimated expectations. |
| 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Autocratic leadership style |

and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas.

9) Organisational Culture - The promotion of professional values of service to users and socialisation into the immediate work group.
relationships with colleagues across organisations and recognise each other’s areas of expertise. Overall, participants expressed a wish to see improved working relationships, as this has the potential to lead to a ‘fluidity in thinking’ when managing difficult or complex situations.

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Management and leadership support was identified as an enabler in four of the seven studies, with Coupe (2013) suggesting that leadership support was essential for the successful implementation of integrated health and social care teams.

2) Workforce Management - Change management can be complex, and Thomas et al (2006) suggest that changes are more likely to be adopted when the change meets an identified need. Ling et al (2012: 4) support this belief, as they reported that where staff felt that change was being forced upon them then they were less likely to support the new activity.

3) Organisational Culture - Ling et al (2012) further reported that pilot sites were more successful when there was evidence of a shared vision, along with a commitment from management in relation to longevity of the change.

4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Thistlethwaite (2011) partially attributed the success in Torbay to the stable leadership within Torbay and the ongoing

| Author(s) | Year | Title                                                                 | Journal                                      | DOI |
|-----------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----|
| Sue Mackie, Angela Darvill | 2016 | Factors enabling implementation of integrated health and social care: a systematic review | British Journal of Community Nursing Systematic Literature Review | DOI: 10.12968/bjcn.2016.2.12.82 |
managerial support to deliver on the integration project.

5) Economic - Resources and capacity have been identified as a key enabler in five out of the seven studies. Coupe (2013) attributed the main cause of under-performance of the integrated health and social care teams to a lack of investment in the teams, which is required to embed the change into practice. Ling et al (2012) also reported that the lack of resources in the integrated health and social care teams resulted in an increased workload, which had an adverse effect on staff motivation.

6) Political - National policy was considered an enabler in four of the studies. Coupe (2013) identified that the NHS payment systems, such as payment by results and block contracts, do not incentivise the delivery of care in the community, and thus pose a barrier to integrated health and social care teams.

7) Economic - Sheaff et al (2009) also referred to the NHS financial system, suggesting that paying hospitals for each case treated was an actual incentive to increase admissions, which completely conflicts with the aims of integrated health and social care teams.

8) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Shared information technology (IT) systems were identified as an enabler in two studies. This may pose a concern for a number of organisations.
| Tom Ling, Laura Brereton, Annalijn Conklin | 2012 | Barriers and facilitators to integrating care: experiences from the English Integrated Care Pilots | HMIC International Journal of Integrated Care | Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.5334/ijic.982 |
|------------------------------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|

1) Workforce Management - Size and complexity: simple, smaller integration made more rapid progress and had the ability and authority to come to quick decisions. 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Compatible IT systems and good management of the sharing of private data. 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Good existing relationships between individuals and/or organisations with clear communication about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work. 4) Organisational Culture - Widespread agreement and shared values among participating staff promoted engagement and motivation. 5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Success when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be strongly committed to implementing lasting change. 6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner.
they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling unprepared to take on new roles.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Different IT systems in partner organisations caused difficulties in data-sharing and communicating, especially across health and social care teams. On occasions, these difficulties were not caused by the IT itself but by how their introduction was managed, such as failure to address privacy concerns where organisations were reluctant to share patient data.

5) Collaboration Between Organisations: Absence of relationships between individuals and/or organisations. Poor communication and disagreement about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner organisations.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of co-location: lack of working together face-to-face in the organisations. 7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Co-location: working together face-to-face in the same building improved the quality and frequency of communication, and expedited problem-solving by allowing quicker access to colleagues' professional knowledge.

8) Organisational Culture - Feelings of being involved with planning from the beginning. 9) Workforce Management - Staff were motivated when there was clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants.

10) Organisational Culture - Willingness to engage. Creating shared beliefs about the benefits of change was described by staff as critical to progress. 11) Intrinsic value of leadership - 'Good' leadership.

12) Workforce Management - Thorough training led to staff being clear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling prepared to take on new roles. The provision of training specific to the service change was important, particularly when the work involved required new or changed roles of participants.

13) Organisational Culture - Supportive, transparent organisational culture: the ability to modify existing systems and practices and to create new ones was especially dependent on organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries. 14) Workforce Management - External
same building decreased the quality and frequency of communication, and exacerbated problems by reducing access to colleagues’ professional knowledge.

9) Intrinsic value of leadership - Failure when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be weakly committed to implementing lasting change.

9) Intrinsic value of leadership - 'Poor' leadership blamed for lack of shared beliefs about the benefits of change.

10) Organisational Culture - A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS blame culture.

10) Organisational Culture - Feelings of being sidelined or uninvolved with planning from the beginning was a major barrier.

10) Organisational Culture - Poor organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries.

11) Organisational Culture - Feelings of being sidelined or uninvolved with planning from the beginning was a major barrier.

11) Organisational Culture - Reluctance to engage was a major barrier.

12) Organisational culture - Poor organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries.

12) Organisational culture - A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS blame culture.

13) Organisational Culture - A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS blame culture.

13) Organisational Culture - A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS blame culture.

14) Political - Chains of managerial approval among multiple organisations and slow decisions about resource facilitation has been very helpful in getting two organisations to work together, which is a method well rehearsed in the wider literature on managing change.

14) Political - Chains of managerial approval among multiple organisations and slow decisions about resource facilitation has been very helpful in getting two organisations to work together, which is a method well rehearsed in the wider literature on managing change.

15) Organisational Culture - Staff feeling permitted to take risks.

16) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer.

16) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer.
distribution were perceived as a barrier to innovation.

15) Economic - Staff cuts.
## Appendix C: Synthesis of Results

| Source of Information | Factors Identified |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| **Organisational Culture** | **Workforce Management** | **Inter-Organisational Culture** | **Leadership** | **Economic** | **Political** |
| **Author** | **Title** | **Facilitators:** | **Facilitators:** | **Facilitators:** | **Recommendations:** |
| Alison Tweed, Andrew Singfield, Julia RA Taulor, Lucy Gilbert, Paul Mount | Creating Allegiance: Leading transformational change within the NHS | 1) Shared Visions (espoused theories) need to be outlined and translated into everyday practice and visions of previous leaders or schemes must be erased. | 1) Connecting through practice: involving frontline staff and all stakeholders in decisions and key pieces of the transformation to integrated care. | 1) Leaders should be non-partisan integrators rather than assign themselves to an organisation - have an allegiance to the system. 2) Leaders should build high quality relationships involving emotional intelligence and positive role modelling. | 1) Connecting is a key theme in managing system or transformational change and occurs through three mediums: relational, with purpose and vision and through practice. 2) To further research the concept of allegiance creation as it appears under-represented within the literature, particularly as part of the process of transformational change, rather than as an outcome of change or behaviours towards leaders. |
### A Year of Integrated Care Systems: Reviewing the journey so far

**Barriers:**
1. A legacy of competitive behaviours.
2. Frequently changing language and the lack of a clear narrative.

**Facilitators:**
1. Shared vision and purpose.
2. A meaningful local identity.

**Recommendations:**
1. Integrate at different levels of the system, building up from places and neighbourhoods.
2. Draw on the skills and leadership of frontline staff.
3. Build governance in an evolutionary way to support delivery.
4. Develop system-wide capabilities to gather, share and act on public insights.
5. Develop active strategies to facilitate wider adoption of new care models.
6. Build robust evaluation into the ICS programme that supports learning and improvement and measures progress.

### Bringing Integration Home: Policy on health and social care integration in...

**Barriers:**
1. Culture of impatience and cynicism.

**Barriers:**
1. Inadequate workforce planning.

**Barriers:**
1. Difficulties in agreeing budgets.

**Facilitators:**
1. System leadership.
2. Clinical leadership and engagement.

**Recommendations:**
1. Promote and value system leadership.
2. Funding to support transformation.

**Barriers:**
1. The legislative context does not support system working.
2. Regulation and oversight is not aligned.

**Facilitators:**
1. A permissive and supportive national programme.

**Barriers:**
1. Complex governance arrangements.
2. Lack of understanding of what the drivers and essential requirements are for successful integration between
### Early Evaluation of the Integrated Care and Support Pioneers Programme: Final Report

| Bob Erens, Gerald Wistow, Sandra Mounier-Jack, Nick Douglas, Lorelei Jones, Tommaso Manacorda and Nicholas Mays | Barriers: | Facilitators: |
|---|---|---|
| *the four nations of the UK* | 1) Differences between the health and social care sectors in terms of language and conceptions of health and wellbeing, professional cultures and working practices. 2) Different priorities between professions: e.g. the people of most concern to social workers were not necessarily the same as those of most concern to GPs. 3) ‘Blame culture’ within and across local health and social care sectors located responsibility for failures in integration elsewhere in the system. | 1) Good leadership and vision was identified as critical at all levels from local authority councillors through to senior managers, supported by appropriate governance structures. |
|   | 1) Integration was less of a priority where stakeholders had urgent competing demands (e.g. meeting 4-hour waiting time A&E targets. 2) Multiple challenges of engaging frontline staff. 3) Difficulties recruiting staff particularly in certain areas of the country. 4) High staff turnover (especially following health care reforms) negatively affected longer-term strategic planning and service provision aiming for integration. 5) Existing approaches to training professionals do not produce effectiveness of care. 2) Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved. 6) Existing approaches to training professionals do not produce effectiveness of care. 2) Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved. | 1) Acute/community trusts or social services departments suffered from significant financial deficit and were subject to ‘special measures’, which diverted senior management attention away from Pioneer activity. 2) The growing demand for costly A&E services by patients at a time when integration seeks to reduce usage – diverts resources and slows the pace of transformation. 3) PbR incentives for acute and specialist services were meant to reduce usage – diverts resources and slows the pace of transformation. 4) Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a sector. |
|   | 1) Health care and social care have different regulatory frameworks and the regulator does not examine systems such as integrated services, instead only looking at individual organisations. 2) Some Pioneers were very complex with a large number of stakeholders and/or a large geographic footprint, which made partnership working more complex in terms of size, communication, governance, etc. | 1) Supportive legislation. |
|   | 1) Pressure by national and local pressure groups to demonstrate the success of new integration initiatives at a stage too early in the programme’s implementation. 2) Strategic direction from the national government is fragmented. Differences in approach: DCLG reportedly favouring more centrally devolved responsibility, while DH/NHSE adopt a more ‘command and control’ approach. |   |

### Recommendations:

1. To further research specific policy analysis domains, i.e. investigate policy formation, policy implementation or service delivery outcomes in integrated or co-ordinated health and social care services.

- **Facilitators:**
  1. Supportive legislation.
4) Scepticism about NHS initiatives that had previously been seen to ‘come and go’.
5) Previous initiatives did not live up to expectations leading to demoralisation.
6) Promoting a ‘play-it-safe’ work culture can be detrimental to ‘barrier busting’.

**Facilitators:**
1) Trust and shared values that are largely developed locally.
2) Freedom to try things out, not having a ‘culture of blame’ if things go wrong, and piloting new initiatives and sharing the learning before roll-out. Reassuring staff so they ‘feel safe’ in the face of change.

Trainees equipped for integrated working, and not enough trainees to meet demand.

**Facilitators:**
1) Experienced staff.
2) Staff involvement in developing integration initiatives and encouraging their ‘ownership’ of new service models.
3) Local champions.
4) Collecting the right information/indicators so that impact/success can be measured and visible to staff, patients/service users and the local population.

Particularly challenging.
5) Inadequate local engagement/buy-in of the mental health sector, due in part to the legacy of underfunding and ‘Cinderella’ status of the sector.
6) In some Pioneers with multiple partners, a sense that transformation could happen only at the pace of the ‘slowest’, most conservative or risk averse stakeholder.
7) Information sharing was seen as critical, but the level of integration of information and intelligence needed was technically difficult to achieve across multiple IT platforms and with obstructive information governance regulations.

**Facilitators:**
1) Being part of a national Pioneer programme, which provided an impetus for local professionals to work together to improve care locally.
2) Building and maintaining good working relationships across organisations and professions at all levels built on trust, so that people could speak larger one.

**Facilitators:**
1) Uncommitted funding.
| Facilitators: | | Facilitators: |
|---|---|---|
| 1) Positive and trusting relationships. | 1) System leaders who work together to support frontline practitioners to overcome bureaucratic barriers. | 1) Co-operative Council with an understanding of communities which helps to target resources and further develop interventions. |
| 2) A culture of innovation, creativity and empowerment and not micro-management based on old fashioned contractual approaches. | | |

Carolyn Wilkins  
An Allied Approach to Success in Oldham

Chris Ham, Judith Smith and Elizabeth Eastmure  
Commissioning integrated care in a liberated NHS

Frankly, come to understand each other's perspectives, and develop a shared vision and understanding of what the Pioneer was aiming to achieve.

3) Integrated information system between organisations to enable sharing of patient/service user records or having suitable facilities for cross-agency and/or multi-disciplinary teams.

4) Co-location of operational teams facilitated communication and partnership working between different professionals.

Barriers:

1) Needs assessment and service specification is time, effort and resource consuming.
| Facilitators:  
| ---  
| 1) Using PMS and APMS contracts to facilitate payments.  

| Barriers:  
| The general practice perspective on barriers to integration between primary and social care: a London, United Kingdom-based qualitative interview study  

| Barriers:  
| 1) All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making.  

| Barriers:  
| 2) Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision.  

| Barriers:  
| 3) Inadequate training of staff.  

| Barriers:  
| 1) Lack of awareness of roles and services: uncertainty about which roles are carried out by which social service provider and how best to contact these individuals.  

| Barriers:  
| 2) Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision.  

| Barriers:  
| 3) Inadequate training of staff.  

| Barriers:  
| 1) Often numbers in practice diaries and on websites are out of date, so staff have to ask the patient directly what social care they receive and how to contact relevant departments, slowing down both communication and any attempts at collaborative working.  

| Barriers:  
| 2) Communication between primary care and social care is logistically challenging, as doctors are busy with patients during the day and social care staff are working in the community, making joint conversations about patients nearly impossible.  

| Barriers:  
| 3) Lack of regular contact: most GPs and PMs explained regular contact with social care teams is necessary for effective information transfer and a multidisciplinary approach to patient care. However, currently, contact is through forms and emails with minimal face-to-face contact,  

| Barriers:  
| 1) Low staffing levels.  

| Barriers:  
| 2) Insufficient funding.  

---

Danial Naqvi, Anam Malik, Mohaimen Al-Zubaidy, Falak Naqvi, Anas Tahir, Ali Tarfiee, Sarina Vara, and Edgar Meyer
different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making.

which professionals find inefficient and a barrier to continuity of care.

4) Inefficient MDT meetings.

5) Interoperability between information systems: the lack of shared information systems.

Recommendations:

1) A culture of quality improvement.

2) A history of trust between partner organisations.

3) Personnel who are open to collaboration and innovation.

4) Awareness of local cultural differences: organisational cultures evolve separately over decades.

Recommendations: 1) Effective and complementary communications and IT systems.

Recommendations: 1) Local leaders who are supportive of integration.

Recommendations: 1) Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes.

Needs: 1) The need to develop a culture in which people are comfortable and competent in working across organisational boundaries to serve

Needs: 1) Staff working within integrated care must have (or develop) emotional intelligence and empathy in dealing with patients and users, be willing to work in teams with shared accountability, and be

Needs: 1) Financial incentives do not encourage collaboration.

2) Lack of shared data.
| Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1) Lack of shared accountability. | 1) At macro level there is a general lack of strategic vision towards integrated care from a systems perspective. | 1) At meso level, the historical fragmentation of organizations poses a strong challenge towards care coordination. | 1) Better information systems. | 1) At the micro level a lack of clinical leadership and buy-in hinders the needed multidisciplinary and collaborative work. |
| \( \text{Barriers:} \ \ | \ 1) Strategic alignment. | \( \text{Facilitators:} \) 1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning. | \( \text{Barriers:} \) 1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning. | \( \text{Barriers:} \) 1) Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives. |
| Elena Urizar, Roberto Nuño, Caridad Alvarez, Fernández Concepción, Carles Blay, Andrea Quiroga | Barriers and facilitators for the implementation of Integrated Care Pathways (ICPs): a systemic perspective | Barriers: 1) At meso level, the historical fragmentation of organizations poses a strong challenge towards care coordination. | Barriers: 1) Better information systems. | Barriers: 1) Securing data-sharing and information governance 2) Balancing competition and collaboration. |
| Gerald Wistow, Matt Gaskins, Holly Holder, Judith Smith | Why implementing integrated care is so much harder than designing it: experience in North West London. | Barriers: 1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning. | Barriers: 1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning. | Barriers: 1) Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives. |
| | | | | |
| Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1) A clear, timetabled route map, together with roles of the programme management team and its resources were seen as valuable enablers. | 1) Full integration compared with arrangements of different autonomous insurers and providers reduces costs of information, negotiation, contracting, control, and adaptation and is hence more efficient. | 1) Finance by capitation. Payment per member for coverage for all care provided by the IHCDS (typically in an annual contract with monthly payments), as the principal reimbursement method acts as a powerful pricing strategy that generates substantial savings through internal incentives for preventive care. | 2) A commitment to cost control and high-quality care. |

Gwyn Bevan, Katharina Janus

Why hasn't integrated health care developed widely in the United States and not at all in England?
3) Durability and size.

Barriers and facilitators in the integration of oral health into primary care: a scoping review

| Hermina Harnagea, Yves Couturier, Richa Shrivastava, Felix Girard, Lise Lamothé, Christophe Pierre Bedos, Elham Emami | Barriers: 1) Discipline-oriented education and lack of competencies. 2) Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management [including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)] and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference). | Facilitators: 1) Interprofessional education. 2) Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management [including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)] and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference). |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Barriers: 1) Lack of continuity of care and services: unstructured mechanism for care coordination at the micro level and lack of practice guidelines and types of practice at the meso level. Discontinuity in the integrated care process associated with poor referral systems, inefficient interface and poor connection between public health section, primary care and academic institutions. | Facilitators: 1) Geographical proximity of interdisciplinary organisations. 2) Partnerships and common vision among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations. |
| Barriers: 1) The cost of integrated services, human resources issues (workload of personnel, staff turnover, time constraints and scarcity of various trained human resources such as care coordinators, public health workforce and allied professionals) and deficient administrative infrastructure (the absence of health records, cross-domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes) at the meso and macro levels. | Facilitators: 1) Supportive policies and resource allocation: financial support from governments, stakeholders and non-profit organisations at the macro level. |

Jenna M. Evans, Agnes Grudniewicz, G. Ross Organization Context and Capabilities for Needs: 1) Social and Psychological Context: Readiness for Change, Needs: 1) Basic Structures and Design: Physical Structures, Human and Material Needs: 1) Processes: Partnering, Teamwork, Delivering Care, and Improving Needs: 1) Leadership and Strategy: Leadership Approach, Clinician Engagement and
| John Deffenbaugh | Becoming an integrated (accountable) care system | Needs:  
1) Common priorities: move from what’s in it for their organisation mindset to how they can help other organisations be successful.  
2) Getting into the shoes of others.  
3) Agreed objectives.  
4) Common narrative. | Needs:  
1) Overarching strategy.  
2) Leaders who get along. | Needs:  
1) An agreed allocation of resources and risk sharing system to achieve maximum results across the system. | Barriers:  
1) System leadership is harder than organisational leadership - there are conflicting performance measures.  
2) Leaders need to see the larger picture, be more reflective and shift focus from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future. | Facilitators:  
1) Leaders understand the motivation of partners enabling unconditional commitment, collective ownership - debts, income etc. | Recommendations:  
1) Stop clashes and set a common goal (no PBR from NHSI conflicting with CCGs from NHSE) - end artificial divides.  
2) Ensuring citizens and communities. | Recommendations:  
1) Long-term perspective needs to be maintained and the stakeholders must be motivated. |
| Judith Smith, Gerald Wistow, Holly Holder & Matthew Gaskins |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Evaluating the design and implementation of the whole systems integrated care programme in North West London: why commissioning proved (again) to be the weakest link. |

**Barriers:**
1) Social and cultural differences including those related to knowledge, organisation and power.

**Recommendations:**
1) Define specifically what changes to services are intended.
2) Convene stakeholders to plan for and support implementation continuously.
3) See outcomes as something for which commissioners and providers are jointly accountable.

**Barriers:**
1) The Health and Social Care Act 2012 re-emphasised the role of competition and implicitly encouraged more extensive use of for-profit and third sector providers alongside mainstream NHS-managed services. Yet there has been a parallel emphasis on collaboration and integration so Commissioners have therefore had to explore ways of balancing apparently contradictory pressures: to promote provider competition through contracting and procurement, while simultaneously securing collaborative service delivery through strategic purchasing.
Kasper Raus, Eric Mortier & Kristof Eeckloo

Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care

Recommendations:

1) Provide the stakeholders with sufficient freedom and autonomy. Research shows that successful integration cannot be fully mandated and requires a willingness from stakeholders and a relationship of trust between them.

Barriers:

1) Resource challenges: integrated care is often believed to allow for ‘improved efficiency of services, and reduced overall cost’, however there is research suggesting that creating integrated care and health care collaborations might actually require a great investment of resources before there is any efficiency pay-off. The resources needed are :(1) expertise, (2) time, and (3) funding.

Recommendations:

1) Be committed to investing the resources needed to genuinely run and evaluate a policy. Research shows how successfully promoting integration may require resources such as time, expertise, and funding. As we have argued, policymakers who fail to invest the necessary amount of money might afterwards incorrectly conclude that a particular policy implementation does not work.

Barriers:

1) Conceptual challenges: lack of clarity on what constitutes integrated care. When drafting and implementing integrated care, there are three fundamental questions that should be considered by every policy-maker: (1) how the integration will be organised; (2) what kind of integration is intended; (3) what outcome is intended. Because of the conceptual complexity and ideological choices, it is particularly difficult to determine when and to what degree integration of care is a success.

2) Empirical challenges: when drafting policy on integrated care, policymakers are likely to make use of the available empirical evidence. There are at least three different sources of such evidence. First, policymakers might learn from places where policies on integrated care have already been put into place. Second, policymakers can make use of the available research literature. Third, policymakers can gather their own data. However, each of these sources of evidence can pose substantial challenges. Successfully transferring policy requires not just learning about particular policy (such as by reading policy documents), but also learning from particular policies. Policymakers can make use of an increasing amount of existing and published evidence from research, however, how to translate this knowledge into political action is far from evident.

Recommendations:

1) Reflect on the type and level of integration you want to promote. As we have argued, integrated care is a broad...
concept that encompasses various sorts of integration and collaboration. It is necessary as a policy-maker to be aware of the level of integration that you want to achieve as, without proper prior thought, it will be impossible to determine the success of the policy afterwards.

2) Reflect beforehand on what you hope to achieve with integrated care. We have argued throughout that integrated care should be seen as a means to a number of possible ends (e.g., economic efficiency or increased quality of care). Knowing what one hopes to achieve by promoting integrated care is crucial to being able to later evaluate the success or failure of the policy. This also allows policy-makers to install a mechanism for evaluation, allowing the health policy to be re-evaluated after a period.

3) Tailor policy to the particular context in which it will be implemented. The successful integration of a given policy in a particular health care context might not be automatically transferrable to another health care context. Policy-makers should critically assess the available scientific literature and look at examples of places where comparable policies have been implemented. One cannot simply copy policy from somewhere else and expect it to work. Policy-makers should preferably not only learn about what happened in other places, but instead learn from other places.

4) Consider beforehand how the actual implementation of the policy can be evaluated: Despite there being empirical challenges, a lot can be learned from the example of other countries and the experiences of other
| Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1) Shared vision and values for the purpose of integrated care.  
2) An integration culture institutionalised through policies and procedures.  
3) Striving towards an open culture for discussing possible improvements for care partners. | 1) Planned/organised meetings. | 1) Information sharing | 1) Local leadership and long-term commitments.  
2) Leaders with a clear vision on integrated care.  
3) Distributed leadership.  
4) Managerial leadership.  
5) Visionary leadership.  
6) Clinical leadership.  
7) Organisational leadership for providing optimal chronic care. |
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| Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: |
|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| 1) Common values. 2) Changing clinical cultures. | 1) A change of culture is required, at both clinical and management levels, without which may lead to a lack of shared vision and problems in the long-term sustainability of integration. | 1) Evaluation models. | 1) Without an infrastructure framework, the coordination of care is stifled; for example, robust shared electronic patient record platforms, which can be accessed by all those involved in providing care to the target patient population. | 1) Clinical leadership. | 1) For integrative care to be successful, a long-term plan with adequately protected support and funding must be provided. Financial incentives must be directed toward integrated pathways and designed to redistribute incentives to stakeholders. | 1) Supportive regulation. 2) Flexible administrative reorganisation. |
| 1) Defining the intervention clearly and what it is meant to achieve and how, and implement it well. 2) Being explicit about how desired outcomes will arise, and use interim markers of success. | | 1) IT infrastructure. 2) Leadership coalition. 3) Involvement of primary, community and social care. | | | | |

**Recommendations:**

1) Blend designated leadership with distributed leadership.
| NHS Future Forum | Clinical advice and leadership: a report from the NHS Future Forum. | Needs: | Needs: | Needs: | Needs: |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                 | 1) Establish feedback loops.                                         | 1) Data about quality and outcomes of care is collected, shared and used in a transparent way to support informed patient choice and continuous improvement. | 1) Integrated information systems need to be developed, commissioned and implemented. | 1) Substantial multi-professional clinical leadership embedded within it including visible leadership for key groups and conditions, for example children, women, older people, mental health and learning disabilities. |
|                 | 2) Engage physicians, patients and families.                         | 2) Continuing professional development. | 2) Responsible officers continue to be in place to support doctors in improving care and ensuring their fitness to practice through revalidation. | 2) All organisations, particularly new ones, should ensure that appropriate leadership development and support are in place. |
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| Barriers: | Barriers: | Barriers: | Barriers: | Needs: | Barriers: |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------|----------|
| 1) Performance management and assurance processes that are not aligned to learning and self-reflection.  
2) A sense that the goalposts keep moving with priorities, funding and expectations changing.  
3) A culture of blame towards leaders. | 1) Strategies and agendas that are imposed by NHS England on local areas rather than being clinically-led and driven by local need.  
2) Complex accountability structures and configurations.  
3) Insufficient development, support and peer support for leaders. | 1) Lack of coordination and alignment at national level between NHS England and NHS Improvement.  
2) Different performance regimes and cultures, including between the NHS and local authorities. | 1) Leaders in ICSs need to be skilled at:  
a) identifying and scaling innovation (e.g. from pilots).  
b) having a strong focus on outcomes and population health.  
c) building strong relationships with other leaders, and often working with them informally to develop joint priorities and plans.  
d) establishing governance structures which drive faster change, often going where the commitment and energy is strongest.  
e) setting the overall outcomes and expectations on behaviours, but handing day-to-day decision-making to others.  
f) supporting the development of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs).  
g) designing and facilitating whole-systems events and workshops to build consensus and deliver change.  
h) understanding and leading cultural change.  
i) building system-wide learning and evaluation | 1) Lack of a coherent view of whole population needs.  
2) Sheer volume of bureaucracy involved in getting service changes through. |

Facilitators:
1) Having the security to make long-term plans.  
2) Trust and delegation of autonomy from the centre: a permissive, not prescriptive, approach and national guidance that provides a broad, enabling framework.

Recommendations:
1) Peer support including mechanisms for ‘buddying up’.  
2) The creation of skilled external

Facilitators:
1) Involving staff and service users.  
2) Clarity about how performance will be judged.  
3) Clarity about how accountability will work, and responsibilities of individual organisations.

Recommendations:
1) Local champions who will push and progress the work, and ‘win hearts and minds’.  
2) Skilled external
For peer review only

'safe spaces' for leaders to meet with peers and share problems and solutions.

3) More opportunities to learn from other professions and sectors.

facilitation, to help deliver complex programmes.

3) Systems leadership development for middle managers across the system.

4) Masterclasses on: co-production theory and practice, finance and risk-sharing, scaling innovation, understanding local government and social care, large-scale and large-group facilitation, working and influencing across multiple layers of governance.

j) fostering a learning culture across the whole system.

Barriers:

1) Capacity and capability of local leaders, pressure and stress in these roles, uncertainty about the future.

2) People in leadership roles finding the job lonely and feeling isolated.

3) High turnover of the leadership workforce, resulting in loss of experience and skills.

4) Confusion about where the decision-making power lies.

5) Clinical leadership is especially challenged by bureaucratic constraints.

Facilitators:

1) Stability in senior leadership positions across organisations.

Recommendations:

1) Leadership programmes and professional development opportunities.
| Name | Integrated Care and Social Care in England – Progress and Prospects |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Nick Goodwin, Judith Smith, Alisha Davies, Rebecca Rosen, Anna Dixon, Jennifer Dixon, Chris Ham | **Barriers:**
1) NHS management is permission based and has a risk averse approach where innovation is needed.
2) Approaches that measure experiences of patients, service users and carers in relation to integrated care.
3) Need for GPs to adapt to provide services at a larger scale.  

**Facilitators:**
1) Clear articulation of benefits to patients, service users and carers.

| Humphries | **Barriers:**
1) In contrast to the ‘Pioneer’ programme which has encouraged locally driven, bottom-up innovation, NHS England has adopted a much more prescriptive and top-down approach to the delivery of the Better Care Fund which is driven by an imperative to reduce emergency hospital admissions.  

**Barriers:**
1) Divide between primary/secondary, health/social care: different contracts, employment, free/means tested.
2) Absence of robust electronic sharing record.  

**Facilitators:**
1) Creating powerful narrative at national and local level.
   **Recommendations:**
1) Setting a clear, ambitious and measurable goal to improve the experience of patients and service users, implement change at scale and pace.  

**Barriers:**
1) Weak commissioning payment based on episodic care at hospital, PBR incentivises more activity in hospitals, mitigating against other providers, competition within the market and choice and regulation focuses on organisation performance not collective system leading to single outcomes framework.  

**Facilitators:**
1) New payment incentives and local currencies. 2) Commission services based on outcomes rather than items of delivery.  

**Recommendations:**
1) A new settlement that brings together all health
### Rebecca Rosen, James Mountford, Geraint Lewis, Richard Lewis, Jenny Shand and Sara Shaw

**Integration in action: four international case studies**

| **Facilitators:** | **Barriers:** |
|-------------------|--------------|
| 1) Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care. | 1) Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods. |
| 2) Taking an incremental approach on progress. | 1) Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems. |
| 3) High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders. | **Facilitators:** |
| **Recommendations:** | **Barriers:** |
| 1) Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs. | 1) Lack of performance management role (indirect influence). |
| 2) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 2) Variable progress in different localities is dependent on local leadership. |

### Richard Gleave

**Across the pond - Lessons from the US on Integrated Healthcare**

| **Recommendations:** |
|----------------------|
| 1) Risk needs to be shared in collaboration between organisations rather than assigned individually. |

| **Recommendations:** |
|----------------------|
| 1) Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, and must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care. |

and care funding into a single, ring fenced budget and overseen by a single local commissioner.

**Barriers:**

1) Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned.

**Facilitators:**

1) Inconsistencies in national policy.

**Barriers:**

1) When transfer of work between organisations does not cause issues with payments.
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| Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1) Make a clear case for change | 1) Facilitate local leadership that has good knowledge of the workings of the local systems. | 1) Work simultaneously with commissioners and service providers so that quality and budgeting is fulfilled. | 1) Facilitate local leadership that has good knowledge of the workings of the local systems. |
| 2) Engage with stakeholders when developing integrated systems |  |  |  |

**Facilitators:**

1) The integrated system appointed GPs as locality clinical directors, which was a key factor as they helped link the GP community directly into the ICO, thereby overcoming barriers between the acute and primary sectors.

2) The partnering and the organisation of inter-professional teamwork and joint care planning as critical determinants of success, especially informal partnership which relies on trusting relationships at all levels. A balance of top-down and bottom-up committees and system-wide steering functions facilitated the emergence over time of trusting relationships and

**Facilitators:**

1) A strong role of shared, bottom-up leadership. Frontline clinicians in the Coastal Locality were notable for having trusting and friendly relationships between team leads (Physio, Nurses and Matrons, Social Care).

**Facilitators:**

1) Size/structural factors were key to integration success: the area was sufficiently small (n=36,251) to allow triage, assessment and referral in one multi-disciplinary team (MDT), whereas in the largest locality had 72,692 registered residents so the single MDT initially had much more caseloads which became unmanageable.
| Sian E. Maslin-Prothero and Amy E. Bennion | Integrated team working: a literature review | Needs: | Needs: | Needs: | Needs: |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Performance: there was a willingness in Coastal to genuinely question the process and outcomes of integrated care. | 1) Need for a shared understanding of the purpose of the joint venture and a mutual understanding of, and commitment to, the vision of the venture across the organizations involved. | 1) Establishment of new roles to support new ways of working. | 1) It is important for integrated services to work together across agency boundaries; this has been facilitated by the removal of structural constraints through the Health Act 1999, which permitting pooled budgets and integrated provision. | |
| | | 2) Need for the development of a shared culture. | 2) The lack of clarity of purpose for integration, and a failure to agree partnership outcomes. | 2) Integrated teams must be able to exchange knowledge easily between agencies; effective shared information technology (IT) systems are key to the success of integrated working. | |
| | | 3) The promotion of professional values of service to users and socialisation into the immediate work group. | 3) Imbalance of power and poor communication. | 3) Exhibiting a past history of joint working. | |
| | | Barriers: | 4) Short-term contract working, lack of clear career structure, and limited opportunities for promotion (unless they left the service) created a dilemma: a trade-off between present job satisfaction and future career progression for staff in integrated care | Barriers: | 1) Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available. |
| | | | 1) Divide between social care staff medical staff: differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, and status inequalities. | | 1) The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance. |
| | | | 2) Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas. | | 2) Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas. |

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

| Factors enabling implementation of integrated health and social care: a systematic review |
|---|
| **Facilitators:** 1) Ling et al (2012) further reported that pilot sites were more successful when there was evidence of a shared vision, along with a commitment from management in relation to longevity of the change. |
| **Facilitators:** 1) Change management can be complex, and Thomas et al (2006) suggest that changes are more likely to be adopted when the change meets an identified need. Ling et al (2012: 4) support this belief, as they reported that where staff felt that change was being forced upon them then they were less likely to support the new activity. |
| **Facilitators:** 1) Shared information technology (IT) systems were identified as an enabler in two studies. This may pose a concern for a number of organisations considering data sharing owing to issues with information governance and maintaining patient confidentiality. |
| **Facilitators:** 1) Management and leadership support was identified as an enabler in four of the seven studies, with Coupe (2013) suggesting that leadership support was essential for the successful implementation of integrated health and social care teams. |
| **Facilitators:** 1) Resources and capacity have been identified as a key enabler in five out of the seven studies. Coupe (2013) attributed the main cause of under-performance of the integrated health and social care teams to a lack of investment in the teams, which is required to embed the change into practice. Ling et al (2012) also reported that the lack of resources in the integrated health and social care teams resulted in an increased workload, which had an adverse effect on staff motivation. |
| **Facilitators:** 1) National policy was considered an enabler in four of the studies. Coupe (2013) identified that the NHS payment systems, such as payment by results and block contracts, do not incentivise the delivery of care in the community, and thus pose a barrier to integrated health and social care teams. |

Sue Mackie, Angela Darvill
### Barriers and Facilitators to Integrating Care: Experiences from the English Integrated Care Pilots

#### Barriers:

1. Feelings of being sidelined, or uninvolved with planning from the beginning.
2. Reluctance to engage was a major barrier.
3. Poor organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries.
4. A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS ‘blame culture’.

#### Facilitators:

1. Widespread agreement and shared values among participating staff promoted engagement and motivation.
2. Feelings of being involved with planning from the beginning.
3. Willingness to engage. Creating shared beliefs about the benefits of change was described by staff as

#### Barriers:

1. Size and complexity: multiple components in integration reported greater challenges of managing change, and they were often greater and longer to implement than they had anticipated. Difficult to communicate the details to all parties and identify the role of each participant group.
2. Staff demotivated when an absence of clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. Where staff felt the change was being forced upon them, they were less likely to support the new activity.
3. Lack of training led to staff being unclear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling unprepared to take on new roles.

#### Facilitators:

1. Success when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be strongly committed to implementing lasting change.
2. ‘Good’ leadership.

#### Barriers:

1. Failure when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be weakly committed to implementing lasting change.
2. ‘Poor’ leadership blamed for lack of shared beliefs about the benefits of change.

#### Facilitators:

1. Willingness to engage. Creating shared beliefs about the benefits of change was described by staff as

#### Barriers:

1. Different IT systems in partner organisations caused difficulties in data-sharing and communicating, especially across health and social care teams. On occasions, these difficulties were not caused by the IT itself but by how their introduction was managed, such as failure to address privacy concerns where organisations were reluctant to share patient data.
2. Absence of relationships between individuals and/or organisations. Poor communication and disagreement about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work.
3. Lack of ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner organisations.
4. Lack of co-location: lack of working together face-to-face in the same building decreased the quality and frequency of communication, and exacerbated problems by reducing access to

#### Barriers:

1. Chains of managerial approval among multiple organisations and slow decisions about resource distribution were perceived as a barrier to innovation.
|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 1) Size and complexity: simple, smaller integration made more rapid progress and had the ability and authority to come to quick decisions. | 4) Supportive, transparent organisational culture: the ability to modify existing systems and practices and to create new ones was especially dependent on organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries. |   |
| 2) Staff were motivated when there was clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. | 5) Staff feeling permitted to take risks. |   |
| 3) Thorough training led to staff being clear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling prepared to take on new roles. The provision of training specific to the service change was important, particularly when the work involved required new or changed roles of participants. |   |   |
| 4) External facilitation has been very helpful in getting two organisations to work together, which is a method well rehearsed in the wider literature on colleagues' professional knowledge. |   |   |
| Facilitators: |   |   |
| 1) Compatible IT systems and good management of the sharing of private data. |   |   |
| 2) Good existing relationships between individuals and/or organisations with clear communication about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work. |   |   |
| 3) Ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner organisations. |   |   |
| 4) Co-location: working together face-to-face in the same building improved the quality and frequency of communication, and expedited problem-solving by allowing quicker access to colleagues' professional knowledge. |   |   |
| 5) Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer. |   |   |
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managing change.
# PRISMA 2009 Checklist

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item                                                                                                                                                   | Reported on page # |
|---------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| TITLE         |   | Title                                                                                                                                                        |                     |
|               | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.                                                                                           | 1                   |
| ABSTRACT      |   | Structured summary                                                                                                                                              |                     |
|               | 2 | Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number. | 2                   |
| INTRODUCTION  |   | Rationale                                                                                                                                                     |                     |
|               | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.                                                                               | 3-4                 |
|               | 4 | Objectives                                                                                                                                                     |                     |
|               |   | Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS). |                     |
| METHODS       |   | Protocol and registration                                                                                                                                       |                     |
|               | 5 | Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number. | 4                   |
|               | 6 | Eligibility criteria                                                                                                                                           |                     |
|               |   | Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale. | 4-5                 |
|               | 7 | Information sources                                                                                                                                            |                     |
|               |   | Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched. | 5                   |
|               | 8 | Search                                                                                                                                                       |                     |
|               |   | Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.                             | 5                   |
|               | 9 | Study selection                                                                                                                                               |                     |
|               |   | State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).     | 5-6                 |
|               | 10| Data collection process                                                                                                                                        |                     |
|               |   | Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators. | 6-7                 |
|               | 11| Data items                                                                                                                                                   |                     |
|               |   | List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.                         |                     |
|               | 12| Risk of bias in individual studies                                                                                                                                                             |                     |
|               |   | Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis. |                     |
|               | 13| Summary measures                                                                                                                                               |                     |
|               |   | State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).                                                                              |                     |
|               | 14| Synthesis of results                                                                                                                                          |                     |
|               |   | Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I² for each meta-analysis).       | 9                   |
# PRISMA 2009 Checklist

## Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Reported on page #
--- | --- | --- | ---
Risk of bias across studies | 15 | Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies). | ---
Additional analyses | 16 | Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified. | ---

## RESULTS

### Study selection
- 17 | Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. | 7

### Study characteristics
- 18 | For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. | 8

### Risk of bias within studies
- 19 | Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). | ---

### Results of individual studies
- 20 | For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot. | 9-11

### Synthesis of results
- 21 | Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. | 9

### Risk of bias across studies
- 22 | Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). | ---

### Additional analysis
- 23 | Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). | ---

## DISCUSSION

### Summary of evidence
- 24 | Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers). | 11-14

### Limitations
- 25 | Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias). | 14

### Conclusions
- 26 | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. | 14

## FUNDING

### Funding
- 27 | Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. | 15

---

*From:* Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097
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ABSTRACT

Objectives:
The NHS has been moving towards integrated care for the best part of two decades to address the growing financial and service pressures created by an ageing population. Integrated healthcare systems (IHSs) join up health and social care services and have been established to manage the care of individuals with complex chronic conditions but with varied success. It is therefore imperative to conduct a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) to identify and understand the factors that influence their successful functioning, and ascertain the factor with the greatest influence, in order to ensure positive outcomes when establishing future IHSs.

Methods:
Articles published between 1st January 1997 - 8th March 2020 were analysed from the following six databases: Healthcare Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Nuffield Trust, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), PubMed, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Evidence and Health Systems Evidence (HSE). Those deemed relevant after title and abstract screening were procured for subsequent review of the full-text article.

Results:
Thirty-three finalised articles were analysed in this SLR to provide a comprehensive overview of the factors that influence the functioning of IHSs. Factors were stratified into six key categories: organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, leadership ability of staff, economic factors and political factors. Leadership was deemed to be the most influential factor due to its intrinsic and instrumental role in influencing the other key factors.

Conclusions:
The findings of this SLR may serve as a guide to developing tailor-made recommendations and policies that address the identified key factors and thereby improve the functioning of present and future IHSs. Furthermore, due to both its overarching influence and the inadequacy of literature in this field, there is a strong case for further research exploring leadership development specifically for IHSs.

Keywords: Integrated Care, NHS, Leadership, Organisational Culture, Workforce Management, Inter-organisational Collaboration

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This is an in-depth systematic literature review uncovering important factors that can be applied when developing policies pertinent to the effective functioning of IHSs in the NHS.
- The selection of studies was based on a specific eligibility criteria, which ensured that the articles in this study were specific to the NHS and IHSs.
- The literature search was conducted across six electronic databases enabling good breadth for selection of papers.
• 17 articles were excluded due to the full-texts being unobtainable, resulting in the possibility that important contributions on the factors influencing the success of IHSs were not considered.

INTRODUCTION

The ever-changing healthcare needs of the UK population present a constant challenge for the National Health Service (NHS). An ageing population has shifted the focus from preventing premature death due to acute illness to managing complex chronic conditions, which requires a coordinated and collaborative effort between families, carers, and the health and social care systems.[1] The growing financial and service pressures facing the NHS, which have been exacerbated further by the current COVID-19 pandemic,[2] cannot be tackled without transforming how health and social care are delivered.[3] Old models of care, which have focussed primarily on providing episodic treatment for acute illness, must be replaced with new patient-centred models that integrate health and care services to meet today’s population health needs.[1] Constant evaluation of these models is crucial to ensure the constituent organisations synergise together and fulfil the larger systemic goals of the NHS. The COVID-19 pandemic has necessitated the synergistic working resulting from integrated care in order to achieve more efficient and effective communication between organisations. Such benefits have played a vital role in the coordination of the national vaccine programme in managing COVID-19, and will undeniably be crucial in any future pandemics.

Integrated care has been a feature of NHS policy for the best part of two decades. However, despite initiatives by successive governments, system-wide integration has not yet been achieved. Progress to date has been slow and has not delivered all of the expected benefits for patients, the NHS or local authorities.[4] The term was first described in ‘The New NHS’ in 1997, and several integrated healthcare systems (IHSs) have since been introduced to join up health and social care services, such as Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) in 2017 and the current form of Integrated Care Systems (ICSs), which were introduced in the NHS Long Term Plan in 2019 and have evolved out of the set of existing network of STPs. In April 2021, all 42 parts of England were declared ICSs and, in July 2021, the government set to publish legislation proposing statutory ICSs for Parliament to consider, with implementation set for April 2022.

Rationale:

As the NHS advances further towards integrated care, it is necessary to identify and study these factors to harness the facilitators and address the barriers. While existing reviews have identified these factors acting as facilitators and barriers to implementing integrated care, there lies a gap in the literature regarding which factor is the most influential. This review aims to comprehensively identify the factors acting as facilitators and barriers to integrated care and subsequently deduce any underpinning factors that have the most influence. A broad understanding of these factors, and the factor(s) with the most influence, is needed to enable their optimisation and ensure positive outcomes when establishing future IHSs in the NHS.
Objectives:

- To comprehensively identify the factors that influence the functioning of IHSs
- To deduce any underpinning factors that have the most influence in the functioning of IHSs

BACKGROUND TO THEORY:

What is the NHS?

The National Health Service (NHS) refers to the UK’s government-funded health care system. Health services are provided ‘free at the point of delivery’, meaning that any UK resident can visit a doctor who will offer diagnosis or treatment for an illness without asking the individual for payment during or after the visit. As these health and care services are ‘publicly funded’, money has been allocated by the government to pay for this visit to the doctor through UK residents paying tax.[5]

What is Integration and Integrated Care?

Over 175 competing definitions for ‘integration’ and ‘integrated care’ exist within literature,[6] reflecting what Kodner describes as ‘an imprecise hodgepodge’. [7] Nonetheless, one of the earliest and most robust definitions from a review by Kodner and Spreeuwenberg states that:

‘Integration is a coherent set of methods and models on the funding, administrative, organisational, service delivery and clinical levels designed to create connectivity, alignment and collaboration within and between the cure and care sectors. The goal of these methods and models is to enhance quality of care and quality of life, consumer satisfaction and system efficiency for patients with complex, long term problems cutting across multiple services, providers and settings. The result of such multi-pronged efforts to promote integration for the benefit of these special patient groups is called ‘integrated care’’. [8]

In essence, ‘integration’ involves bringing organisations together with the ultimate aim of improving outcomes and service experience for patients who require access to multiple health and care services through the practice of ‘integrated care’ at various levels. There are three levels to integration: the macro level where integrated care is delivered to whole populations, the meso level where it is delivered to a particular care group or population with the same condition (e.g. heart disease), and the micro level where integrated care is delivered to individual service users and their carers.[9] In addition, integration can occur horizontally when two or more organisations or services that deliver care at a similar level come together (e.g. mergers of acute hospitals), or vertically when two or more organisations or services delivering care at differing levels come together (e.g. mergers of acute hospitals with community health services). There are also six key requirements for effective integration.[10] This includes:

- Organisation integration, where organisations are brought together by mergers and/or structural change, or virtually via contracts between separate organisations
- Functional integration, where non-clinical support and back-office functions are integrated
- Service integration, where different clinical services provided are integrated at organisational level
- Clinical integration, where patient care is integrated in a single process both within and across professions, e.g. use of shared guidelines
- Normative integration, where there exist shared values in co-ordinating work and securing collaboration in delivering healthcare
- Systemic integration, where there is coherence of rules and policies at all organisational levels

**What are Integrated healthcare systems (IHSs)?**

The term IHS has been used to denote the working together of different healthcare organisations as a single cohesive body with the aim of addressing population health needs. This encompasses STPs and ICSs, the latter of which is the latest among initiatives to integrate care in the NHS. By this definition, an ICS is an integrated healthcare system; however, integrated healthcare systems aren’t limited exclusively to ICSs and can refer to any integrated body tasked with delivering integrated care such as STPs.

**What is a Successful IHS?**

The NHS has traditionally based its definition of success on performance metrics that are specific to the production process of the NHS, which involves inputs (funding), processes (patient waiting times), and outputs (number of patients treated).[11] However, there has been a lack of emphasis placed upon the ultimate outcome, which is high quality patient care. Alongside the need to provide more holistic outcomes, as well as the NHS moving towards integrated care, a new understanding of success is required. For the purpose of this study, the success of IHSs should be defined as patients having a seamless experience across all healthcare services they interact with, reducing inefficiencies and non-value steps in the patient journey and ultimately improving outcomes at a lower cost.[1, 12]

**METHODOLOGY**

**Protocol:**
This systematic literature review (SLR) was reported using the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis) framework, which was developed according to published guidance by the EQUATOR (Enhancing the Quality and Transparency Of health Research) Network.[13]

**Eligibility criteria:**
This review will consider qualitative studies that address factors that influence the establishment and/or functioning of IHSs within the UK. The NHS has a unique organisational structure including national bodies, local clinical commissioning groups, and healthcare providers. For this reason, articles were excluded that pertain to the private health and care sector, the business
sector, and international IHSs in order to make findings specific to this unique context. Articles were limited to the English language to be legible by the authors.

This review considered literature published in the years 1997-2020, as ‘The New NHS’, published on the 8th December 1997, represents one of the earliest examples of literature calling to ‘replace the internal market with integrated care’, thereby serving as the starting point for research activity on the topic of integration in the NHS.[14]

| INCLUSION | EXCLUSION |
|-----------|-----------|
| Articles relevant to the health and care sector | Articles relevant to other sectors such as the business sector |
| Articles addressing the implementation of IHSs specifically within the UK | Articles that pertain to International IHSs with different organisational structure to the UK |
| Articles published after 1997 | Articles published prior to 1997 |
| Articles with a full-text accessible for thorough analysis | Articles that only had an accessible abstract, not allowing for comprehensive analysis |
| Articles relevant to the public health and care sector | Articles relevant to the private health and care sector |
| Articles written in the English language | Articles not written in the English language |

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for articles selected in this study

Information sources:
The search was implemented on 08/04/2020 across six electronic databases: Healthcare Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Nuffield Trust, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), PubMed, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Evidence, and Health Systems Evidence (HSE).
To supplement the comprehensive literature search, a ‘snowball’ technique was adopted, whereby the reference list for all relevant articles was scanned to identify further relevant articles.

Articles found through this literature search consisted of thought pieces as well as those which were empirically driven or peer reviewed. As a result, the contributions of each article were also assessed in accordance with the hierarchy of evidence.[15] The categorisation of these articles are detailed in Table 2.

Search:
The search strategy was developed through consensus-based discussion and agreement between all authors. The final search string was as follows:

("Integrated Health*" OR "Integrating Health*" OR "Integrated Care*") AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

The search query was tailored to the specific requirements of each database. The adapted electronic search strings for each database can be found in Appendix A.

Selection of sources of evidence:
Initially, all authors independently screened only the title and abstract (or background in white papers) of each article to preclude the waste of time and energy from reviewing full-text articles that fail to meet the eligibility criteria. To ensure consistency among all authors, a pilot screening was initially completed in which each author screened the same 200 articles independently. From this, all reviewers independently agreed on all but 4 articles; however this was resolved upon discussion to clarify the eligibility criteria, which was then amended to increase specificity and clarity. Consequently, the pilot ended in comprehensive agreement on the eligibility criteria and resulted in the reviewers having the same view on which papers should be accepted or rejected.

All articles deemed relevant after title and abstract screening were procured for subsequent review of the full-text article. The full-text articles were then assessed for eligibility and a proportion were excluded, resulting in a final selection of studies to be included in the SLR. 17 articles were unobtainable due to financial limitations restricting access to the full-text versions of abstracts that were found on database searches.

Data Extraction Chart:
The following key identifiable information was extracted from each article: the author(s), year of publication, title, database the article was retrieved from, journal, study type, DOI or URL. The articles were also stratified under the following headings: needs identified, barriers identified, facilitators identified and recommendations. The categories were identified qualitatively through the language used in articles to describe each factor, with a quantitative record of the number of mentions in each article also noted. The categories were found to be highly interdependent and therefore it must be noted that there was some overlap between them. The findings were reported in a ‘Data Extraction Chart’ table format (see Appendix B).
All authors jointly extracted the data from each article using ‘Google Sheets’, discussed the results and continuously iterated the data extraction chart. The main revision to the headings included the addition of ‘Recommendations’ as articles often framed influential factors in the form of recommended actions to improve IHSs. An interpretivist approach was then used to draw the factors that were identified from the data extraction chart into the corresponding themes and subsequently identify any underpinning factors that have the most influence in the functioning of IHSs.

**Patient and Public Involvement**

Patients or the public were not involved in the design of this study.
RESULTS:

Search Results:
The overall search resulted in 33 finalised articles to be included in the SLR. The flow of records in the search process is conveyed in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Process of identifying search results, screening, assessing for eligibility and inclusion.

Characteristics of sources of evidence:
Table 2 describes the categories into which the data from each article was inserted, accompanied by the year of publication, database and study type.

| Characteristic                                | Number (n = 33) | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| **Publication year**                          |                |                |
| 1997-2004                                     | 0              | 0.0            |
| 2005-2009                                     | 2              | 6.1            |
| 2010-2014                                     | 11             | 33.3           |
| 2014-2019                                     | 17             | 51.5           |
| >2020                                         | 3              | 9.1            |
| **Study Type**                                |                |                |
| Qualitative Study                             | 9              | 27.3           |
| Report                                        | 15             | 45.5           |
| Scoping Narrative Literature Review           | 1              | 3.0            |
| Systematic Literature Review                  | 5              | 15.2           |
| Case Study                                   | 3              | 9.1            |
| **Database**                                  |                |                |
| EMCARE                                        | 3              | 9.1            |
| HMIC                                          | 7              | 21.2           |
| BNI                                           | 1              | 3.0            |
| HSE                                           | 2              | 6.1            |
| EMBASE                                        | 1              | 3.0            |
| CINAHL                                        | 3              | 9.1            |
| Nuffield Trust                                | 6              | 18.2           |
Summary of evidence:
From 1997 to 2019, an increasing number of selected articles were published (0% in 1997-2004, 6.1% in 2005-2009, 33.3% in 2010-2014, and 51.5% in 2014-2019). This reflects the growing field of research into IHSs leading up to The NHS Long-Term Plan, influencing its strategic focus on integration.[16]

The factors that influence the functioning of IHSs were framed as needs in 27.3% of articles, barriers and facilitators in 60.6% of articles, and as recommendations in 48.5%. On the basis of the language used to describe each factor, all factors were categorised into themes.

The themes identified were:
1. Organisational Culture - an informal organisational system of shared values (i.e. what is important) and beliefs (i.e. how things work), that influence the environment and produce behavioural norms (i.e. the way we do things around here).
2. Workforce Management - the formal organisational arrangements that enable staff to carry out the tasks at hand as productively as possible.
3. Inter-organisational collaboration - the formal and informal organisational arrangements that build trust and collective relationships between organisations.
4. Leadership Ability of Staff - an informal organisational system by which one individual influences others toward attaining defined goals.
5. Economic factors - formal organisational arrangements relating to the consumption and supply of resources.
6. Political factors - formal organisational arrangements relating to the government or public affairs of a country.

See Appendix B to view the 'Data Extraction Chart' displaying the exact language used by each article to describe the identified factors, and their categorisation into each of the themes listed above. See Appendix C to view the ‘Synthesis of Results’ displaying all findings from each article stratified by the identified themes.

In this SLR of 33 articles, each factor identified influences the functioning of IHSs by either shaping their planning and implementation, or their ongoing functioning, or both. The factors...
that pertain to each stage are made clear in the summaries below. Furthermore, integration poses its own unique challenges and requires a unique set of factors to meet these challenges. The factors outlined below are described in the context of IHSs, rather than in the context of a conventional organisation. Although these themes are clearly defined, it is worth noting that they are not mutually exclusive and are highly interdependent.

**Organisational Culture**
82% of articles cited issues relating to organisational culture, including the need for leaders to communicate a shared vision to effectively plan and implement integration.[17-22] This demands a mutual understanding of and commitment to the vision across the organisations involved.[23] Differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, status inequalities, professional cultures, working practices and priorities can lead to divides between staff from different organisations, creating conflict and a ‘blame culture’ that stifles ongoing integrated working.[24-28] Fostering an ethos of learning and self-reflection was also shown to yield positive outcomes as staff continue to work together long-term.[25, 27, 29]

**Workforce Management**
Factors relating to workforce management were expressed in 76% of articles, such as the need to provide staff with adequate incentives to ‘buy into’ the integration process as the new style of working is established in the NHS.[30, 31] Healthcare staff need to be trained for the new roles they may need for integrated work,[32] and leaders must encourage staff to take ‘ownership’ of new service models as they are planned and implemented by involving them in decision making.[24, 33] Furthermore, integrating services often requires increased workloads at the start and overworking staff can reduce motivation to collaborate with other sectors, yielding high staff turnover and poorer outcomes. Therefore, managing the workload of staff is key in both the initial stages of implementation and the ongoing functioning of IHSs.[24, 26]

**Inter-organisational Collaboration**
As IHSs involve cooperation between different organisations, 70% of articles demonstrated the need for factors relating to inter-organisational collaboration to both achieve and sustain integrated care. These include: inter-professional teamwork involving both top-down and bottom-up communication,[23, 24, 34] the formation of good working relationships built on trust,[25, 34, 35] and the presence of shared information technology (IT) platforms between organisations to enable easy data-sharing.[19, 20, 23-25, 30, 36, 37] The lack of ongoing planned communication between members of partnering organisations leads to contact often being limited to emails with minimal face-to-face interaction, and was often cited as a barrier to long-term collaboration.[26]

**Leadership Ability of Staff**
82% of articles addressed leadership ability of staff, outlining that successful integration requires a combination of clear leadership and governance from senior managers at the macro level with strong involvement of frontline staff as clinical leaders at the micro level.[20, 34, 37-40] together with local authority figures acting as local leaders.[18, 24, 30, 32]
The unique challenges posed by planning and implementing integration include: high levels of pressure and stress faced by staff, high turnover of staff as personnel changes are made, and a lack of stability among the leadership workforce as their roles are adapted.[27] These challenges require leaders to support the emotional wellbeing of staff, set clear and measurable goals, identify and scale innovation from pilot programmes, and establish governance structures that drive faster change.[19, 27]

The ongoing functioning of IHSs is highly influenced by the ability of leaders to shift from organisational leadership (leading individuals within one organisation) towards ‘systems leadership’ (leading individuals across multiple organisations),[17, 29, 33, 41, 42] as well as by the capacity of leaders to act as role models and apply a high level of emotional intelligence to build high quality relationships with team members and allegiances with other leaders.[27, 33, 43]

**Economic Factors**
Economic factors, such as the reluctance of commissioning organisations to pool budgets, and low levels of funding and staff, often with inadequate training, were cited as barriers to planning and implementing integrated care in 61% of articles,[29, 31, 32] and the need to devise long-term plans with an appropriate level of funding was expressed as vital to preserve the ongoing functioning of IHSs.[17, 26] Providing a manageable caseload without overstretching human resources is also a crucial success factor for the long-term functioning of IHSs,[32] as it was in the case of Coastal Locality in Torbay and South.[34] Payment methods such as Payment by Results (PbR) that incentivise activity in hospitals over other providers and were also identified as barriers to the continued functioning of IHSs.[24]

**Political Factors**
Political barriers to the planning and implementation of IHSs were expressed in 52% of articles, examples of which include the fragmented strategic direction from national government with conflicting leadership approaches by different government entities,[31, 23, 24, 32] together with difficulties in agreeing budgets and uncertainty regarding the level of integration that is desired.[44] Furthermore, failures of policy makers to evaluate and learn from the pitfalls of existing policies and translate published evidence into political action served as barriers to the ongoing delivery of integrated care.[44]

**DISCUSSION**
After synthesising the results, the categories of factors identified were ascertained to be under the responsibility of either leaders within IHSs (organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, leadership ability of staff) or policymakers above (economic and political factors).

An interpretivist approach was employed to draw meaning from the overview of factors presented in the SLR and wider literature. This particular approach is one of social construction
as opposed to objectivity, and thus was used to analyse the various subjective perspectives of the authors within the literature.

Detailed analysis of the three core factors (organisational culture, workforce management and inter-organisational collaboration) revealed leadership to be a key driving force behind each factor. 82% of articles emphasised the importance of organisational culture, which is determined by the core values cultivated by leaders in order to establish a shared culture in which all members feel represented. Moreover, 76% of articles emphasised the importance of workforce management in IHSs. In managing the workforce, leaders should utilise compassionate leadership, moulding an environment through ‘consistently listening, understanding, empathising and helping’ staff. [45] Leaders being more enabling and facilitative of the workforce leads to increased productivity, resulting in better delivery of care and ultimately improved health outcomes for patients. The third principal factor discussed in the results is inter-organisational collaboration, discussed in 70% of articles. It can be inferred that effective leadership has the potential to create an atmosphere consistent with achieving a common goal by cooperating effectively with other organisations. However, IHSs carry a lot of ‘uncertainty and ambiguity’, [46] which further stresses the need for a leader to create a network of trust and communicate a shared vision across multiple organisations.[47]

As a result, leadership was deemed to be the most influential factor in determining the success of IHSs due to its intrinsic and instrumental role in influencing the other three key factors, as depicted in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: The underpinning role of leadership in influencing other key factors in integrated care

Both Charles et al. and Tweed et al. argued the need for ‘systems leadership’ over ‘organisational leadership’ to implement the system-wide change required for integrated care.[17, 33] Charles et al. describes that systems leadership requires leaders to create a positive organisational culture by ‘communicating(a) shared vision and purpose’; they need to manage their workforce through ‘frequent personal contact with others and resolving conflicts’, and they need to facilitate organisational collaboration by ‘building(trust and rapport with partner organisations to move away from competition and towards forming long-term collaborative relationships’. [17]

Tweed et al. developed on this further by introducing a model of ‘connecting’ (Figure 3) to create an allegiance based upon qualitative research involving the active participation of leaders achieving transformational change. The responsibilities of leaders are included in this model: leading with ‘purpose’ and ‘vision’, shaping organisational culture, and managing the workforce in a ‘relational’ manner ‘through practice’ by collaborating between organisations, which correspond with the key themes identified in the results. [33]

Figure 3: Visual representation of the ‘Connecting’ model [33]
It has been suggested that the successful implementation of integrated care has improved certain patient outcomes, such as hospital admission rates, length of hospital stay and patient satisfaction.[48, 49] It can therefore be inferred that strong leadership in IHSs is extremely valuable in the delivery of high quality healthcare to patients. However, the relationship between integrated care and the long lasting outcomes on patient health requires further follow-up and research.[48]

It is important to note that collaboration between multiple healthcare bodies requires leaders to work with numerous organisational cultures. For example, in a study by Smith et al., there are clear differences in the culture between healthcare and social care bodies, which create two distinct uni-professional cultures. These are two key aspects that integrated care aims to converge, through the use of inter-organisational collaboration.[50]

Another responsibility of leaders in IHSs is to effectively implement a clear governance system that creates an overarching structure overseeing the functioning of IHSs. This is necessary in creating order, accountability, and setting a clear direction in a relatively recent healthcare structure that lacks a distinct ‘rule book’,[51] thereby ensuring that integrated operations are sustained long-term.

The SLR also identified economic and political factors to be crucial in the function of IHSs. These were interpreted to be largely in the hands of governments and policy makers who determine the strategic direction of integration, resource availability, and payment mechanisms. The capacity to amend these factors is relatively inflexible, while leadership and its overarching factors can be optimised despite any systemic economic and political constraints. Thus, leadership is not only the most influential factor, but also the factor with the greatest capacity to be influenced. However, leadership cannot be changed overnight and requires the development of leadership skills in healthcare staff from the beginning of their careers, as well as the removal of bad leaders and the appointment of more qualified leaders, which can be highly disruptive to IHSs initially. Furthermore, the collaboration needed between all leaders within IHSs necessitates an extended period of time to develop, resulting in a gradual change in functioning rather than a quick fix.

Furthermore, a gap lies in this field of literature. Evans et al. noted that, while ‘Leadership Approach’ and ‘Clinician Engagement and Leadership’ are among the most important capabilities shaping the capacity of organisations to implement integrated care, they have not been consistently studied.[38] As such, there is much value to be gained by undertaking further research to explore deeper the role leadership plays in influencing its attributed factors.

**LIMITATIONS**

When analysing the selected full-text articles, the authors found issues discussed in literature to be multi-faceted, leading to overlap between the factors identified when synthesising the results. Interpretation and categorisation of these factors may have been subject to individual bias.
17 articles were excluded from this study due to the full-texts being unobtainable. These were excluded after title and abstract screening, resulting in a proportion of papers and their contribution on factors influencing IHSs being forgone and thus limiting the extent of the SLR. Therefore, it is recommended that future researchers invest in payments to journals to be given access to the full scope of articles.

Due to the evolving nature of IHSs there is an inevitable lack of widespread IHS-related terminology across literature. As a result it is likely that relevant studies were missed during the search process reducing the breadth of information available for analysis.

In addition, the inclusion of grey literature in the search uncovered challenges such as the lack of extensive search tools for these papers which resulted in web searching- a method that is not as thorough as the use of databases.

7 of the search terms may have distorted results as they were new concepts and can be referred to by multiple names.

CONCLUSION
This SLR presented an overview of a multitude of key factors that influence the functioning of IHSs in the NHS relating to organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, the leadership ability of staff, economic and political factors. Within ICSs in the NHS, ‘system leadership’ was found to be vital to achieve the transformational change required to integrate care and meet the ideals of The NHS Long Term Plan.[16] This is a concept that has been identified in other articles - underlining that leaders in healthcare must develop more in the domains of collaborative working and coalition.[52]

The current available literature includes material which discusses the ideal implementation of integrated healthcare, such as the work from Jon Glasby and Helen Dickinson who explore specific challenges related to delivering integrated care.[53] However, the shift of the NHS towards integrated healthcare is an ongoing narrative and the findings of this SLR provide a topical review of the literature. This will help to better contextualise the current state of IHSs and act as a key steppingstone towards the development of tailor-made recommendations and policies to address and optimise these factors within present and future IHSs in the NHS. In addition, there is a strong case for further research exploring leadership development, due to its underpinning influence on the other categories of factors and the identified gap within the literature that pertains to this field.

Acknowledgement Statement
We would like to express our gratitude to Colin Love, our supervisor, for his clarity of thought and intellectual challenge at every stage of our development. A special thank you is also extended to Anant Jani, for his guidance, support and philosophical ideologies that gave deeper meaning to our work.
**Contributorship Statement**
All authors contributed their thoughts in the formulation of the research idea. AT, RE and MS were involved in researching the background to the study. Findings were relayed to the fellow authors to ensure mutual understanding of core foundational concepts. Following this AT, RE and MS wrote up the introduction and background to theory. Objectives were formulated by MJ, KB, WP and VS. This was discussed with the rest of the team and further finalised.

RE and MS designed the study protocol and made suggestions for initial search criteria for selection of studies. This was finalised during a whole group discussion. All authors contributed to the data extraction chart and continuously iterated throughout this process. KB, MJ and VS led the process of grouping factors identified from the studies into key themes.

MS, VS, AT, MJ and KB wrote up the summaries of the findings from the data extraction chart in the results section. RE and WP assimilated the characteristics of the studies into a summary table (Table 2).

All authors contributed content for the discussion section. This section was written up by AT, VS, MJ, WP and RE.

KB and MS identified limitations and discussed with the group. KB and MS further proceeded to write up the limitations section.

Authors congregated to discuss the main conclusions drawn from the study. AT and WP proceeded to write this up.

All authors read through the entire draft to underline potential changes. These were then implemented by MJ, VS, MS, WP and AT. The final draft, with changes, was looked over again by RE and KB before submission. All authors were in agreeance of the final product.

**Joint First Authorship Statement**
KB, RE, MJ, WP, VS, MS, AT contributed equally to this paper.

**Data Availability Statement**
Data is available in Supplementary Materials

Contact corresponding author for further information.

**Ethics Approval Statement**
In this Systematic Literature Review, deeply personal, sensitive, or confidential information from participants was not collected. The review was completed using publicly accessible documents as evidence and therefore institutional ethics approval was not sought before the commencement of this review.
Competing Interests
None Declared

Funding
None

References

1. Ham C, Imison C, Goodwin N, Dixon A, South P. The case for integrated care. 2011;19.
2. Ward S. NHS Covid costs are more than £1bn a month [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Jul 24]. Available from: https://www.hfma.org.uk/news-news-list/Article/nhs-covid-costs-are-more-than-1bn-a-month
3. NHS. Five Year Forward View [Internet]. NHS; 2014 [cited 2020 Dec 12] p. 41. Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/5yfv-web.pdf
4. Department of Health. Health and social care integration [Internet]. National Audit Office; 2017 p. 56. Available from: https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Health-and-social-care-integration.pdf
5. What is the NHS? [Internet]. Full Fact. 12:02:44+00:00 [cited 2021 Jul 24]. Available from: https://fullfact.org/health/what-is-the-nhs/
6. Armitage GD, Suter E, Oelke ND, Adair CE. Health systems integration: state of the evidence. Int J Integr Care [Internet]. 2009 Jun 17 [cited 2020 Dec 12];9(2). Available from: http://www.ijic.org/article/10.5334/ijic.316/
7. Kodner D. All Together Now: A Conceptual Exploration of Integrated Care. Healthc Q. 2009 Oct 15;13(Sp):6–15.
8. Kodner DL, Spreeuwenberg C. Integrated care: meaning, logic, applications, and implications – a discussion paper. Int J Integr Care [Internet]. 2002 Nov 14 [cited 2020 Dec 12];2(4). Available from: http://www.ijic.org/article/10.5334/ijic.67/
9. Curry, N., Ham, C., 2010. Clinical and service integration. The route to improved outcomes. The King’s Fund.
10. Fulop N, Protopsaltis G, King A, Allen P, Hutchings A, Normand C. Changing organisations: a study of the context and processes of mergers of health care providers in England. Social Science & Medicine. 2005 Jan 1;60(1):119–30.
11. Appleby J, Devlin N. MEASURING NHS SUCCESS [Internet]. Kings fund; 2005. Available from: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/field/field_publication_file/measuring-nhs-success-patients-views-health-outcomes-help-manage-performance-john-appleby-nancy-devlin-kings-fund-1-january-2005.pdf
12. Fillingham D. Can lean save lives? Bowerman J, editor. Leadersh Health Serv. 2007 Jan 1;20(4):231–41.
13. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement | The EQUATOR Network [Internet]. [cited 2020 Dec 12]. Available from: https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/prisma/
14. The Department of Health. The new NHS: modern, dependable ; presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Health by Command of Her Majesty [Internet].
London: The Stationery Office Ltd; 1997 [cited 2020 Dec 12]. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/266003/newnhs.pdf

15. Yetley EA, MacFarlane AJ, Greene-Finestone LS, Garza C, Ard JD, Atkinson SA, et al. Options for basing Dietary Reference Intakes (DRIs) on chronic disease endpoints: report from a joint US-/Canadian-sponsored working group. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 2017 Jan 1;105(1):249S-285S.

16. nhs-long-term-plan-version-1.2.pdf [Internet]. [cited 2020 Dec 12]. Available from: https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/nhs-long-term-plan-version-1.2.pdf

17. Charles A, Wenzel L, Kershaw M, Ham SC, Walsh N. A year of integrated care systems: reviewing the journey so far [Internet]. The King’s Fund; 2018 [cited 2020 Dec 12] p. 112. Available from: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/year-integrated-care-systems

18. González-Ortiz LG, Calciolari S, Goodwin N, Stein V. The Core Dimensions of Integrated Care: A Literature Review to Support the Development of a Comprehensive Framework for Implementing Integrated Care. Int J Integr Care. 2018 Aug 8;18(3):10.

19. Mackie S, Darvill A. Factors enabling implementation of integrated health and social care: a systematic review. Br J Community Nurs. 2016 Feb 2;21(2):82–7.

20. Maruthappu M, Hasan A, Zeltner T. Enablers and Barriers in Implementing Integrated Care. Health Syst Reform. 2015 May 19;1(4):250–6.

21. Rosen R, Mountford J, Lewis G, Lewis R, Shand J, Shaw S. Integration in action: four international case studies. Res Rep. 2011;56.

22. Shaw S, Levenson R. Towards integrated care in Trafford [Internet]. Nuffield Trust; 2011 [cited 2020 Dec 12] p. 32. Available from: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/towards-integrated-care-in-trafford-web-final.pdf

23. Maslin_Prothero SE, Bennion AE. Integrated team working: a literature review. Int J Integr Care [Internet]. 2010 Apr 30 [cited 2020 Dec 12];10(2). Available from: http://www.ijic.org/article/10.5334/ijic.529/

24. Erens B, Wistow G, Mounier-Jack S, Douglas N, Jones L, Manacorda T, et al. Early evaluation of the Integrated Care and Support Pioneers Programme [Internet]. 2017 p. 183. Available from: https://piru.ac.uk/assets/files/Early_evaluation_of_IC_Pioneers_Final_Report.pdf

25. Ling T, Brereton L, Conklin A, Newbould J, Roland M. Barriers and facilitators to integrating care: experiences from the English Integrated Care Pilots. Int J Integr Care [Internet]. 2012 Jul 27 [cited 2020 Dec 12];12(5). Available from: http://www.ijic.org/articles/abstract/10.5334/ijic.982/

26. Naqvi D, Malik A, Al-Zubaidy M, Naqvi F, Tahir A, Tarfiee A, et al. The general practice perspective on barriers to integration between primary and social care: a London, United Kingdom-based qualitative interview study. BMJ Open. 2019 Aug;9(8):e029702.

27. NHS Leadership Academy. Leadership in Integrated Care Systems [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Dec 12]. Available from: https://www.scie.org.uk/files/integrated-care/leadership/systems/leadership-in-integrated-care-systems.pdf
28. Smith J, Wistow G, Holder H, Gaskins M. Evaluating the design and implementation of the whole systems integrated care programme in North West London: why commissioning proved (again) to be the weakest link. BMC Health Serv Res. 2019 Apr 15;19(1):228.

29. Wistow G, Gaskins M, Holder H, Smith J. Why Implementing Integrated Care is so much harder than designing it: experience in North West London. England. Int J Integr Care. 2016 Dec 16;16(6):A308.

30. Goodwin N, Smith J. The Evidence Base for Integrated Care [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2020 Dec 12]. Available from: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/Evidence-base-integrated-care2.pdf

31. Urizar E, Nuño R, Alvarez C, Concepción F, Blay C, Quiroga A. Barriers and facilitators for the implementation of Integrated Care Pathways ICPs: a systemic perspective. Int J Integr Care. 2018 Oct 23;18(s2):131.

32. Harnagea H, Couturier Y, Shrivastava R, Girard F, Lamothe L, Bedos CP, et al. Barriers and facilitators in the integration of oral health into primary care: a scoping review. BMJ Open. 2017 Sep;7(9):e016078.

33. Tweed A, Singfield A, Taylor JRA, Gilbert L, Mount P. Creating allegiance: leading transformational change within the NHS. BMJ Lead. 2018 Sep;2(3):110–4.

34. Asthana S, Gradinger F, Elston J, Martin S, Byng R. Capturing the Role of Context in Complex System Change: An Application of the Canadian Context and Capabilities for Integrating Care (CCIC) Framework to an Integrated Care Organisation in the UK. Int J Integr Care. 2020 Feb 11;20(1):4.

35. Best S. Facilitating integrated delivery of services across organisational boundaries: Essential enablers to integration. Br J Occup Ther. 2017 May;80(5):302–9.

36. Goodwin N, Smith J, Davies A, Perry C, Rosen R, Dixon J, et al. Integrated care for patients and populations: Improving outcomes by working together. 2012;20.

37. NHS Future Forum [Internet]. [cited 2020 Dec 12]. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213748/dh_127540.pdf

38. Evans J, Daub S, Goldhar J, Purbhoo AW and D. Leading Integrated Health and Social Care Systems: Perspectives from Research and Practice [Internet]. Vol. 18, Healthcare Quarterly. 2016 [cited 2020 Dec 12]. Available from: https://www.longwoods.com/content/24553/healthcare-quarterly/leading-integrated-health-and-social-care-systems-perspectives-from-research-and-practice

39. Gleave R. Across the pond–lessons from the US on integrated healthcare [Internet]. Nuffield Trust; 2009 Nov [cited 2020 Dec 12]. Available from: http://www.ijic.org/article/10.5334/ijic.504/

40. Ham C, Smith J, Eastmure E. Commissioning integrated care in a liberated NHS [Internet]. Nuffield Trust; 2011 [cited 2020 Dec 12] p. 68. Available from: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/1484821582_commissioning-integrated-care-in-a-liberated-nhs-report-web-final.pdf

41. Wilkins. An allied approach to success in Oldham. 2020 [cited 2020 Dec 12]; Available from: https://www.themj.co.uk/An-allied-approach-to-success-in-Oldham/216693#
42. Deffenbaugh J. Becoming an integrated (accountable) care system. Br J Healthc Manag. 2018 Apr 2;24(4):175–80.
43. Paice E, Hasan S. Educating for integrated care. Lond J Prim Care. 2013 Apr 7;5(1):52–5.
44. Raus K, Mortier E, Eeckloo K. Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care. BMC Health Serv Res. 2020 Dec;20(1):130.
45. Carson D, Gilmore A, Perry C, Gronhaug K. Qualitative Marketing Research [Internet]. 1 Oliver's Yard, 55 City Road, London England EC1Y 1SP United Kingdom: SAGE Publications, Ltd; 2001 [cited 2021 Jul 24]. Available from: http://methods.sagepub.com/book/qualitative-marketing-research-carson
46. Fillingham D, Weir B. System Leadership: Lessons and learning from AQuA’s Integrated Care Discovery Communities. :47.
47. Thakrar SV, Bell D. Sustainability and transformation plans: translating the perspectives. Br J Hosp Med. 2017 Oct 2;78(10):580–3.
48. Liljas AEM, Brattström F, Burström B, Schön P, Agerholm J. Impact of Integrated Care on Patient-Related Outcomes Among Older People – A Systematic Review. Int J Integr Care. 19(3):6.
49. Baxter S, Johnson M, Chambers D, Sutton A, Goyder E, Booth A. The effects of integrated care: a systematic review of UK and international evidence. BMC Health Services Research. 2018 May 10;18(1):350.
50. Smith T, Davis SF, Nancarrow S, Ariss S, Enderby P. Towards a theoretical framework for Integrated Team Leadership (IgTL). Journal of Interprofessional Care. 2020 Nov 1;34(6):726–36.
51. Matthew Kershaw. Developing governance to support integrated care: a bumpy ride? [Internet]. The King’s Fund. 2018 [cited 2021 Jul 24]. Available from: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/blog/2018/10/developing-governance-support-integrated-care-bumpy-ride
52. Curry LA, Ayedun AA, Cherlin EJ, Allen NH, Linnander EL. Leadership development in complex health systems: a qualitative study. BMJ Open. 2020 Apr 1;10(4):e035797.
53. Curreri NA. Partnership Working in Health and Social Care. Int J Integr Care. 19(2):12.
Figure 1: Process of identifying search results, screening, assessing for eligibility and inclusion.
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Figure 2: The underpinning role of leadership in influencing other key factors in integrated care
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Figure 3: Visual representation of the ‘Connecting’ model [33]

92x87mm (72 x 72 DPI)
Appendix A: Search Strings

**HMIC:**

(“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 2000 - Current

**Nuffield Trust:**

(“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits:

Years: 1997-2020

Content Type: Report, Journal Article

**CINAHL:**

NHS AND (“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: December 1997 - April 2020, English Language

**PubMed:**

NHS AND (“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 08/12/1997-08/04/2020, English Language

**NICE Evidence:**

NHS AND (“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 2000-2020
HSE:

("Integrated Health" OR "Integrating Health" OR "Integrated Care") AND (Factor OR Perform OR Success OR Fail)

Limits: 2000-2020
### Appendix B: Data Extraction Chart

| Author | Year of Publication | Title | Database | Journal | Study Type | DOI/URL | Needs Identified | Barriers Identified | Facilitators Identified | Recommendations |
|--------|---------------------|-------|----------|---------|------------|---------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Alison Tweed, Andrew Singfield, Julia RA Taulor, Lucy Gilbert, Paul Mount | 2018 | Creating Allegiance: Leading transformational change within the NHS | EMCA RE | BMJ Leader | Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.1136/leader-2018-000088 | | | | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders should be non-partisan integrators rather than assign themselves to an organisation - have an allegiance to the system. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders should build high quality relationships involving emotional intelligence and positive role modelling. 3) Organisational Culture - Shared visions (espoused theories) need to be outlined and translated into everyday practice and visions of previous leaders or schemes must be erased. 4) Workforce Management - Connecting through practice: involving frontline staff and all stakeholders in decisions and key pieces of the transformation to integrated care. |
| Anna Charles, Lillie Wenzel, Matthew Kershaw, Chris Ham, Nicola Walsh | 2018 | A Year of Integrated Care Systems: Reviewing the journey so far | N/A - Snowball | The King's Fund | Report | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/2018-09/Yea r-of-integrat ed-care-systems.pdf | 1) Political - The legislative context does not support system working. 2) Political - Regulation and oversight is not aligned. 3) Organisational Culture - A legacy of competitive behaviours. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Collaborative relationships. 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Partnerships with local authorities. 3) Organisational Culture - Shared vision and purpose. 4) Organisational Culture - A meaningful local identity. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Invest in building collaborative relationships at all levels of the system. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Promote and value system leadership. 3) Workforce Management - Integrate at different levels of the system, |
|   | Inter-organisational Collaboration | Organisational Culture | Economic | Workforce Management |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------|----------------------|
| 1 | Inadequate collaboration continues to result in poor quality, efficiency and effectiveness of care. | Culture of impatience and cynicism. | Leaders face competing demands. | Inadequate workforce planning. |
| 2 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved. | System leadership. | Clinical leadership and engagement. | Clinical leadership and engagement. |
| 3 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Establishing models of integrated working. | System leadership. | Stability of local finances and performance. | System-wide capabilities to gather, share and act on public insights. |
| 4 | To further research specific policy analysis domains, i.e. investigate policy formation, policy implementation or service delivery outcomes in integrated or co-ordinated health and social care services. | Building up from places and neighbourhoods. | A permissive and supportive national programme. | Develop active strategies to facilitate wider adoption of new care models. |
| 5 | To further research specific policy analysis domains, i.e. investigate policy formation, policy implementation or service delivery outcomes in integrated or co-ordinated health and social care services. | Building up from places and neighbourhoods. | A permissive and supportive national programme. | Develop robust evaluation into the ICS programme that supports learning and improvement and measures progress. |

Axel Kaehne, Alison J Petch, Robin Stewart Miller

2017
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DOI: 10.1108/JICA-12-2016-0049
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5) Political - Complex governance arrangements. | 6) Economic - Difficulties in agreeing budgets. | 7) Political - Lack of understanding of what the drivers and essential requirements are for successful integration between health and social care and how to use policy to steer care organisations through this change.
1) Political - Pressure by national and local policy-makers to demonstrate the success of new integration initiatives at a stage too early in the programme's implementation.

2) Economic - Acute/community trusts or social services departments suffered from significant financial deficit and were subject to 'special measures', which diverted senior management attention away from Pioneer activity.

3) Economic - The growing demand for costly A&E services by patients at a time when integration seeks to reduce usage - diverts resources and slows the pace of transformation.

4) Political - Strategic direction from the national government is fragmented. Differences in approach: DCLG reportedly favouring more locally devolved responsibility, while DH/NHSE adopt a more 'command and control' approach.

5) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Building and maintaining good working relationships across organisations and professions at all levels built on trust, so that people could speak frankly, come to understand each other's perspectives, and develop a shared vision and understanding of what the Pioneer was aiming to achieve.

6) Workforce Management - Experienced staff.

7) Economic - Uncommitted funding.

1) Organisational Culture - Trust and shared values that are largely developed locally.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Being part of a national Pioneer programme, which provided an impetus for local professionals to work together to improve care locally.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated information system between organisations to enable sharing of patient/service user records or having suitable facilities for cross-agency and/or multi-disciplinary teams.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Being part of a national Pioneer programme, which provided an impetus for local professionals to work together to improve care locally.

5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Good leadership and vision was also identified as critical at all levels from local authority councillors through to senior managers, supported by appropriate governance structures.

6) Workforce Management - Experienced staff.

7) Economic - Uncommitted funding.
looking at individual organisations.

6) Workforce Management - Integration was less of a priority where stakeholders had urgent competing demands (e.g. meeting 4-hour waiting time A&E targets).

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Some Pioneers were very complex with a large number of stakeholders and/or a large geographic footprint, which made partnership working more complex in terms of size, communication, governance, etc.

8) Collaboration between Organisation - Inadequate local engagement/buy-in of the independent, community and voluntary sectors, in part, because they were often required to compete against each other for contracts, making working together particularly challenging.

9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inadequate local engagement/buy-in of the mental health sector, due in part to the legacy of underfunding and 'Cinderella' status of the sector.

10) Inter-organisational Collaboration - In some Pioneers with multiple partners, a sense that

8) Workforce Management - Staff involvement in developing integration initiatives and encouraging their 'ownership' of new service models.

9) Political - Supportive legislation.

10) Workforce Management - Local champions.

11) Workforce Management - Collecting the right information/indicators so that impact/success can be measured and visible to staff, patients/service users and the local population.

12) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Co-location of operational teams facilitated communication and partnership working between different professionals.

13) Organisational Culture - Freedom to try things out, not having a 'culture of blame' if things go wrong, and piloting new initiatives and sharing the learning before roll-out. Reassuring staff so they 'feel safe' in the face of change.
transformation could happen only at the pace of the ‘slowest’, most conservative or risk averse stakeholder.

11) Economic - PbR incentives for acute providers to increase activity against providing more care outside hospital.

12) Economic - Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a larger one.

13) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Information sharing was seen as critical, but the level of integration of information and intelligence needed was technically difficult to achieve across multiple IT platforms and with obstructive information governance regulations.

14) Organisational Culture - Differences between the health and social care sectors in terms of language and conceptions of health and wellbeing, professional cultures and working practices.

15) Organisational Culture - Different priorities between professions: e.g. the people of most concern to social workers were not
necessarily the same as those of most concern to GPs.

16) Organisational Culture - 'Blame culture' within and across local health and social care sectors located responsibility for failures in integration elsewhere in the system.

17) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of agreement on priorities among local system leaders.

18) Workforce Management - Multiple challenges of engaging frontline staff

19) Organisational Culture - Scepticism about NHS initiatives that had previously been seen to 'come and go'.

20) Organisational Culture - Previous initiatives did not live up to expectations leading to demoralisation.

21) Workforce Management - Difficulties recruiting staff particularly in certain areas of the country.

22) Workforce Management - High staff turnover (especially following health care reforms) negatively affected longer-term strategic planning and
service provision aiming for integration.

23) Organisational Culture - Promoting a 'play-it-safe' work culture can be detrimental to 'barrier busting'.

24) Existing approaches to training professionals do not produce trainees equipped for integrated working, and not enough trainees to meet demand.
| Year   | Authors                          | Title                                                                 | Journal          | URL                                                                 | Notes                                                                 |
|--------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2020   | Carolyn Wilkins                 | An Allied Approach to Success in Oldham                               | HMIC Municipal Journal Qualitative Study | URL: https://www.themj.co.uk/An-allied-approach-to-success-in-Oldham/216693# | 1) Political - Co-operative council with an understanding of communities which helps to target resources and further develop interventions. 2) Organisational Culture - Positive and trusting relationships. 3) Organisational Culture - A culture of innovation, creativity and empowerment and not micro-management based on old fashioned contractual approaches. 4) Intrinsic value of leadership - System leaders who work together to support frontline practitioners to overcome bureaucratic barriers. |
| 2011   | Chris Ham, Judith Smith and Elizabeth Eastmure | Commissioning integrated care in a liberated NHS                      | Nuffield Trust Report URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/commissioning-integrated-care-in-a-liberated-nhs | | 1) Economic - Needs assessment and service specification is time, effort and resource consuming. 1) Economic - Using PMS and APMS contracts to facilitate payments. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Managerial leadership in combination with clinician leadership. |
| Year | Authors | Title | Journal | DOI |
|------|---------|-------|---------|-----|
| 2019 | Danial Naqvi, Anam Malik, Mohaimen Al-Zubaidy, Falak Naqvi, Anas Tahir, Ali Tarfiee, Sarina Vara, and Edgar Meyer | The general practice perspective on barriers to integration between primary and social care: a London, United Kingdom-based qualitative interview study | EMBASE  | DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029702 |

1) Workforce Management - Lack of awareness of roles and services: uncertainty about which roles are carried out by which social service provider and how best to contact these individuals.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Often numbers in practice diaries and on websites are out of date, so staff have to ask the patient directly what social care they receive and how to contact relevant departments, slowing down both communication and any attempts at collaborative working.

3) Workforce Management - Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Communication between primary care and social care is logistically challenging, as doctors are busy with patients during the day and social care staff are working in the community, making joint conversations about patients nearly impossible.
5) Organisational Culture - All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of regular contact: most GPs and PMs explained regular contact with social care teams is necessary for effective information transfer and a multidisciplinary approach to patient care. However, currently, contact is through forms and emails with minimal face-to-face contact, which professionals find inefficient and a barrier to continuity of care.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inefficient MDT meetings.

8) Economic - Low staffing levels.

9) Workforce Management - Inadequate training of staff.
10) Economic - Insufficient funding.
11) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Interoperability between information systems: the lack of shared information systems.
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E Paice, S Hasan | 2013 | Educating for Integrated Care | PubMed | London Journal of Primary Care | Report | DOI: 10.1080/17571472.2013.1149374 |
| 1) Organisational Culture - The need to develop a culture in which people are comfortable and competent in working across organisational boundaries to serve the needs of patients more effectively and strive continuously to improve the quality of care. | 1) Organisational Culture - The need to develop a culture in which people are comfortable and competent in working across organisational boundaries to serve the needs of patients more effectively and strive continuously to improve the quality of care. |
| 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Staff working within integrated care must have (or develop) emotional intelligence and empathy in dealing with patients and users, be willing to work in teams with shared accountability, and be prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care. | 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Staff working within integrated care must have (or develop) emotional intelligence and empathy in dealing with patients and users, be willing to work in teams with shared accountability, and be prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care. |
| 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Financial incentives do not encourage collaboration. | 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Financial incentives do not encourage collaboration. |
| 4) Organisational Culture - Lack of shared accountability. | 4) Organisational Culture - Lack of shared accountability. |
| 8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Local leaders who are supportive of integration. | 8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Local leaders who are supportive of integration. |
| 9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Effective and complementary communications and IT systems. | 9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Effective and complementary communications and IT systems. |
| 10) Political - Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes. | 10) Political - Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes. |
| Year | Authors | Title | Journal | DOI |
|------|---------|-------|---------|-----|
| 2018 | Elena Urizar, Roberto Nuño, Caridad Alvarez, Fernández Concepción, Carles Blay, Andrea Quiroga | Barriers and facilitators for the implementation of Integrated Care Pathways ICPs: a systemic perspective | International Journal of Integrated Care | 10.5334/ijic.s2131 |
| 2016 | Gerald Wistow, Matt Gaskins, Holly Holder, Judith Smith | Why implementing integrated care is so much harder than designing it: experience in North West London. | International Journal of Integrated Care | http://doi.org/10.5334/ijic.2856 |

1) Organisational Culture - At macro level there is a general lack of strategic vision towards integrated care from a systems perspective.
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - At meso level, the historical fragmentation of organizations poses a strong challenge towards care coordination.
3) Intrinsic value of leadership - At the micro level a lack of clinical leadership and buy-in hinders the needed multidisciplinary and collaborative work.
4) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Better Information Systems.
5) Organisational Culture - Strategic Alignment.
6) Workforce Management - Improving data collection, continuous monitoring and evaluation, feedback looping to professionals.
7) Workforce Management - Incentives and training healthcare professionals in communication and teamwork skills.
|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Securing data-sharing and information governance. |
| 4) Economic - Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives. |
| 5) Workforce Management - Maintaining acute provider viability while reducing hospital admissions. |
| 6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Balancing competition and collaboration. |

Gwyn Bevan; Katharina Janus

2011

Why hasn't integrated health care developed widely in the United States and not at all in England?

PubMe d Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law. Report DOI: 10.1215/50381 6878-1191135

1) Workforce Management - Governance by hierarchy (ownership) or a mode that is close to a hierarchy (through long-term contractual relationships).

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Full integration compared with arrangements of different autonomous insurers and providers reduces costs of information, negotiation, contracting, control, and adaptation and is hence more efficient.

3) Economic - Finance by capitation. Payment per member for coverage for all care provided by the IHCDS (typically in an annual contract with monthly payments), as the principal reimbursement method acts as a powerful pricing strategy that generates substantial savings.
4) Economic - A commitment to cost control and high-quality care.

5) Workforce Management - Good management and information systems. In a well-organized IHCDs, tight management controls its bureaucratic costs (which can otherwise result in hierarchy failure), sophisticated data management enables it to react quickly to developments in health care and markets, and standardisation in care management facilitates health care provision and thereby economises on transaction costs.

6) Workforce Management - Durability and size.

| Hermina Harnagea, Yves Couturier, Richa Shrivastava, Felix Girard, Lise Lamotte, Christophe Pierre Bedos, Elham Emami | 2017 | Barriers and facilitators in the integration of oral health into primary care: a scoping review | HMIC Open Scoping Review | DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016078 | 1) Political - Lack of political leadership and healthcare policies and a poor understanding of the population and low prioritisation on the political agenda as well the absence of appropriate policies at the macro level.

2) Economic - The cost of integrated services, human resources issues (workload of personnel, staff turnover, time constraints and scarcity of various trained human resources such as care coordinators, public health workforce and allied professionals) and deficient administrative infrastructure (the absence of health records, cross-organisational collaboration - Geographical, etc.)

3) Workforce Management - Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management (including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)) and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference).

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Geographical

1) Economic - Supportive policies and resource allocation: financial support from governments, stakeholders and non-profit organisations at the macro level.

2) Workforce Management - Interprofessional education.

3) Workforce Management - Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management (including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)) and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference).

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Geographical
1) Workforce Management - Basic Structures and Design: Physical Structures, Human and Material Resources, Organizational Design, Governance, Accountability, and Information Technology.

2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leadership and Strategy: Leadership Approach, Clinician Engagement and Leadership, Strategic Focus on Improvement, proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.

3) Workforce Management - Discipline-oriented education and lack of competencies.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of continuity of care and services: unstructured mechanism for care coordination at the micro level and lack of practice guidelines and types of practice at the meso level. Discontinuity in the integrated care process associated with poor referral systems, deficient interface and poor connection between public health section, primary care and academic institutions.

5) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.

6) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader in building teamwork and communities' capacities.

| Jenna M. Evans, Agnes Grudniewicz, G. Ross Baker, Walter P. Wodchis | Organization and Capabilities for Integrating Care: A Framework for Improvemen t | HSE | Internation al Journal of Integrate d Care | Systematic Literature Review | DOI: 10.533 4/ijic.24 16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2016 | | | | | |
### Organisational Culture - Social and Psychological Context:

1. **Readiness for Change,** Organisational Culture, and Work Environment.

2. Inter-organisational Collaboration - Processes: Partnering, Teamwork, Delivering Care, and Improving Quality.

### Intrinsic Value of Leadership

1. System leadership is harder than organisational leadership - there are conflicting performance measures.

2. Leaders need to see the larger picture, be more reflective and shift focus from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future.

3. Leaders understanding the motivation of partners enabling unconditional commitment, collective ownership - debts, income etc.

### Intrinsic Value of Leadership

1. Stop clashes and set a common goal (no PBR from NHSI conflicting with CCGs from NHSE) - end artificial divides.

2. Long-term perspective needs to be maintained and the stakeholders must be motivated.

3. Leadership roles must change to become facilitators of change (no more competition).
| 8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders who get along. |
|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Judith Smith, Gerald Wistow, Holly Holder & Matthew Gaskins |
| Evaluating the design and implementation of the whole systems integrated care programme in North West London: why commissioning proved (again) to be the weakest link. |
| BMC Health Services Research |
| Systematic Literature Review |
| DOI: 10.1186/s12913-019-4013-5. |
| 1) Organisational Culture - Social and cultural differences including those related to knowledge, organisation and power. |
| 2) Political - The Health and Social Care Act 2012 re-emphasised the role of competition and implicitly encouraged more extensive use of for-profit and third sector providers alongside mainstream NHS-managed services. Yet there has been a parallel emphasis on collaboration and integration so Commissioners have therefore had to explore ways of balancing apparently contradictory pressures: to promote provider competition through contracting and procurement, while simultaneously securing collaborative service delivery through strategic purchasing. |
| 1) Workforce Management - Define specifically what changes to services are intended. |
| 2) Workforce Management - Convene stakeholders to plan for and support implementation continuously. |
| 3) Workforce Management - See outcomes as something for which commissioners and providers are jointly accountable. |
| Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care | Kasper Raus, Eric Mortier & Kristof Eeckloo | Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care | Kasper Raus, Eric Mortier & Kristof Eeckloo | Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care | Kasper Raus, Eric Mortier & Kristof Eeckloo |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1) Political - Conceptual** challenges: lack of clarity on what constitutes integrated care. When drafting and implementing integrated care, there are three fundamental questions that should be considered by every policymaker: (1) how the integration will be organised; (2) what kind of integration is intended; (3) what outcome is intended. Because of the conceptual complexity and ideological choices, it is particularly difficult to determine when and to what degree integration of care is a success. |
| **2) Political - Empirical** challenges: when drafting policy on integrated care, policymakers are likely to make use of the available empirical evidence. There are at least three different sources of such evidence. First, policymakers might learn from places where policies on integrated care have already been put into place. Second, policymakers can make use of the available research literature. Third, policymakers can gather their own data. However, each of these sources of evidence can pose substantial challenges. Successfully transferring policy requires not just learning about particular policy (such as by reading |
| | | | | | |
| **1) Political - Reflect on the type and level of integration you want to promote. As we have argued, integrated care is a broad concept that encompasses various sorts of integration and collaboration. It is necessary as a policymaker to be aware of the level of integration that you want to achieve as, without proper prior thought, it will be impossible to determine the success of the policy afterwards.** |
| **2) Political - Reflect beforehand on what you hope to achieve with integrated care. We have argued throughout that integrated care should be seen as a means to a number of possible ends (e.g., economic efficiency or increased quality of care). Knowing what one hopes to achieve by promoting integrated care is crucial to being able to later evaluate the success or failure of the policy. This also allows policymakers to install a mechanism for evaluation, allowing the health policy to be re-evaluated after a period.** |
| **3) Political - Tailor policy to the particular context in which it will be implemented. The successful integration of a given policy in a particular health care context might not be automatically transferrable to another health care context. Policymakers should critically assess the available scientific literature and look at examples of places where comparable policies have been implemented. One cannot simply copy policy from somewhere else and expect it to work. Policymakers should preferably not only learn about what happened in other places, but instead learn from other places.** |
policy documents), but also learning from particular policies. Policymakers can make use of an increasing amount of existing and published evidence from research, however, how to translate this knowledge into political action is far from evident. Also, while many case studies have been published there may be publication or reporting bias, whereby successful networks are more likely to be published than unsuccessful ones.

3) Economic - Resource challenges: integrated care is often believed to allow for ‘improved efficiency of services, and reduced overall cost’, however there is research suggesting that creating integrated care and health care collaborations might actually require a great investment of resources before there is any efficiency pay-off. The resources needed are: (1) expertise, (2) time, and (3) funding.

4) Economic - Be committed to investing the resources needed to genuinely run and evaluate a policy. Research shows how successfully promoting integration may require resources such as time, expertise, and funding. As we have argued, policy-makers who fail to invest the necessary amount of money might afterwards incorrectly conclude that a particular policy implementation does not work.

5) Organisational Culture - Provide the stakeholders with sufficient freedom and autonomy. Research shows that successful integration cannot be fully mandated and requires a willingness from stakeholders and a relationship of trust between them.

6) Political - Consider beforehand how the actual implementation of the policy can be evaluated: Despite there being empirical challenges, a lot can be learned from the example of other countries and the experiences of other policy makers. There is also the option of setting up pilot projects or policy experiments to gather relevant feedback. Finally, policy makers should also consider the installation and use of feedback mechanisms to gain insight into the implementation of policy once it is underway.

| Laura G. González-Ortiz, Stefano Calciolari, Viktoria Stein, Nick Goodwin | 2018 | The core dimensions of integrated care: a literature review to support the development of a systematic literature review | Systematic Literature Review | DOI: 10.5334/ijic.4198 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Local leadership and long-term commitments. |
| 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders with a clear vision on integrated care. |
### Comprehensive Framework for Implementing Integrated Care

1. Intrinsic value of leadership - Distributed leadership.
2. Intrinsic value of leadership - Managerial leadership.
3. Intrinsic value of leadership - Visionary leadership.
4. Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical leadership.
5. Intrinsic value of leadership - Organisational leadership for providing optimal chronic care.
6. Organisational Culture - Shared vision and values for the purpose of integrated care.
7. Organisational Culture - An integration culture institutionalised through policies and procedures.
8. Organisational Culture - Striving towards an open culture for discussing possible improvements for care partners.
9. Organisational Culture - Linking cultures.
10. Organisational Culture - Trust (on colleagues, caregivers and organisations).
11. Inter-organisational Collaboration - Information sharing.
12. Planned/organised meetings.

---

**Enablers and Barriers in Implementing Integrated Care**

| Enablers/Barriers | N/A - Snowball | Health Systems and Reform | Report DOI: 10.1080/20388042015.1077301 |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 1) Political       |               |                          | 1) Supportive regulation.                |
| 2) Political       |               |                          | 2) Flexible administrative reorganisation.|
| 3) Economic        |               |                          | 3) Funding realignment.                  |

---
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2) Economic - For integrative care to be successful, a long-term plan with adequately protected support and funding must be provided. Financial incentives must be directed toward integrated pathways and designed to redistribute incentives to stakeholders.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Without an infrastructure framework, the coordination of care is stifled; for example, robust shared electronic patient record platforms, which can be accessed by all those involved in providing care to the target patient population.

4) Economic - Identification of target population.

5) Economic - Adequate financing.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - IT infrastructure.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Leadership coalition.

8) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Involvement of primary, community and social care.

9) Workforce Management - Identification of target population.

10) Organisational Culture - Adequate financing.

11) Organisational Culture - Changing clinical cultures.

12) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical Leadership.

---

| Martin Bardsley, Adam Steventon, Judith Smith and Jennifer Dixon | 2013 | Evaluating integrated and community-based care | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report | URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/evaluating-integrated-and-community-based-care-how-do-we-know-what-works |

---

1) Political - Recognising that planning and implementing large-scale service changes takes time e.g. Kaiser Permanente.

2) Workforce Management - Defining the intervention clearly and what it is meant to achieve and how, and implement it well.

3) Workforce Management - Being explicit about how desired outcomes will arise, and using interim markers of success.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Generalisability and context are important - each area
will have specific success factors but the aim must be the same.

| NHS Future Forum | 2011 | Clinical advice and leadership: a report from the NHS Future Forum | HMIC | N/A | Report | URL: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213750/dh_127542.pdf |
|------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated information systems need to be developed, commissioned and implemented. |
| 2) Workforce Management - Data about quality and outcomes of care is collected, shared and used in a transparent way to support informed patient choice and continuous improvement. |
| 3) Organisational Culture - A duty to promote research and innovation and the use of research evidence. |
| 4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Substantial multi-professional clinical leadership embedded within it including visible leadership for key groups and conditions, for example children, women, older people, mental health and learning disabilities. |
| 5) Workforce Management - Continuing professional development. |
| 6) Intrinsic value of leadership - All |
7) Workforce Management - Responsible officers continuing to be in place to support doctors in improving care and ensuring their fitness to practice through revalidation.

8) Organisational Culture - Strong and visible clinical and professional leadership at all levels, focused on increasing trust and encouraging positive behaviour.

---

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders in ICSs need to be skilled at:
- identifying and scaling innovation (e.g. from pilots)
- having a strong focus on outcomes and population health
- building strong relationships with other leaders, and often working with them informally to develop joint priorities and plans
- establishing governance structures which drive faster change, often going

2) Workforce Management - Strategies and agendas that are imposed by NHS England on local areas rather than being clinically-led and driven by local need.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of coordination and alignment at national level between NHS England and NHS Improvement.

4) Workforce Management - Complex accountability structures and configurations.

5) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Different performance regimes and

---

6) Leadership Style - Leadership programmes and professional development opportunities.

7) Organisational Culture - Peer support including mechanisms for ‘buddying up’.

8) Workforce Management - Local champions who will push and progress the work, and ‘win hearts and minds’.

9) Organisational Culture - Having the security to make long-term plans.

10) Organisational Culture - Trust and delegation of autonomy from the centre; a permissive, not prescriptive, approach and national guidance that provides a broad, enabling framework.

11) Organisational Culture - The creation of ‘safe spaces’ for leaders to meet with peers and share problems and solutions.
where the commitment and energy is strongest
e) setting the overall outcomes and expectations on behaviours, but handing day-to-day decision-making to others
f) supporting the development of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs)
g) designing and facilitating whole-systems events and workshops to build consensus and deliver change
h) understanding and leading cultural change
i) building system-wide learning and evaluation frameworks
j) fostering a learning culture across the whole system.
cultures, including between the NHS and local authorities.
5) Political - Lack of a coherent view of whole population needs.
6) Political - Sheer volume of bureaucracy involved in getting service changes through.
7) Workforce Management - Insufficient development, support and peer support for leaders.
8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Capacity and capability of local leaders, pressure and stress in these roles, uncertainty about the future.
9) Intrinsic value of leadership - People in leadership roles finding the job lonely and feeling isolated.
10) Organisational Culture - A culture of blame towards leaders.
11) Intrinsic value of leadership - High turnover of the leadership workforce, resulting in loss of experience and skills.
12) Intrinsic value of leadership - Confusion about where the decision-making power lies.
13) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical leadership especially
6) Workforce Management - Clarity about how performance will be judged.
7) Workforce Management - Clarity about how accountability will work, and responsibilities of individual organisations.
8) Workforce Management - Systems leadership development for middle managers across the system.
9) Workforce Management - Masterclasses on: co-production theory and practice, finance and risk-sharing, scaling innovation, understanding local government and social care, large-scale and large-group facilitation, working and influencing across multiple layers of governance.
| Nick Goodwin and Judith Smith | 2011 | The Evidence Base for Integrated Care | N/A - Snowball | The King’s Fund and the Nuffield Trust: Developing a National Strategy for the Promotion of Integrated Care | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/Evidence-base-integrated-care2.pdf |

| Nick Goodwin, Judith Smith, Alisha Davies, Claire Perry, Rebecca Rosen, Anna Dixon, Jennifer | 2012 | Integrated care for patients and populations: Improving outcomes by working together | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/integrated-care-patient-associations-working |

| 14) Organisational Culture - Performance management and assurance processes that are not aligned to learning and self-reflection. |
| 15) Organisational Culture - A sense that the goalposts keep moving with priorities, funding and expectations changing. | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Setting a clear, ambitious and measurable goal to improve the experience of patients and service users, implement change at scale and pace. | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Creating powerful narrative at national and local level. |

2) Workforce Management - Clear articulation of benefits to patients, service users and carers. |
3) Workforce Management - Approaches that measure experiences of patients, service users and carers in relation to integrated care. |
| Dixon, Chris Ham | 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Absence of robust electronic sharing record. |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                  | 4) Economic - Weak commissioning payment based on episodic care at hospital, PBR incentivises more activity in hospitals, mitigating against other providers, competition within the market and choice and regulation focuses on organisation performance not collective system leading to single outcomes framework |
|                  | 5) Economic - New payment incentives and local currencies. |
|                  | 6) Economic - Commission services based on outcomes rather than items of delivery. |
| R Humphries 2015 | 1) Organisational Culture - In contrast to the 'Pioneer' programme which has encouraged locally driven, bottom-up innovation, NHS England has adopted a much more prescriptive and top-down approach to the delivery of the Better Care Fund which is driven by an imperative to reduce emergency hospital admissions. |
|                  | 2) Economic - The personal commissioning programme is an entirely different approach again which rests on the ability of individuals rather than organisations to integrate their own care. It remains to be seen how the inevitable tensions between these very different policy levers and |
|                  | 1) Economic - A new settlement that brings together all health and care funding into a single, ring fenced budget and overseen by a single local commissioner. |
| Name                  | Year | Case Description                                                                 | Case Study | URL                                                                 |
|-----------------------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rebecca Rosen, James Mountford, Geraint Lewis, Richard Lewis, Jenny Shand and Sara Shaw | 2011 | Integration in action: four international case studies                           | N/A - Snowball | Nuffield Trust Case Study URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/integration-in-action-four-international-case-studies |

Implementation styles will play out.

1) Workforce Management - Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods.
2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of performance management role (indirect influence).
3) Economic - Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned.
4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems.
5) Political - Inconsistencies in national policy.
6) Intrinsic value of leadership - Variable progress in different localities dependent on local leadership.

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Active medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice.
2) Workforce Management - Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients.
3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record.
4) Organisational Culture - High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders.
5) Economic - When transfer of work between organisations does not cause issues with payments.
6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Planned increase in provider competition.
7) Organisational Culture - Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care.
8) Workforce Management - Staff commitment and belief that integration is doing the right thing.
9) Workforce Management - Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems.

1) Organisational Culture - Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs.
1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Skilled leaders with ability to win hearts and minds of frontline staff.

11) Organisational Culture - Taking an incremental approach on progress.

12) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support.

| Author(s)                  | Year | Title                                                                 | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Case Study |
|----------------------------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|
| Richard Gleave             | 2009 | Across the pond - Lessons from the US on Integrated Healthcare       |                |                |            |
| URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/across-the-pond-lessons-from-the-us-on-integrated-healthcare |      |                                                                      |                |                |            |
| Sara Shaw, Rebecca Rosen and Benedict Rumbold | 2011 | What is integrated care?                                             |                |                |            |
| URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/whatis-integrated-care |      |                                                                      |                |                |            |
| 1) Economic - Situate performance measures within wider health and care systems: acknowledge the level and combination of strategies used based on the challenges faced in obtaining appropriate |      |                                                                      |                |                |            |
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| Sara Shaw, Ros Levenson | 2011 | Towards integrated care in Trafford | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/towards-integrated-care-in-trafford-web-final.pdf | quality care for local communities and user groups and consider the contextual factors that affect development and delivery.  
2) Workforce Management - Standardised, validated tools and indicators that measure integration across different settings relative to a set of models, structures and processes.  
3) Workforce Management - Improvement through audit of medical records, analysis of register data on hospitalisation rates, self-assessment for managers, annual surveys, questionnaires for clinical leaders, qualitative interviews with executives, leaders, staff and managers.  
1) Organisational Culture - Recognise that major change is needed, ensure a clear and agreed vision from GPs to specialists.  
2) Economic - Work simultaneously with commissioners and service providers so that quality and budgeting is fulfilled.  
3) Workforce Management - Make a clear case for change  
4) Workforce Management - Engage with stakeholders when developing integrated systems |
| 5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Facilitate local leadership that has good knowledge of the workings of the local systems. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Economic - Size/structural factors were key to integration success: the area was sufficiently small (n=36,251) to allow triage, assessment and referral in one multi-disciplinary team (MDT), whereas in the largest locality had 72,692 registered residents so the single MDT initially had much more caseloads which became unmanageable. |
| 2) Organisational Culture - The small size allowed relationships to develop over time; indeed, there is a history of collaboration there (e.g. between GPs and community hospital teams and between health and social care). |
| 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - A strong role of shared, bottom-up leadership. Frontline clinicians in the Coastal Locality were notable for having trusting and friendly relationships between team leads (Physio, Nurses and Matrons, Social Care). |
| 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - The integrated system appointed GPs as locality clinical directors, which was a key factor as they helped link the GP community directly into the ICO, thereby overcoming barriers between the acute and primary sectors. |
| 5) Organisational Culture - There was a commitment to learning by leaders. The Coastal leads |
insisted on collecting their own performance data despite being asked to discontinue doing so and devised their own performance management system (measuring performance). Priority to measure performance; there was a willingness in Coastal to genuinely question the process and outcomes of integrated care.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - The partnering and the organisation of inter-professional teamwork and joint care planning as critical determinants of success, especially informal partnership which relies on trusting relationships at all levels. A balance of top-down and bottom-up committees and system-wide steering functions facilitated the emergence over time of trusting relationships and iteratively evolving teams at locality level. This in turn allowed for better service delivery.

1) Political - The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance.

2) Organisational Culture - Need for a shared understanding of the purpose of the joint venture and a mutual understanding of, and

1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Divide between social care staff and medical staff: differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, and status inequalities.

2) Organisational Culture - The mismatch in cultures, behaviours and understanding of services creates a divide between the disciplines. Organisational boundaries resulted in staff feeling pressured, and the process
commitment to, the vision of the venture across the organizations involved.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - It is important for integrated services to work together across agency boundaries; this has been facilitated by the removal of structural constraints through the Health Act 1999, which permitting pooled budgets and integrated provision.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated teams must be able to exchange knowledge easily between agencies; effective shared information technology (IT) systems are key to the success of integrated working.

5) Organisational Culture - Need for the development of a shared culture.

6) Workforce Management - Establishment of new roles to support new ways of working

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Exhibiting a past history of joint working.

8) Political - Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms of collaborative working led to unrealistic expectations being placed on staff.

3) Workforce Management - A lack of clarity of purpose for integration, and a failure to agree partnership outcomes.

4) Workforce Management - The lack of understanding and clarity of others' roles, leading to conflict between team managers.

5) Workforce Management - Imbalance of power and poor communication.

6) Workforce Management - Short-term contract working, lack of clear career structure, and limited opportunities for promotion (unless they left the service) created a dilemma: a trade-off between present job satisfaction and future career progression for staff in integrated care teams.

7) Economic - Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available.
and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas.

9) Organisational Culture
- The promotion of professional values of service to users and socialisation into the immediate work group.

| Author | Year | Title | Journal | DOI |
|--------|------|-------|---------|-----|
| Stephanie Best | 2016 | Facilitating integrated delivery of services across organisational boundaries: Essential enablers to integration | British Journal of Occupational Therapy | DOI: 10.1177/03080281688019 |

1) Intra-organisational Collaboration - Horizontal communication.

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of support.
2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Overestimated expectations.
3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Autocratic leadership style
4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Setting direction, setting the vision.
5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Accessibility through visibility both within and across organisations.
6) Intrinsic value of leadership - Joint decision-making.
7) Intrinsic value of leadership - Authority to influence across organisations.
8) Intra-organisational Collaboration - Joint training offers an opportunity to build...
relationships with colleagues across organisations and recognise each other’s areas of expertise. Overall, participants expressed a wish to see improved working relationships, as this has the potential to lead to ‘a fluidity in thinking’ when managing difficult or complex situations.

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Management and leadership support was identified as an enabler in four of the seven studies, with Coupe (2013) suggesting that leadership support was essential for the successful implementation of integrated health and social care teams.

2) Workforce Management - Change management can be complex, and Thomas et al (2006) suggest that changes are more likely to be adopted when the change meets an identified need. Ling et al (2012: 4) support this belief, as they reported that ‘where staff felt that change was being forced upon them then they were less likely to support the new activity.

3) Organisational Culture - Ling et al (2012) further reported that pilot sites were more successful when there was evidence of a shared vision, along with a commitment from management in relation to longevity of the change.

4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Thistlethwaite (2011) partially attributed the success in Torbay to the stable leadership within Torbay and the ongoing...
5) Economic - Resources and capacity have been identified as a key enabler in five out of the seven studies. Coupe (2013) attributed the main cause of under-performance of the integrated health and social care teams to a lack of investment in the teams, which is required to embed the change into practice. Ling et al (2012) also reported that the lack of resources in the integrated health and social care teams resulted in an increased workload, which had an adverse effect on staff motivation.

6) Political - National policy was considered an enabler in four of the studies. Coupe (2013) identified that the NHS payment systems, such as payment by results and block contracts, do not incentivise the delivery of care in the community, and thus pose a barrier to integrated health and social care teams.

7) Economic - Sheaff et al (2009) also referred to the NHS financial system, suggesting that paying hospitals for each case treated was an actual incentive to increase admissions, which completely conflicts with the aims of integrated health and social care teams.

8) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Shared information technology (IT) systems were identified as an enabler in two studies. This may pose a concern for a number of organisations.
| Tom Ling, Laura Bereton, Annalijn Conklin | 2012 | Barriers and facilitators to integrating care: experiences from the English Integrated Care Pilots | HMIC International Journal of Integrated Care Qualitative Study DOI: 10.5334/ijic.98 | 1) Workforce Management - Size and complexity: multiple components in integration reported greater challenges of managing change, and they were often greater and longer to implement than they had anticipated. Difficult to communicate the details to all parties and identify the role of each participant group.

2) Workforce Management - Staff demotivated when an absence of clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. Where staff felt the change was being forced upon them, they were less likely to support the new activity.

3) Workforce Management - Lack of training led to staff being unclear whether | 1) Workforce Management - Size and complexity: simple, smaller integration made more rapid progress and had the ability and authority to come to quick decisions. 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Compatible IT systems and good management of the sharing of private data. 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Good existing relationships between individuals and/or organisations with clear communication about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work. 4) Organisational Culture - Widespread agreement and shared values among participating staff promoted engagement and motivation. 5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Success when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be strongly committed to implementing lasting change. 6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner |
they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling unprepared to take on new roles.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Different IT systems in partner organisations caused difficulties in data-sharing and communicating, especially across health and social care teams. On occasions, these difficulties were not caused by the IT itself but by how their introduction was managed, such as failure to address privacy concerns where organisations were reluctant to share patient data.

5) Collaboration Between Organisations: Absence of relationships between individuals and/or organisations. Poor communication and disagreement about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner organisations.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of co-location: lack of working together face-to-face in the organisations. 7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Co-location: working together face-to-face in the same building improved the quality and frequency of communication, and expedited problem-solving by allowing quicker access to colleagues’ professional knowledge. 8) Organisational Culture - Feelings of being involved with planning from the beginning. 9) Workforce Management - Staff were motivated when there was clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. 10) Organisational Culture - Willingness to engage. Creating shared beliefs about the benefits of change was described by staff as critical to progress. 11) Intrinsic value of leadership - ‘Good’ leadership. 12) Workforce Management - Thorough training led to staff being clear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling prepared to take on new roles. The provision of training specific to the service change was important, particularly when the work involved required new or changed roles of participants. 13) Organisational Culture - Supportive, transparent organisational culture: the ability to modify existing systems and practices and to create new ones was especially dependent on organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries. 14) Workforce Management - External
same building decreased the quality and frequency of communication, and exacerbated problems by reducing access to colleagues' professional knowledge.

8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Failure when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be weakly committed to implementing lasting change.

9) Intrinsic value of leadership - ‘Poor’ leadership blamed for lack of shared beliefs about the benefits of change.

10) Organisational Culture - Feelings of being sidelined, or uninvolved with planning from the beginning.

11) Organisational Culture - Reluctance to engage was a major barrier.

12) Organisational culture - Poor organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries.

13) Organisational Culture - A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS 'blame culture'.

14) Political - Chains of managerial approval among multiple organisations and slow decisions about resource facilitation has been very helpful in getting two organisations to work together, which is a method well rehearsed in the wider literature on managing change. 15) Organisational Culture - Staff feeling permitted to take risks. 16) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer.
15) Economic - Staff cuts.

distribution were perceived as a barrier to innovation.
### Appendix C: Synthesis of Results

| Source of Information | Factors Identified |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| **Author**            | **Organisational Culture** | **Workforce Management** | **Inter-Organisational Culture** | **Leadership** | **Economic** | **Political** |
| Alison Tweed, Andrew Singfield, Julia RA Taulor, Lucy Gilbert, Paul Mount | Facilitators: 1) Shared Visions (espoused theories) need to be outlined and translated into everyday practice and visions of previous leaders or schemes must be erased. | Facilitators: 1) Connecting through practice: involving frontline staff and all stakeholders in decisions and key pieces of the transformation to integrated care. | Facilitators: 1) Leaders should be non-partisan integrators rather than assign themselves to an organisation - have an allegiance to the system. 2) Leaders should build high quality relationships involving emotional intelligence and positive role modelling. | **Recommendations:** 1) Connecting is a key theme in managing system or transformational change and occurs through three mediums: relational, with purpose and vision and through practice. 2) To further research the concept of allegiance creation as it appears under-represented within the literature, particularly as part of the process of transformational change, rather than as an outcome of change or behaviours towards leaders. |
| Facilitators: | Barriers: |
|--------------|-----------|
| 1) Shared vision and purpose. | 1) A legacy of competitive behaviours. |
| 2) A meaningful local identity. | 2) Frequently changing language and the lack of a clear narrative. |

**Facilitators:**
1) Established models of integrated working.
2) Shared vision and purpose.
3) A meaningful local identity.

**Barriers:**
1) A legacy of competitive behaviours.
2) Frequently changing language and the lack of a clear narrative.

**Recommendations:**
1) Integrate at different levels of the system, building up from places and neighbourhoods.
2) Draw on the skills and leadership of frontline staff.
3) Build governance in an evolutionary way to support delivery.
4) Develop system-wide capabilities to gather, share and act on public insights.
5) Develop active strategies to facilitate wider adoption of new care models.
6) Build robust evaluation into the ICS programme that supports learning and improvement and measures progress.

**Facilitators:**
1) Collaborative relationships.
2) Partnerships with local authorities.
3) Established models of integrated working.
4) System leadership.

**Barriers:**
1) Leaders face competing demands.
2) Funding pressures.
3) The legislative context does not support system working.
4) Regulation and oversight is not aligned.
5) Difficulties in agreeing budgets.
6) Complex governance arrangements.
7) Lack of understanding of what the drivers and essential requirements are for successful integration between...
| Bob Erens, Gerald Wistow, Sandra Mounier-Jack, Nick Douglas, Lorelei Jones, Tommaso Manacorda and Nicholas Mays | Early Evaluation of the Integrated Care and Support Pioneers Programme: Final Report |
|---|---|
| **Barriers:** | **Barriers:** |
| 1) Differences between the health and social care sectors in terms of language and conceptions of health and wellbeing, professional cultures and working practices. | 1) Integration was less of a priority where stakeholders had urgent competing demands (e.g. meeting 4-hour waiting time A&E targets. |
| 2) Different priorities between professions: e.g. the people of most concern to social workers were not necessarily the same as those of most concern to GPs. | 2) Multiple challenges of engaging frontline staff. |
| 3) ‘Blame culture’ within and across local health and social care sectors located responsibility for failures in integration elsewhere in the | 3) Difficulties recruiting staff particularly in certain areas of the country. |
| health and social care sectors in terms of language and conceptions of health and wellbeing, professional cultures and working practices. | 4) High staff turnover (especially following health care reforms) negatively affected longer-term strategic planning and service provision aiming for integration. |
| 5) Existing approaches to training professionals do not produce | 5) Inadequate local engagement/’buy-in’ of the independent, community and voluntary sectors, in part, because they were often required to compete against each other for contracts, making working together |
| effectiveness of care. | 2) Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved. |
| 2) Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved. | 2) Some Pioneers were very complex with a large number of stakeholders and/or a large geographic footprint, which made partnership working more complex in terms of size, communication, governance, etc. |
| 2) Multiple challenges of engaging frontline staff. | 3) PbR incentives for acute and social services departments suffered from significant financial deficit and were subject to ‘special measures’, which diverted senior management attention away from Pioneer activity. |
| 3) ‘Blame culture’ within and across local health and social care sectors located responsibility for failures in integration elsewhere in the | 3) PbR incentives for acute and social services departments suffered from significant financial deficit and were subject to ‘special measures’, which diverted senior management attention away from Pioneer activity. |
| 5) Existing approaches to training professionals do not produce | 4) High staff turnover (especially following health care reforms) negatively affected longer-term strategic planning and service provision aiming for integration. |
| effectiveness of care. | 5) Inadequate local engagement/’buy-in’ of the independent, community and voluntary sectors, in part, because they were often required to compete against each other for contracts, making working together |
| 2) Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved. | 2) Some Pioneers were very complex with a large number of stakeholders and/or a large geographic footprint, which made partnership working more complex in terms of size, communication, governance, etc. |

**Facilitators:**

1) Good leadership and vision was identified as critical at all levels from local authority councillors through to senior managers, supported by appropriate governance structures.

**Barriers:**

1) Lack of agreement on priorities among local system leaders.

**Facilitators:**

1) Supportive legislation.

**Barriers:**

1) Pressure by national and local policy-makers to demonstrate the success of new integration initiatives at a stage too early in the programme’s implementation.

2) Strategic direction from the national government is fragmented. Differences in approach: DCLG reportedly favouring more locally devolved responsibility, while DH/NHSE adopt a more ‘command and control’ approach.  

3) Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a

4) Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a

**Recommendations:**

1) To further research specific policy analysis domains, i.e. investigate policy formation, policy implementation or service delivery outcomes in integrated or co-ordinated health and social care services.

2) Strategic direction from the national government is fragmented. Differences in approach: DCLG reportedly favouring more locally devolved responsibility, while DH/NHSE adopt a more 'command and control' approach.

3) Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a

4) Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a

**Recommendations:**

1) To further research specific policy analysis domains, i.e. investigate policy formation, policy implementation or service delivery outcomes in integrated or co-ordinated health and social care services.

2) Strategic direction from the national government is fragmented. Differences in approach: DCLG reportedly favouring more locally devolved responsibility, while DH/NHSE adopt a more 'command and control' approach.

3) Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a

4) Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a
4) Scepticism about NHS initiatives that had previously been seen to ‘come and go’.

5) Previous initiatives did not live up to expectations leading to demoralisation.

6) Promoting a ‘play-it-safe’ work culture can be detrimental to ‘barrier busting’.

Facilitators:
1) Trust and shared values that are largely developed locally.

2) Freedom to try things out, not having a ‘culture of blame’ if things go wrong, and piloting new initiatives and sharing the learning before roll-out. Reassuring staff so they ‘feel safe’ in the face of change.

Trainees equipped for integrated working, and not enough trainees to meet demand.

Facilitators:
1) Experienced staff.

2) Staff involvement in developing integration initiatives and encouraging their ‘ownership’ of new service models.

3) Local champions.

4) Collecting the right information/indicators so that impact/success can be measured and visible to staff, patients/service users and the local population.

Particularly challenging.

5) Inadequate local engagement/‘buy-in’ of the mental health sector, due in part to the legacy of underfunding and ‘Cinderella’ status of the sector.

6) In some Pioneers with multiple partners, a sense that transformation could happen only at the pace of the ‘slowest’, most conservative or risk averse stakeholder.

7) Information sharing was seen as critical, but the level of integration of information and intelligence needed was technically difficult to achieve across multiple IT platforms and with obstructive information governance regulations.

Facilitators:
1) Being part of a national Pioneer programme, which provided an impetus for local professionals to work together to improve care locally.

2) Building and maintaining good working relationships across organisations and professions at all levels built on trust, so that people could speak the larger one.

Facilitators:
1) Uncommitted funding.
| Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1) Positive and trusting relationships.  
2) A culture of innovation, creativity and empowerment and not micro-management based on old fashioned contractual approaches. | 1) System leaders who work together to support frontline practitioners to overcome bureaucratic barriers. | 1) Co-operative Council with an understanding of communities which helps to target resources and further develop interventions. |
| 3) Integrated information system between organisations to enable sharing of patient/service user records or having suitable facilities for cross-agency and/or multi-disciplinary teams. | 4) Co-location of operational teams facilitated communication and partnership working between different professionals. | |

| Facilitators: | Barriers: |
|--------------|----------|
| 1) Managerial leadership in combination with clinician leadership. | 1) Needs assessment and service specification is time, effort and resource consuming. |
Danial Naqvi, Anam Malik, Mohaimen Al-Zubaidy, Falak Naqvi, Anas Tahir, Ali Tarfiee, Sarina Vara, and Edgar Meyer

The general practice perspective on barriers to integration between primary and social care: a London, United Kingdom-based qualitative interview study

**Barriers:**

1) All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making.

2) Poor interprofessional culture: All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with

3) Inadequate training of staff.

**Barriers:**

1) Lack of awareness of roles and services: uncertainty about which roles are carried out by which social service provider and how best to contact these individuals.

2) Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision.

3) Inadequate training of staff.

**Barriers:**

1) Often numbers in practice diaries and on websites are out of date, so staff have to ask the patient directly what social care they receive and how to contact relevant departments, slowing down both communication and any attempts at collaborative working.

2) Communication between primary care and social care is logistically challenging, as doctors are busy with patients during the day and social care staff are working in the community, making joint conversations about patients nearly impossible.

3) Lack of regular contact: most GPs and PMs explained regular contact with social care teams is necessary for effective information transfer and a multidisciplinary approach to patient care. However, currently, contact is through forms and emails with minimal face-to-face contact,

**Barriers:**

1) Low staffing levels.

2) Insufficient funding.
| different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making. | which professionals find inefficient and a barrier to continuity of care. 4) Inefficient MDT meetings. 5) Interoperability between information systems: the lack of shared information systems. |
| --- | --- |

---

**Recommendations:**

1) A culture of quality improvement. 2) A history of trust between partner organisations. 3) Personnel who are open to collaboration and innovation. 4) Awareness of local cultural differences: organisational cultures evolve separately over decades.

---

**Recommendations:**

1) The objectives of integration need to be made explicit. 2) Begin integration at the frontline, which impacts directly on the patient experience; based on this, the most apt organisational support for service provision might be identified. 3) The right incentives: it is important that frontline staff recognise and buy into the integration process.

---

**Recommendations:**

1) Effective and complementary communications and IT systems.

---

**Recommendations:**

1) Local leaders who are supportive of integration.

---

**Recommendations:**

1) Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes.

---

**Needs:**

1) The need to develop a culture in which people are comfortable and competent in working across organisational boundaries to serve needs.

---

**Needs:**

1) Financial incentives do not encourage collaboration. 2) Lack of shared data.

---

**Needs:**

1) Staff working within integrated care must have (or develop) emotional intelligence and empathy in dealing with patients and users, be willing to work in teams with shared accountability, and be
| Elena Urizar, Roberto Nuño, Caridad Álvarez, Conception Fernández, Carles Blay, Andrea Quiroga | Barriers:  
1) Lack of shared accountability.  

Facilitators:  
1) At macro level there is a general lack of strategic vision towards integrated care from a systemic perspective.  
2) Incentives and training healthcare professionals in communication and teamwork skills.  

| Gerald Wistow, Matt Gaskins, Holly Holder, Judith Smith | Barriers:  
1) At the micro level a lack of clinical leadership and buy-in hinders the needed multidisciplinary and collaborative work.  

Facilitators:  
1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning.  
2) Balancing competition and collaboration.  

|  | Prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care.  

|  | Prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care.  

Barriers:  
1) At macro level there is a general lack of strategic vision towards integrated care from a systemic perspective.  
2) Incentives and training healthcare professionals in communication and teamwork skills.  

Facilitators:  
1) Strategic alignment.  

Barriers:  
1) Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives.  

Facilitators:  
1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning.  
2) Balancing competition and collaboration.  

Barriers:  
1) At the micro level a lack of clinical leadership and buy-in hinders the needed multidisciplinary and collaborative work.  

Facilitators:  
1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning.  
2) Balancing competition and collaboration.  

Barriers:  
1) Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives.  

Facilitators:  
1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning.  
2) Balancing competition and collaboration.
| Gwyn Bevan, Katharina Janus | Why hasn't integrated health care developed widely in the United States and not at all in England? | Facilitators: |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
|                             | 1) Governance by hierarchy (ownership) or a mode that is close to a hierarchy (through long-term contractual relationships). 2) Good management and information systems. In a well-organized IHCDS, tight management controls its bureaucratic costs (which can otherwise result in hierarchy failure), sophisticated data management enables it to react quickly to developments in health care and markets, and standardisation in care management | 1) Full integration compared with arrangements of different autonomous insurers and providers reduces costs of information, negotiation, contracting, control, and adaptation and is hence more efficient. |

| Facilitators: |
|---------------|
| 1) Finance by capitation. Payment per member for coverage for all care provided by the IHCDS (typically in an annual contract with monthly payments), as the principal reimbursement method acts as a powerful pricing strategy that generates substantial savings through internal incentives for preventive care. 2) A commitment to cost control and high-quality care. |
| Barriers and facilitators in the integration of oral health into primary care: a scoping review | Barriers: 1) Discipline-oriented education and lack of competencies. 2) Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management (including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)) and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference). | Facilitators: 1) Interprofessional education. 2) Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management (including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)) and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference). 3) Durability and size. | Barriers: 1) Lack of continuity of care and services: unstructured mechanism for care coordination at the micro level and lack of practice guidelines and types of practice at the meso level. Discontinuity in the integrated care process associated with poor referral systems, deficient interface and poor connection between public health section, primary care and academic institutions. | Facilitators: 1) Geographical proximity of interdisciplinary organisations. 2) Partnerships and common vision among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations. 3) The strategic role of the local leader in building teamwork and communities’ capacities. | Barriers: 1) The cost of integrated services, human resources issues (workload of personnel, staff turnover, time constraints and scarcity of various trained human resources such as care coordinators, public health workforce and allied professionals) and deficient administrative infrastructure (the absence of health records, cross-domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes) at the meso and macro levels. | Barriers: 1) Lack of political leadership and healthcare policies and a poor understanding of the population and low prioritisation on the political agenda as well the absence of appropriate policies at the macro level. |

**Needs:**
- Social and Psychological Context: Readiness for Change
- Basic Structures and Design: Physical Structures, Human and Material
- Processes: Partnering, Teamwork, Delivering Care, and Improving

**Facilitators:**
- Leadership and Strategy: Leadership Approach, Clinician Engagement and Supportive policies and resource allocation: financial support from governments, stakeholders and non-profit organisations at the macro level.
| Baker, Walter P. Wodchis | Integrating Care: A Framework for Improvement | Organisational Culture, and Work Environment. | Resources, Organizational Design, Governance, Accountability, and Information Technology. | Quality. | Leadership, Strategic Focus on Improvement, and Performance Measurement. |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|

John Deffenbaugh

| Needs: | Needs: | Needs: | Needs: |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1) Common priorities: move from what's in it for their organisation mindset to how they can help other organisations be successful. | 1) Engaging citizens and communities. | 1) Overarching strategy. | 1) An agreed allocation of resources and risk sharing system to achieve maximum results across the system. |
| 2) Getting into the shoes of others. | | 2) Leaders who get along. | |
| 3) Agreed objectives. | | | |
| 4) Common narrative. | | | |

**Recommendations:**

1) Stop clashes and set a common goal (no PBR from NHSI conflicting with CCGs from NHSE) - end artificial divides.

**Needs:**

1) Engaging citizens and communities.

2) Leaders who get along.

**Barriers:**

1) System leadership is harder than organisational leadership - there are conflicting performance measures.

2) Leaders need to see the larger picture, be more reflective and shift focus from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future.

**Facilitators:**

1) Leaders understand the motivation of partners enabling unconditional commitment, collective ownership - debts, income etc.

**Recommendations:**

1) Long-term perspective needs to be maintained and the stakeholders must be motivated.
| Judith Smith, Gerald Wistow, Holly Holder & Matthew Gaskins | Evaluating the design and implementation of the whole systems integrated care programme in North West London: why commissioning proved (again) to be the weakest link. | **Barriers:**
1) Social and cultural differences including those related to knowledge, organisation and power. | **Recommendations:**
1) Define specifically what changes to services are intended.
2) Convene stakeholders to plan for and support implementation continuously.
3) See outcomes as something for which commissioners and providers are jointly accountable. | **Barriers:**
1) The Health and Social Care Act 2012 re-emphasised the role of competition and implicitly encouraged more extensive use of for-profit and third sector providers alongside mainstream NHS-managed services. Yet there has been a parallel emphasis on collaboration and integration so Commissioners have therefore had to explore ways of balancing apparently contradictory pressures: to promote provider competition through contracting and procurement, while simultaneously securing collaborative service delivery through strategic purchasing. |
Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care

**Recommendations:**

1) Provide the stakeholders with sufficient freedom and autonomy. Research shows that successful integration cannot be fully mandated and requires a willingness from stakeholders and a relationship of trust between them.

**Barriers:**

1) Resource challenges: integrated care is often believed to allow for "improved efficiency of services, and reduced overall cost", however there is research suggesting that creating integrated care and health care collaborations might actually require a great investment of resources before there is any efficiency pay-off. The resources needed are: (1) expertise, (2) time, and (3) funding.

**Recommendations:**

1) Be committed to investing the resources needed to genuinely run and evaluate a policy. Research shows how successfully promoting integration may require resources such as time, expertise, and funding. As we have argued, policymakers who fail to invest the necessary amount of money might afterwards incorrectly conclude that a particular policy implementation does not work.

**Barriers:**

1) Conceptual challenges: lack of clarity on what constitutes integrated care. When drafting and implementing integrated care, there are three fundamental questions that should be considered by every policy-maker: (1) how the integration will be organised; (2) what kind of integration is intended; (3) what outcome is intended. Because of the conceptual complexity and ideological choices, it is particularly difficult to determine when and to what degree integration of care is a success.

2) Empirical challenges: when drafting policy on integrated care, policymakers are likely to make use of the available empirical evidence. There are at least three different sources of such evidence. First, policymakers might learn from places where policies on integrated care have already been put into place. Second, policymakers can make use of the available research literature. Third, policymakers can gather their own data. However, each of these sources of evidence can pose substantial challenges. Successfully transferring policy requires not just learning about particular policy (such as by reading policy documents), but also learning from particular policies. Policymakers can make use of an increasing amount of existing and published evidence from research, however, how to translate this knowledge into political action is far from evident.

**Recommendations:**

1) Reflect on the type and level of integration you want to promote. As we have argued, integrated care is a broad
concept that encompasses various sorts of integration and collaboration. It is necessary as a policy-maker to be aware of the level of integration that you want to achieve as, without proper prior thought, it will be impossible to determine the success of the policy afterwards.

2) Reflect beforehand on what you hope to achieve with integrated care. We have argued throughout that integrated care should be seen as a means to a number of possible ends (e.g., economic efficiency or increased quality of care). Knowing what one hopes to achieve by promoting integrated care is crucial to being able to later evaluate the success or failure of the policy. This also allows policy-makers to install a mechanism for evaluation, allowing the health policy to be re-evaluated after a period.

3) Tailor policy to the particular context in which it will be implemented. The successful integration of a given policy in a particular health care context might not be automatically transferrable to another health care context. Policy-makers should critically assess the available scientific literature and look at examples of places where comparable policies have been implemented. One cannot simply copy policy from somewhere else and expect it to work. Policy-makers should preferably not only learn about what happened in other places, but instead learn from other places.

4) Consider beforehand how the actual implementation of the policy can be evaluated: Despite there being empirical challenges, a lot can be learned from the example of other countries and the experiences of other
There is also the option of setting up pilot projects or policy experiments to gather relevant feedback. Finally, policy makers should also consider the installation and use of feedback mechanisms to gain insight into the implementation of policy once it is underway.
| Mahiben Maruthappu | Enablers and Barriers in Implementing Integrated Care | 4) Linking cultures.  
5) Trust (on colleagues, caregivers and organisations). | 4) Linking cultures.  
5) Trust (on colleagues, caregivers and organisations). |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Facilitators: | Barriers:  
1) Evaluation models. | 1) A change of culture is required, at both clinical and management levels, without which may lead to a lack of shared vision and problems in the long-term sustainability of integration. |
| 1) Common values.  
2) Changing clinical cultures. | 1) Without an infrastructure framework, the coordination of care is stifled; for example, robust shared electronic patient record platforms, which can be accessed by all those involved in providing care to the target patient population. |
| Facilitators: | Facilitators:  
1) IT infrastructure.  
2) Leadership coalition.  
3) Involvement of primary, community and social care. | 1) Clinical leadership. |
| Martin Bardsley, Adam Steventon, Judith Smith and Jennifer Dixon | Evaluating integrated and community-based care | 1) Defining the intervention clearly and what it is meant to achieve and how, and implement it well.  
2) Being explicit about how desired outcomes will arise, and use interim markers of success. |
| Facilitators: | Facilitators:  
1) Generalisability and context are important - each area will have specific success factors but the aim must be the same. |
| Recommendations: | 1) Blend designated leadership with distributed leadership. |
| Facilitators: | 1) Supportive regulation.  
2) Flexible administrative reorganisation. | 1) For integrative care to be successful, a long-term plan with adequately protected support and funding must be provided. Financial incentives must be directed toward integrated pathways and designed to redistribute incentives to stakeholders. |
| Facilitators: | Facilitators:  
1) Funding realignment.  
2) Identification of target population.  
3) Adequate financing. | 1) Recognising that planning and implementing large-scale service changes takes time e.g. Kaiser Permanente. |
| NHS Future Forum | Clinical advice and leadership: a report from the NHS Future Forum. | Recommendations: |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
|                  |                                                                 | 1) Establish feedback loops. |
|                  |                                                                 | 2) Engage physicians, patients and families. |
| Needs:           |                                                                 | Needs: |
|                  | 1) A duty to promote research and innovation and the use of research evidence. | 1) Data about quality and outcomes of care is collected, shared and used in a transparent way to support informed patient choice and continuous improvement. |
|                  | 2) Strong and visible clinical and professional leadership at all levels, focused on increasing trust and encouraging positive behaviour. | 2) Continuing professional development. |
|                  |                                                                 | 3) Responsible officers continue to be in place to support doctors in improving care and ensuring their fitness to practice through revalidation. |
| Needs:           |                                                                 | Needs: |
|                  | 1) Integrated information systems need to be developed, commissioned and implemented. | 1) Substantial multi-professional clinical leadership embedded within it including visible leadership for key groups and conditions, for example children, women, older people, mental health and learning disabilities. |
|                  |                                                                 | 2) All organisations, particularly new ones, should ensure that appropriate leadership development and support are in place. |
| NHS Leadership Academy | Leadership in Integrated Care Systems (ICSs) | **Barriers:** | **Facilitators:** | **Recommendations:** |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| **Barriers:**          |                                             | 1) Performance management and assurance processes that are not aligned to learning and self-reflection.  
2) A sense that the goalposts keep moving with priorities, funding and expectations changing.  
3) A culture of blame towards leaders. | 1) Having the security to make long-term plans.  
2) Trust and delegation of autonomy from the centre: a permissive, not prescriptive, approach and national guidance that provides a broad, enabling framework. | 1) Peer support including mechanisms for ‘buddying up’.  
2) The creation of |
| **Barriers:**          |                                             | 1) Strategies and agendas that are imposed by NHS England on local areas rather than being clinically-led and driven by local need.  
2) Complex accountability structures and configurations.  
3) Insufficient development, support and peer support for leaders. | 1) Involving staff and service users.  
2) Clarity about how performance will be judged.  
3) Clarity about how accountability will work, and responsibilities of individual organisations. | |
| **Barriers:**          |                                             | 1) Lack of coordination and alignment at national level between NHS England and NHS Improvement.  
2) Different performance regimes and cultures, including between the NHS and local authorities. | 1) Relationships before structures: drawing on established working relationships built over the years. | |
| **Needs:**             |                                             | 1) Leaders in ICSs need to be skilled at:  
- identifying and scaling innovation (e.g. from pilots).  
- having a strong focus on outcomes and population health.  
- building strong relationships with other leaders, and often working with them informally to develop joint priorities and plans.  
- establishing governance structures which drive faster change, often going where the commitment and energy is strongest.  
- setting the overall outcomes and expectations on behaviours, but handing day-to-day decision-making to others.  
- supporting the development of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs).  
- designing and facilitating whole-systems events and workshops to build consensus and deliver change.  
- understanding and leading cultural change.  
- building system-wide learning and evaluation | |
| **Barriers:**          |                                             | 1) Lack of a coherent view of whole population needs.  
2) Sheer volume of bureaucracy involved in getting service changes through. | |

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
| 'safe spaces' for leaders to meet with peers and share problems and solutions. | Facilitation, to help deliver complex programmes. | 3) Systems leadership development for middle managers across the system. |
| 3) More opportunities to learn from other professions and sectors. | 4) Masterclasses on: co-production theory and practice, finance and risk-sharing, scaling innovation, understanding local government and social care, large-scale and large-group facilitation, working and influencing across multiple layers of governance. | Frameworks. |
|  |  | j) fostering a learning culture across the whole system. |

**Barriers:**

1) Capacity and capability of local leaders, pressure and stress in these roles, uncertainty about the future.

2) People in leadership roles finding the job lonely and feeling isolated.

3) High turnover of the leadership workforce, resulting in loss of experience and skills.

4) Confusion about where the decision-making power lies.

5) Clinical leadership is especially challenged by bureaucratic constraints.

**Facilitators:**

1) Stability in senior leadership positions across organisations.

**Recommendations:**

1) Leadership programmes and professional development opportunities.
| Nick Goodwin, Judith Smith, Alisha Davies, Claire Perry, Rebecca Rosen, Anna Dixon, Jennifer Dixon, Chris Ham | **Barriers:**
1) NHS management is permission based and has a risk averse approach where innovation is needed.
2) Approaches that measure experiences of patients, service users and carers in relation to integrated care.
3) Need for GPs to adapt to provide services at a larger scale.
   | **Facilitators:**
1) Clear articulation of benefits to patients, service users and carers.
   | **Barriers:**
1) Divide between primary/secondary, health/social care: different contracts, employment, free/means tested.
2) Absence of robust electronic sharing record.
   | **Facilitators:**
1) Creating powerful narrative at national and local level.
   | **Recommendations:**
1) Setting a clear, ambitious and measurable goal to improve the experience of patients and service users, implement change at scale and pace.
   |

| R Humphries | **Barriers:**
1) In contrast to the ‘Pioneer’ programme which has encouraged locally driven, bottom-up innovation, NHS England has adopted a much more prescriptive and top-down approach to the delivery of the Better Care Fund which is driven by an imperative to reduce emergency hospital admissions.
   | **Barriers:**
1) The personal commissioning programme is an entirely different approach again which rests on the ability of individuals rather than organisations to integrate their own care. It remains to be seen how the inevitable tensions between these very different policy levers and implementation styles will play out.
   | **Recommendations:**
1) A new settlement that brings together all health
| Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| 1) Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care. 2) Taking an incremental approach on progress. 3) High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders. | 1) Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods. | 1) Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients. 2) Staff commitment and belief that integration is doing the right thing. 3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 1) Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems. | 1) Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support. 2) Planned increase in provider competition. | 1) Active Medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice. 2) Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record. 3) Skilled leaders with the ability to win the hearts and minds of frontline staff. | 1) Lack of performance management role (indirect influence). 2) Variable progress in different localities is dependent on local leadership. | 1) Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned. | 1) Inconsistencies in national policy. |

**Rebecca Rosen, James Mountford, Geraint Lewis, Richard Lewis, Jenny Shand and Sara Shaw**

Integration in action: four international case studies

**Facilitators:**
- Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs.

**Recommendations:**
- Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care.
- Taking an incremental approach on progress.
- High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders.

**Barriers:**
- Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods.

**Recommendations:**
- Risk needs to be shared in collaboration between organisations rather than assigned individually.

**Barriers:**
- Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems.

**Recommendations:**
- Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, and must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care.

**Barriers:**
- Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned.

**Facilitators:**
- Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support.
- Planned increase in provider competition.
- Active Medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice.
- Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record.
- Skilled leaders with the ability to win the hearts and minds of frontline staff.

**Barriers:**
- Lack of performance management role (indirect influence).
- Variable progress in different localities is dependent on local leadership.
- Inconsistencies in national policy.
| Needs: | Needs: | Needs: |
|--------|--------|--------|
| 1) Standardised, validated tools and indicators that measure integration across different settings relative to a set of models, structures and processes. | 1) Focused, 'off-the-shelf measures' that suit a specific purpose or aspect of integrated care which can be applied by decision-makers and planners across diverse health and care systems and settings. | 1) Situate performance measures within wider health and care systems: acknowledge the level and combination of strategies used based on the challenges faced in obtaining appropriate quality care for local communities and user groups and consider the contextual factors that affect development and delivery. |
| 2) Improvement through audit of medical records, analysis of register data on hospitalisation rates, self assessment for managers, annual surveys, questionnaires for clinical leaders, qualitative interviews with executives, leaders, staff and managers. | 2) Qualitative and mixed methods approaches (such as comparative case study research and/or realistic evaluation) that facilitate understanding of which integrative processes work, for whom, and in what circumstances. | |
| 3) Longitudinal methods that move beyond simple snapshots of integrated care and follow integrative processes through time, allowing evaluators to assess not only the long-term implications for integrated delivery, organisation and outcomes, but also the way in which planned change is actually experienced for those with long- | | |
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| Sara Shaw, Ros Levenson | Towards integrated care in Trafford | **Recommendations:** | **Facilitators:** | **Facilitators:** | **Facilitators:** | **Facilitators:** |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                         |                                   | 1) Recognise that major change is needed, ensure a clear and agreed vision from GPs to specialists | 1) The small size allowed relationships to develop over time; indeed, there is a history of collaboration there (e.g. between GPs and community hospital teams and between health and social care). | 1) The integrated system appointed GPs as locality clinical directors, which was a key factor as they helped link the GP community directly into the ICO, thereby overcoming barriers between the acute and primary sectors. | 1) A strong role of shared, bottom-up leadership. Frontline clinicians in the Coastal Locality were notable for having trusting and friendly relationships between team leads (Physio, Nurses and Matrons, Social Care). | 1) Size/structural factors were key to integration success: the area was sufficiently small (n=36,251) to allow triage, assessment and referral in one multi-disciplinary team (MDT), whereas in the largest locality had 72,692 registered residents so the single MDT initially had much more caseloads which became unmanageable. |
| Sheena Asthana, Felix Gradinger, Julian Elston, Susan Martin, Richard Byng | Capturing the Role of Context in Complex System Change: An Application of the Canadian Context and Capabilities for Integrating Care (CCIC) Framework to an Integrated Care Organisation in the UK. | 2) Engage with stakeholders when developing integrated systems | 2) There was a commitment to learning by leaders. The Coastal leads insisted on collecting their own performance data despite being asked to discontinue doing so and devised their own performance management system (measuring performance). Priority to measure | 2) The partnering and the organisation of inter-professional teamwork and joint care planning as critical determinants of success, especially informal partnership which relies on trusting relationships at all levels. A balance of top-down and bottom-up committees and system-wide steering functions facilitated the emergence over time of trusting relationships and | | |
| Performance; there was a willingness in Coastal to genuinely question the process and outcomes of integrated care. | Iteratively evolving teams at locality level. This in turn allowed for better service delivery. | Needs: | Needs: |
|---|---|---|---|
| Needs: | 1) Need for a shared understanding of the purpose of the joint venture and a mutual understanding of, and commitment to, the vision of the venture across the organizations involved. 2) Need for the development of a shared culture. 3) The promotion of professional values of service to users and socialisation into the immediate work group. | Needs: | 1) Establishment of new roles to support new ways of working. |
| Barriers: | 1) A lack of clarity of purpose for integration, and a failure to agree partnership outcomes. 2) The lack of understanding and clarity of others' roles, leading to conflict between team managers. 3) Imbalance of power and poor communication. 4) Short-term contract working, lack of clear career structure, and limited opportunities for promotion (unless they left the service) created a dilemma: a trade-off between present job satisfaction and future career progression for staff in integrated care. | Barriers: | 1) It is important for integrated services to work together across agency boundaries; this has been facilitated by the removal of structural constraints through the Health Act 1999, which permitting pooled budgets and integrated provision. |
| Needs: | 1) Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available. | Needs: | 1) The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance. |
| Needs: | 1) Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available. | Needs: | 1) The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance. |
| Needs: | 1) Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas. | Needs: | 1) Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas. |

Sian E. Maslin-Prothero and Amy E. Bennion

Integrated team working: a literature review

**Needs:**
1) Need for a shared understanding of the purpose of the joint venture and a mutual understanding of, and commitment to, the vision of the venture across the organizations involved.
2) Need for the development of a shared culture.
3) The promotion of professional values of service to users and socialisation into the immediate work group.

**Barriers:**
1) The mismatch in cultures, behaviours and understanding of services creates a divide between the disciplines. Organisational boundaries resulted in staff feeling pressured, and the process of collaborative working.

**Needs:**
1) Establishment of new roles to support new ways of working.

**Barriers:**
1) A lack of clarity of purpose for integration, and a failure to agree partnership outcomes.
2) The lack of understanding and clarity of others' roles, leading to conflict between team managers.
3) Imbalance of power and poor communication.
4) Short-term contract working, lack of clear career structure, and limited opportunities for promotion (unless they left the service) created a dilemma: a trade-off between present job satisfaction and future career progression for staff in integrated care.

**Needs:**
1) It is important for integrated services to work together across agency boundaries; this has been facilitated by the removal of structural constraints through the Health Act 1999, which permitting pooled budgets and integrated provision.

**Barriers:**
1) Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available.

**Needs:**
1) The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance.
2) Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas.
led to unrealistic expectations being placed on staff. Stephanie Best Facilitating integrated delivery of services across organisational boundaries: Essential enablers to integration

| Needs: | Barriers: |
|---|---|
| 1) Horizontal communication. | 1) Lack of support. |
| 2) Joint training offers an opportunity to build relationships with colleagues across organisations and recognise each other's areas of expertise. Overall, participants expressed a wish to see improved working | 2) Overestimated expectations. |
| 3) Autocratic leadership style | 3) Joint decision-making. |
| Facilitators: | Facilitators: |
| 1) Communication: Intra- and Inter-professional; staff kept informed; spontaneously shared knowledge across organisations; top-down communication is acknowledged with the need to set a vision and strategic direction identified within leadership; bottom-up communication is seen as essential to actively supporting new ways of working and to sharing a common understanding of operational circumstances. | 1) Setting direction, setting the vision. |
| 2) Joint training offers an opportunity to build relationships with colleagues across organisations and recognise each other's areas of expertise. Overall, participants expressed a wish to see improved working | 2) Accessibility through visibility both within and across organisations. |
| 4) Authority to influence across organisations.
relationships, as this has the potential to lead to a ‘fluidity in thinking’ when managing difficult or complex situations.

Facilitators:

1) Ling et al (2012) further reported that pilot sites were more successful when there was evidence of a shared vision, along with a commitment from management in relation to longevity of the change.

Facilitators:

1) Change management can be complex, and Thomas et al (2006) suggest that changes are more likely to be adopted when the change meets an identified need. Ling et al (2012: 4) support this belief, as they reported that ‘where staff felt that change was being forced upon them then they were less likely to support the new activity.

Facilitators:

1) Shared information technology (IT) systems were identified as an enabler in two studies. This may pose a concern for a number of organisations considering data sharing owing to issues with information governance and maintaining patient confidentiality.

Facilitators:

1) Management and leadership support was identified as an enabler in four of the seven studies, with Coupe (2013) suggesting that leadership support was essential for the successful implementation of integrated health and social care teams.

Facilitators:

1) Resources and capacity have been identified as a key enabler in five out of the seven studies. Coupe (2013) attributed the main cause of under-performance of the integrated health and social care teams to a lack of investment in the teams, which is required to embed the change into practice. Ling et al (2012) also reported that the lack of resources in the integrated health and social care teams resulted in an increased workload, which had an adverse effect on staff motivation.

Facilitators:

2) Thistlethwaite (2011) partially attributed the success in Torbay to the stable leadership within Torbay and the ongoing managerial support to deliver on the integration project.

Facilitators:

2) Sheaff et al (2009) also referred to the NHS financial system, suggesting that paying hospitals for each case treated was an actual incentive to increase admissions, which completely conflicts with the aims of integrated health and social care teams.

Facilitators:

1) National policy was considered an enabler in four of the studies. Coupe (2013) identified that the NHS payment systems, such as payment by results and block contracts, do not incentivise the delivery of care in the community, and thus pose a barrier to integrated health and social care teams.
Barriers and facilitators to integrating care: experiences from the English Integrated Care Pilots

**Barriers:**
1. Feelings of being sidelined, or uninvolved with planning from the beginning.  
2. Reluctance to engage was a major barrier.  
3. Poor organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries.  
4. A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS ‘blame culture’.

**Facilitators:**
1. Widespread agreement and shared values among participating staff promoted engagement and motivation.  
2. Feelings of being involved with planning from the beginning.  
3. Willingness to engage. Creating shared beliefs about the benefits of change was described by staff as

---

**Barriers:**
1. Size and complexity: multiple components in integration reported greater challenges of managing change, and they were often greater and longer to implement than they had anticipated.  
2. Staff demotivated when an absence of clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. Where staff felt the change was being forced upon them, they were less likely to support the new activity.  
3. Lack of training led to staff being unclear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling unprepared to take on new roles.

**Facilitators:**
1. Success when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be strongly committed to implementing lasting change.  
2. ‘Good’ leadership.

---

**Barriers:**
1. Failure when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be weakly committed to implementing lasting change.  
2. ‘Poor’ leadership blamed for lack of shared beliefs about the benefits of change.

**Facilitators:**
1. Success when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be strongly committed to implementing lasting change.  
2. ‘Good’ leadership.

---

**Barriers:**
1. Staff cuts.

**Barriers:**
1. Chains of managerial approval among multiple organisations and slow decisions about resource distribution were perceived as a barrier to innovation.

---
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critical to progress.

4) Supportive, transparent organisational culture: the ability to modify existing systems and practices and to create new ones was especially dependent on organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries.

5) Staff feeling permitted to take risks.

Facilitators:

1) Size and complexity: simple, smaller integration made more rapid progress and had the ability and authority to come to quick decisions.

2) Staff were motivated when there was clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants.

3) Thorough training led to staff being clear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling prepared to take on new roles. The provision of training specific to the service change was important, particularly when the work involved required new or changed roles of participants.

4) External facilitation has been very helpful in getting two organisations to work together, which is a method well rehearsed in the wider literature on colleagues’ professional knowledge.

5) Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer.
| Section and Topic | Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------------------|--------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| TITLE             |        |                |                                |
| Title             | 1      | Identify the report as a systematic review. | 1 |
| ABSTRACT          |        |                |                                |
| Abstract          | 2      | See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist. | 2 |
| INTRODUCTION      |        |                |                                |
| Rationale         | 3      | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | 3 |
| Objectives        | 4      | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | 4 |
| METHODS           |        |                |                                |
| Eligibility criteria | 5   | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | 6 |
| Information sources | 6     | Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted. | 6 |
| Search strategy   | 7      | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | 7 |
| Selection process | 8      | Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | 7 |
| Data collection process | 9  | Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | 7 |
| Data items        | 10a    | List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect. | 7 |
|                   | 10b    | List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information. | 7 |
| Study risk of bias assessment | 11 | Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | 8 |
| Effect measures   | 12     | Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results. | 9 |
| Synthesis methods | 13a    | Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)). | 10 |
|                   | 13b    | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. | 9 |
|                   | 13c    | Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. | 11 |
|                   | 13d    | Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. | 11 |
|                   | 13e    | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). | N/A |
|                   | 13f    | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. | N/A |
| Reporting bias assessment | 14 | Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting bias). | 7 |
| Certainty         | 15     | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | 7 |
### RESULTS

#### Study selection

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 16a   | Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. | 9 |
| 16b   | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | 11 |

#### Study characteristics

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 17    | Cite each included study and present its characteristics. | Appendix B |

#### Risk of bias in studies

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 18    | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. | Appendix B |

#### Results of individual studies

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 19    | For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots. | Appendix B |

#### Results of syntheses

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 20a   | For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. | Appendix B |
| 20b   | Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect. | N/A |
| 20c   | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. | N/A |
| 20d   | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | N/A |

#### Reporting biases

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 21    | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. | 7 |

#### Certainty of evidence

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 22    | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. | 7 |

### DISCUSSION

#### Discussion

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 23a   | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. | 13 |
| 23b   | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | 16 |
| 23c   | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | 16 |
| 23d   | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | 16 |

### OTHER INFORMATION

#### Registration and protocol

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 24a   | Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered. | Review not registered |
| 24b   | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. | Appendix |
| 24c   | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. | N/A |

#### Support

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 25    | Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | 17 |

#### Competing interests

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 26    | Declare any competing interests of review authors. | 17 |

#### Availability of data, code and other materials

| Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| 27    | Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. | 17 |
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ABSTRACT

Objectives:
The NHS has been moving towards integrated care for the best part of two decades to address the growing financial and service pressures created by an ageing population. Integrated healthcare systems (IHSs) join up health and social care services and have been established to manage the care of individuals with complex chronic conditions but with varied success. It is therefore imperative to conduct a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) to identify and understand the factors that influence their successful functioning, and ascertain the factor with the greatest influence, in order to ensure positive outcomes when establishing future IHSs.

Methods:
Articles published between 1st January 1997 - 8th March 2020 were analysed from the following six databases: Healthcare Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Nuffield Trust, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), PubMed, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Evidence and Health Systems Evidence (HSE). Those deemed relevant after title and abstract screening were procured for subsequent review of the full-text article.

Results:
Thirty-three finalised articles were analysed in this SLR to provide a comprehensive overview of the factors that influence the functioning of IHSs. Factors were stratified into six key categories: organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, leadership ability of staff, economic factors and political factors. Leadership was deemed to be the most influential factor due to its intrinsic and instrumental role in influencing the other key factors.

Conclusions:
The findings of this SLR may serve as a guide to developing tailor-made recommendations and policies that address the identified key factors and thereby improve the functioning of present and future IHSs. Furthermore, due to both its overarching influence and the inadequacy of literature in this field, there is a strong case for further research exploring leadership development specifically for IHSs.

Keywords: Integrated Care, NHS, Leadership, Organisational Culture, Workforce Management, Inter-organisational Collaboration

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This is an in-depth systematic literature review uncovering important factors that can be applied when developing policies pertinent to the effective functioning of IHSs in the NHS.
- The selection of studies was based on a specific eligibility criteria, which ensured that the articles in this study were specific to the NHS and IHSs.
- The literature search was conducted across six electronic databases enabling good breadth for selection of papers.
- 17 articles were excluded due to the full-texts being unobtainable, resulting in the possibility that important contributions on the factors influencing the success of IHSs were not considered.
INTRODUCTION

The ever-changing healthcare needs of the UK population present a constant challenge for the National Health Service (NHS). An ageing population together with a rise in the prevalence of long standing illness amongst the younger population has shifted the focus from preventing premature death due to acute illness to managing complex chronic conditions, which requires a coordinated and collaborative effort between families, carers, and the health and social care systems.[1, 2] The growing financial and service pressures facing the NHS, which have been exacerbated further by the current COVID-19 pandemic,[3] cannot be tackled without transforming how health and social care are delivered.[4] Old models of care, which have focussed primarily on providing episodic treatment for acute illness, must be replaced with new patient-centred models that integrate health and care services to meet today’s population health needs.[1] Constant evaluation of these models is crucial to ensure the constituent organisations synergise together and fulfil the larger systemic goals of the NHS. The COVID-19 pandemic has necessitated the synergistic working resulting from integrated care in order to achieve more efficient and effective communication between organisations. Such benefits have played a vital role in the coordination of the national vaccine programme in managing COVID-19, and will undeniably be crucial in any future pandemics and, in the wider context, the development of the system to better fulfil the healthcare needs of the population.

Integrated care has been a feature of NHS policy for the best part of two decades. However, despite initiatives by successive governments, system-wide integration has not yet been achieved. Progress to date has been slow and has not delivered all of the expected benefits for patients, the NHS or local authorities.[5] The term was first described in ‘The New NHS’ in 1997, and several integrated healthcare systems (IHSs) have since been introduced to join up health and social care services, such as Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) in 2017 and the current form of Integrated Care Systems (ICSs), which were introduced in the NHS Long Term Plan in 2019 and have evolved out of the set of existing network of STPs. In April 2021, all 42 parts of England were declared ICSs and, in July 2021, the government set to publish legislation proposing statutory ICSs for Parliament to consider, with implementation set for April 2022.

Rationale:

As the NHS advances further towards integrated care, it is necessary to identify and study these factors to harness the facilitators and address the barriers. While existing reviews have identified these factors acting as facilitators and barriers to implementing integrated care, there lies a gap in the literature regarding which factor is the most influential. This review aims to comprehensively identify the factors acting as facilitators and barriers to integrated care and subsequently deduce any underpinning factors that have the most influence. A broad understanding of these factors, and the factor(s) with the most influence, is needed to enable their optimisation and ensure positive outcomes when establishing future IHSs in the NHS.

Objectives:

- To comprehensively identify the factors that influence the functioning of IHSs
- To deduce any underpinning factors that have the most influence in the functioning of IHSs

BACKGROUND TO THEORY:3

What is the NHS?
The National Health Service (NHS) refers to the UK’s government-funded health care system. Health services are provided ‘free at the point of delivery’, meaning that any UK resident can visit a doctor who will offer diagnosis or treatment for an illness without asking the individual for payment during or after the visit. As these health and care services are ‘publicly funded’, money has been allocated by the government to pay for this visit to the doctor through UK residents paying tax.[6]

What is Integration and Integrated Care?

Over 175 competing definitions for ‘integration’ and ‘integrated care’ exist within literature,[7] reflecting what Kodner describes as ‘an imprecise hodgepodge’. [8] Nonetheless, one of the earliest and most robust definitions from a review by Kodner and Spreeuwenberg states that:

‘Integration is a coherent set of methods and models on the funding, administrative, organisational, service delivery and clinical levels designed to create connectivity, alignment and collaboration within and between the care and care sectors. The goal of these methods and models is to enhance quality of care and quality of life, consumer satisfaction and system efficiency for patients with complex, long term problems cutting across multiple services, providers and settings. The result of such multi-pronged efforts to promote integration for the benefit of these special patient groups is called ‘integrated care’. [9]

In essence, ‘integration’ involves bringing organisations together with the ultimate aim of improving outcomes and service experience for patients who require access to multiple health and care services through the practice of ‘integrated care’ at various levels. There are three levels to integration: the macro level where integrated care is delivered to whole populations, the meso level where it is delivered to a particular care group or population with the same condition (e.g. heart disease), and the micro level where integrated care is delivered to individual service users and their carers.[10] In addition, integration can occur horizontally when two or more organisations or services that deliver care at a similar level come together (e.g. mergers of acute hospitals), or vertically when two or more organisations or services delivering care at differing levels come together (e.g. mergers of acute hospitals with community health services). There are also six key requirements for effective integration.[11] This includes:

- Organisation integration, where organisations are brought together by mergers and/or structural change, or virtually via contracts between separate organisations
- Functional integration, where non-clinical support and back-office functions are integrated
- Service integration, where different clinical services provided are integrated at organisational level
- Clinical integration, where patient care is integrated in a single process both within and across professions, e.g. use of shared guidelines
- Normative integration, where there exist shared values in co-ordinating work and securing collaboration in delivering healthcare
- Systemic integration, where there is coherence of rules and policies at all organisational levels

What are Integrated healthcare systems (IHSs)?

The term IHS has been used to denote the working together of different healthcare organisations as a single cohesive body with the aim of addressing population health needs. This encompasses STPs and ICSs, the latter of which is the latest among initiatives to integrate care in the NHS. By this definition, an ICS is an integrated healthcare system; however, integrated healthcare systems aren’t limited exclusively to ICSs and can refer to any integrated body tasked with delivering integrated care such as STPs.
What is a Successful IHS?

The NHS has traditionally based its definition of success on performance metrics that are specific to the production process of the NHS, which involves inputs (funding), processes (patient waiting times), and outputs (number of patients treated).[12] However, there has been a lack of emphasis placed upon the ultimate outcome, which is high quality patient care. Alongside the need to provide more holistic outcomes, as well as the NHS moving towards integrated care, a new understanding of success is required. For the purpose of this study, the success of IHSs should be defined as patients having a seamless experience across all health and social care services they interact with, reducing inefficiencies and non-value steps in the patient journey and ultimately improving outcomes at a lower cost.[1, 13]

METHODOLOGY

Protocol:
This systematic literature review (SLR) was reported using the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis) framework, which was developed according to published guidance by the EQUATOR (Enhancing the Quality and Transparency Of health Research) Network.[14]

Eligibility criteria:
This review will consider qualitative studies that address factors that influence the establishment and/or functioning of IHSs within the UK. The NHS has a unique organisational structure including national bodies, local clinical commissioning groups, and healthcare providers. For this reason, articles were excluded that pertain to the private health and care sector, the business sector, and international IHSs in order to make findings specific to this unique context. Articles were limited to the English language to be legible by the authors.

This review considered literature published in the years 1997-2020, as ‘The New NHS’, published on the 8th December 1997, represents one of the earliest examples of literature calling to ‘replace the internal market with integrated care’, thereby serving as the starting point for research activity on the topic of integration in the NHS.[15]

| INCLUSION | EXCLUSION |
|-----------|-----------|
| Articles relevant to the health and care sector | Articles relevant to other sectors such as the business sector |
| Articles addressing the implementation of IHSs specifically within the UK | Articles that pertain to International IHSs with different organisational structure to the UK |
| Articles published after 1997 | Articles published prior to 1997 |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Articles with a full-text accessible for thorough analysis | Articles that only had an accessible abstract, not allowing for comprehensive analysis |
| Articles relevant to the public health and care sector | Articles relevant to the private health and care sector |
| Articles written in the English language | Articles not written in the English language |

Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for articles selected in this study

**Information sources:**

The search was implemented on 08/04/2020 across six electronic databases: Healthcare Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Nuffield Trust, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), PubMed, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Evidence, and Health Systems Evidence (HSE).

To supplement the comprehensive literature search, a 'snowball' technique was adopted, whereby the reference list for all relevant articles was scanned to identify further relevant articles.

Articles found through this literature search consisted of thought pieces as well as those which were empirically driven or peer reviewed. As a result, the contributions of each article were also assessed in accordance with the hierarchy of evidence.[16] The categorisation of these articles are detailed in Table 2.

**Search:**

The search strategy was developed through consensus-based discussion and agreement between all authors. The final search string was as follows:

("Integrated Health"* OR "Integrating Health"* OR "Integrated Care"*) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

The search query was tailored to the specific requirements of each database. The adapted electronic search strings for each database can be found in Appendix A.

**Selection of sources of evidence:**

Initially, all authors independently screened only the title and abstract (or background in white papers) of each article to preclude the waste of time and energy from reviewing full-text articles that fail to meet the eligibility criteria. To ensure consistency among all authors,
a pilot screening was initially completed in which each author screened the same 200 articles independently. From this, all reviewers independently agreed on all but 4 articles; however this was resolved upon discussion to clarify the eligibility criteria, which was then amended to increase specificity and clarity. Consequently, the pilot ended in comprehensive agreement on the eligibility criteria and resulted in the reviewers having the same view on which papers should be accepted or rejected.

All articles deemed relevant after title and abstract screening were procured for subsequent review of the full-text article. The full-text articles were then assessed for eligibility and a proportion were excluded, resulting in a final selection of studies to be included in the SLR. As this was an unfunded project, 17 articles were unobtainable through our institutional search and due to these financial limitations access to the full-text versions of abstracts that were found on database searches was restricted.

**Data Extraction Chart:**
The following key identifiable information was extracted from each article: the author(s), year of publication, title, database the article was retrieved from, journal, study type, DOI or URL. The articles were also stratified under the following headings: needs identified, barriers identified, facilitators identified and recommendations. The categories were identified qualitatively through the language used in articles to describe each factor, with a quantitative record of the number of mentions in each article also noted. The categories were found to be highly interdependent and therefore it must be noted that there was some overlap between them. The findings were reported in a ‘Data Extraction Chart’ table format (see Appendix B). The main revision to the headings in the chart included the addition of ‘Recommendations’ as articles often framed influential factors in the form of recommended actions to improve IHSs.

All authors jointly extracted the data from each article using ‘Google Sheets’, discussed the results and continuously iterated the data extraction chart. An interpretivist approach was then used to draw the factors that were identified from the data extraction chart into the corresponding themes and subsequently identify any underpinning factors that have the most influence in the functioning of IHSs. This particular approach is one of social construction as opposed to objectivity, and thus was used to analyse the various subjective perspectives of the authors within the literature. This method involved an initial extraction in which each author had the opportunity to further research independently into the content of the literature. This process enabled diversity of thought into the subject matter with each author developing their own interpretations of the data extraction. Furthermore this enhanced reflectivity and analysis of key themes, a crucial component towards a rigorous review process.

**Patient and Public Involvement**
Patients or the public were not involved in the design of this study.

**RESULTS:**

**Search Results:**

The overall search resulted in 33 finalised articles to be included in the SLR. The flow of records in the search process is conveyed in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Process of identifying search results, screening, assessing for eligibility and inclusion.](image)

**Characteristics of sources of evidence:**
Table 2 describes the categories into which the data from each article was inserted, accompanied by the year of publication, database and study type.

| Characteristic           | Number (n = 33) | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| **Publication year**     |                 |                |
| 1997-2004                | 0               | 0.0            |
| 2005-2009                | 2               | 6.1            |
| 2010-2014                | 11              | 33.3           |
| 2014-2019                | 17              | 51.5           |
| >2020                    | 3               | 9.1            |
| **Study Type**           |                 |                |
| Qualitative Study        | 9               | 27.3           |
| Report                   | 15              | 45.5           |
| Scoping Narrative Literature Review | 1 | 3.0 |
| Systematic Literature Review | 5 | 15.2 |
| Case Study               | 3               | 9.1            |
| **Database**             |                 |                |
| EMCARE                   | 3               | 9.1            |
| HMIC                     | 7               | 21.2           |
| BNI                      | 1               | 3.0            |
| HSE                      | 2               | 6.1            |
| EMBASE                   | 1               | 3.0            |
| CINAHL                   | 3               | 9.1            |
| Nuffield Trust           | 6               | 18.2           |
| PubMed                   | 5               | 15.2           |
| N/A                      | 5               | 15.2           |
| **Data Categories**      |                 |                |
| Needs                    | 9               | 27.3           |
| Barriers                 | 20              | 60.6           |
| Facilitators             | 21              | 63.6           |
| Recommendations          | 16              | 48.5           |

Table 2: Characteristics of Sources of Evidence
Summary of evidence:
From 1997 to 2019, an increasing number of selected articles were published (0% in 1997-2004, 6.1% in 2005-2009, 33.3% in 2010-2014, and 51.5% in 2014-2019). This reflects the growing field of research into IHSs leading up to The NHS Long-Term Plan, influencing its strategic focus on integration.[17]

The factors that influence the functioning of IHSs were framed as needs in 27.3% of articles, barriers and facilitators in 60.6% of articles, and as recommendations in 48.5%. On the basis of the language used to describe each factor, all factors were categorised into themes. The themes identified were:

1. Organisational Culture - an informal organisational system of shared values (i.e. what is important) and beliefs (i.e. how things work), that influence the environment and produce behavioural norms (i.e. the way we do things around here).
2. Workforce Management - the formal organisational arrangements that enable staff to carry out the tasks at hand as productively as possible.
3. Inter-organisational collaboration - the formal and informal organisational arrangements that build trust and collective relationships between organisations.
4. Leadership Ability of Staff - an informal organisational system by which one individual influences others toward attaining defined goals.
5. Economic factors - formal organisational arrangements relating to the consumption and supply of resources.
6. Political factors - formal organisational arrangements relating to the government or public affairs of a country.

See Appendix B to view the ‘Data Extraction Chart’ displaying the exact language used by each article to describe the identified factors, and their categorisation into each of the themes listed above. See Appendix C to view the ‘Synthesis of Results’ displaying all findings from each article stratified by the identified themes.

In this SLR of 33 articles, each factor identified influences the functioning of IHSs by either shaping their planning and implementation, or their ongoing functioning, or both. The factors that pertain to each stage are made clear in the summaries below. Furthermore, integration poses its own unique challenges and requires a unique set of factors to meet these challenges. The factors outlined below are described in the context of IHSs, rather than in the context of a conventional organisation. Although these themes are clearly defined, it is worth noting that they are not mutually exclusive and are highly interdependent.

Organisational Culture
82% of articles cited issues relating to organisational culture, including the need for leaders to communicate a shared vision to effectively plan and implement integration.[18-23] This demands a mutual understanding of and commitment to the vision across the organisations involved.[24] Differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, status inequalities, professional cultures, working practices and priorities can lead to divides between staff from different organisations, creating conflict and a ‘blame culture’ that stifles ongoing integrated working.[25-29] Fostering an ethos of learning and self-reflection was also shown to yield positive outcomes as staff continue to work together long-term.[26, 28, 30]

Workforce Management
Factors relating to workforce management were expressed in 76% of articles, such as the need to provide staff with adequate incentives to ‘buy into’ the integration process as the new style of working is established in the NHS.[31, 32] Healthcare staff need to be trained for the new roles they may need for integrated work.[33] and leaders must encourage staff to
take 'ownership' of new service models as they are planned and implemented by involving them in decision making.[25, 34] Furthermore, integrating services often requires increased workloads at the start and overworking staff can reduce motivation to collaborate with other sectors, yielding high staff turnover and poorer outcomes. Therefore, managing the workload of staff is key in both the initial stages of implementation and the ongoing functioning of IHSs.[25, 27]

Inter-organisational Collaboration
As IHSs involve cooperation between different organisations, 70% of articles demonstrated the need for factors relating to inter-organisational collaboration to both achieve and sustain integrated care. These include: inter-professional teamwork involving both top-down and bottom-up communication,[24, 25, 35] the formation of good working relationships built on trust,[26, 35, 36] and the presence of shared information technology (IT) platforms between organisations to enable easy data-sharing.[20, 21, 24-26, 31, 37, 38] The lack of ongoing planned communication between members of partnering organisations leads to contact often being limited to emails with minimal face-to-face interaction, and was often cited as a barrier to long-term collaboration.[27]

Leadership Ability of Staff
82% of articles addressed leadership ability of staff, outlining that successful integration requires a combination of clear leadership and governance from senior managers at the macro level with strong involvement of frontline staff as clinical leaders at the micro level,[21, 35, 38-41] together with local authority figures acting as local leaders.[19, 25, 31, 33]

The unique challenges posed by planning and implementing integration include: high levels of pressure and stress faced by staff, high turnover of staff as personnel changes are made, and a lack of stability among the leadership workforce as their roles are adapted.[28] These challenges require leaders to support the emotional wellbeing of staff, set clear and measurable goals, identify and scale innovation from pilot programmes, and establish governance structures that drive faster change.[20, 28]

The ongoing functioning of IHSs is highly influenced by the ability of leaders to shift from organisational leadership (leading individuals within one organisation) towards ‘systems leadership’ (leading individuals across multiple organisations),[18, 30, 34, 42, 43] as well as by the capacity of leaders to act as role models and apply a high level of emotional intelligence to build high quality relationships with team members and allegiances with other leaders.[28, 34, 44]

Economic Factors
Economic factors, such as the reluctance of commissioning organisations to pool budgets, and low levels of funding and staff, often with inadequate training, were cited as barriers to planning and implementing integrated care in 61% of articles,[30, 32, 33] and the need to devise long-term plans with an appropriate level of funding was expressed as vital to preserve the ongoing functioning of IHSs.[18, 27] Providing a manageable caseload without overstretching human resources is also a crucial success factor for the long-term functioning of IHSs,[33] as it was in the case of Coastal Locality in Torbay and South.[35] Payment methods such as Payment by Results (PbR) that incentivise activity in hospitals over other providers and were also identified as barriers to the continued functioning of IHSs.[25]

Political Factors
Political barriers to the planning and implementation of IHSs were expressed in 52% of articles, examples of which include the fragmented strategic direction from national government with conflicting leadership approaches by different government entities,[32, 24, 25, 33] together with difficulties in agreeing budgets and uncertainty regarding the level of integration that is desired.[45] Furthermore, failures of policy makers to evaluate and learn
from the pitfalls of existing policies and translate published evidence into political action served as barriers to the ongoing delivery of integrated care.[45]

DISCUSSION

After synthesising the results, the categories of factors identified were ascertained to be under the responsibility of either leaders within IHSs (organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, leadership ability of staff) or policymakers above (economic and political factors).

Detailed analysis carried out by all reviewers identified a significant overlap between leadership and the three core factors (organisational culture, workforce management and inter-organisational collaboration) during the review process. 82% of articles emphasised the importance of organisational culture, which is determined by the core values cultivated by leaders in order to establish a shared culture in which all members feel represented. Moreover, 76% of articles emphasised the importance of workforce management in IHSs. In managing the workforce, leaders should utilise compassionate leadership, moulding an environment through ‘consistently listening, understanding, empathising and helping’ staff.

Leaders being more enabling and facilitative of the workforce leads to increased productivity, resulting in better delivery of care and ultimately improved health outcomes for patients. The third principal factor discussed in the results is inter-organisational collaboration, discussed in 70% of articles. It can be inferred that effective leadership has the potential to create an atmosphere consistent with achieving a common goal by cooperating effectively with other organisations. However, IHSs carry a lot of ‘uncertainty and ambiguity’, which further stresses the need for a leader to create a network of trust and communicate a shared vision across multiple organisations.

As a result, group reflection amongst reviewers revealed that leadership has an intrinsic and instrumental role in influencing the other three key factors, as depicted in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: The underpinning role of leadership in influencing other key factors in integrated care

In the argument for leadership being the most influential factor, both Charles et al. and Tweed et al. expressed the need for ‘systems leadership’ to implement the system-wide change required for integrated care.[19, 35] Charles et al. describes that systems leadership requires leaders to create a positive organisational culture by ‘communicat(ing) a shared vision and purpose’; they need to manage their workforce through ‘frequent personal contact with others and resolv(ing) conflicts’, and they need to facilitate organisational collaboration by ‘build(ing) trust and rapport with partner organisations to move away from competition and towards forming long-term collaborative relationships’. [19] Systems leadership is a concept that is supported by the views of Kellerman who states, ‘Leadership is a system not a person’ and incorporates the followers and the context within which they work in addition to the leaders themselves. [49]

Tweed et al. developed on this further by introducing a model of ‘connecting’ (Figure 3) to create an allegiance based upon qualitative research involving the active participation of leaders achieving transformational change. The conceptualisation of leadership as a system is further justified through the responsibilities of leaders included in this model: leading with ‘purpose’ and ‘vision’, shaping organisational culture, and managing the workforce in a ‘relational’ manner ‘through practice’ by collaborating between organisations, which correspond with the key themes identified in the results. [35]

Figure 3: Visual representation of the ‘Connecting’ model [35]
When considering the ‘followers’ and the ‘context’ components of leadership as a system, it is important to note that collaboration between multiple healthcare bodies requires leaders to work with numerous organisational cultures. For example, in a study by Smith et al., there are clear differences in the culture between healthcare and social care bodies, which create two distinct uni-professional cultures. These are two key aspects that integrated care aims to converge, through the use of inter-organisational collaboration.[50]

Another responsibility of leaders in IHSs is to effectively implement a clear governance system that creates an overarching structure overseeing the functioning of IHSs. This is necessary in creating order, accountability, and setting a clear direction in a relatively recent healthcare structure that lacks a distinct ‘rule book’, [51] thereby ensuring that integrated operations are sustained long-term.

The SLR also identified economic and political factors to be crucial in the function of IHSs. These were interpreted to be largely in the hands of governments and policy makers who determine the strategic direction of integration, resource availability, and payment mechanisms. The capacity to amend these factors is relatively inflexible, while leadership and its overarching factors can be optimised despite any systemic economic and political constraints.

Thus, leadership is not only the most influential factor, but also the factor with the greatest capacity to be influenced. However, leadership cannot be changed overnight and requires the development of leadership skills in healthcare staff from the beginning of their careers, as well as the removal of bad leaders and the appointment of more qualified leaders, which can be highly disruptive to IHSs initially. Furthermore, the collaboration needed between all leaders within IHSs necessitates an extended period of time to develop, resulting in a gradual change in functioning rather than a quick fix.

It has been suggested that the successful implementation of integrated care has improved certain patient outcomes, such as hospital admission rates, length of hospital stay and patient satisfaction.[52, 53] It can therefore be inferred that strong leadership in IHSs is extremely valuable in the delivery of high quality healthcare to patients. However, the relationship between integrated care and the long lasting outcomes on patient health requires further follow-up and research.[54]

Ultimately, a gap lies in this field of literature. Evans et al. noted that, while ‘Leadership Approach’ and ‘Clinician Engagement and Leadership’ are among the most important capabilities shaping the capacity of organisations to implement integrated care, they have not been consistently studied.[39] As such, there is much value to be gained by undertaking further research to explore deeper the role leadership plays in influencing its attributed factors.

LIMITATIONS
When analysing the selected full-text articles, the authors found issues discussed in literature to be multi-faceted, leading to overlap between the factors identified when synthesising the results. Interpretation and categorisation of these factors may have been subject to individual bias.

17 articles were excluded from this study due to the full-texts being unobtainable due to reasons explained in the methodology. These were excluded after title and abstract screening, resulting in a proportion of papers and their contribution on factors influencing IHSs being forgone and thus limiting the extent of the SLR. Therefore, it is recommended...
that future researchers invest in payments to journals to be given access to the full scope of articles.

Due to the evolving nature of IHSs there is an inevitable lack of widespread IHS-related terminology across literature. As a result it is likely that relevant studies were missed during the search process reducing the breadth of information available for analysis.

In addition, the inclusion of grey literature in the search uncovered challenges such as the lack of extensive search tools for these papers which resulted in web searching- a method that is not as thorough as the use of databases.

CONCLUSION
This SLR presented an overview of a multitude of key factors that influence the functioning of IHSs in the NHS relating to organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, the leadership ability of staff, economic and political factors. Within ICSs in the NHS, ‘system leadership’ was found to be vital to achieve the transformational change required to integrate care and meet the ideals of The NHS Long Term Plan.[17] This is a concept that has been identified in other articles - underlining that leaders in healthcare must develop more in the domains of collaborative working and coalition.[54]

The current available literature includes material which discusses the ideal implementation of integrated healthcare, such as the work from Jon Glasby and Helen Dickinson who explore specific challenges related to delivering integrated care.[55] However, the shift of the NHS towards integrated healthcare is an ongoing narrative and the findings of this SLR provide a topical review of the literature. This will help to better contextualise the current state of IHSs and act as a key stepping stone towards the development of tailor-made recommendations and policies to address and optimise these factors within present and future IHSs in the NHS. In addition, there is a strong case for further research exploring leadership development, due to its underpinning influence on the other categories of factors and the identified gap within the literature that pertains to this field.
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Figure 1: Process of identifying search results, screening, assessing for eligibility and inclusion.
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Figure 2: The underpinning role of leadership in influencing other key factors in integrated care
Figure 3: Visual representation of the 'Connecting' model [33]
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Appendix A: Search Strings

**HMIC:**

("Integrated Health*" OR "Integrating Health*" OR "Integrated Care*") AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 2000 - Current

**Nuffield Trust:**

("Integrated Health*" OR "Integrating Health*" OR "Integrated Care*") AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits:

Years: 1997-2020

Content Type: Report, Journal Article

**CINAHL:**

NHS AND ("Integrated Health*" OR "Integrating Health*" OR "Integrated Care*") AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: December 1997 - April 2020, English Language

**PubMed:**

NHS AND ("Integrated Health*" OR "Integrating Health*" OR "Integrated Care*") AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 08/12/1997-08/04/2020, English Language

**NICE Evidence:**

NHS AND ("Integrated Health*" OR "Integrating Health*" OR "Integrated Care*") AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 2000-2020
HSE:

(“Integrated Health” OR “Integrating Health” OR “Integrated Care”) AND (Factor OR Perform OR Success OR Fail)

Limits: 2000-2020
## Appendix B: Data Extraction Chart

| Author | Year of Publication | Title | Database | Journal | Study Type | DOI/ URL | Needs Identified | Barriers Identified | Facilitators Identified | Recommendations |
|--------|---------------------|-------|----------|---------|------------|----------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Alison Tweed, Andrew Singfield, Julia RA Taulor, Lucy Gilbert, Paul Mount | 2018 | Creating Allegiance: Leading transformational change within the NHS | EMCA RE | BMJ Leader | Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.1136/leaders-2018-000088 | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders should be non-partisan integrators rather than assign themselves to an organisation - have an allegiance to the system. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders should build high quality relationships involving emotional intelligence and positive role modelling. 3) Organisational Culture - Shared visions (espoused theories) need to be outlined and translated into everyday practice and visions of previous leaders or schemes must be erased. 4) Workforce Management - Connecting through practice: involving frontline staff and all stakeholders in decisions and key pieces of the transformation to integrated care. | 1) Political - The legislative context does not support system working. 2) Political - Regulation and oversight is not aligned. 3) Organisational Culture - A legacy of competitive behaviours. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Collaborative relationships. 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Partnerships with local authorities. 3) Organisational Culture - Shared vision and purpose. 4) Organisational Culture - A meaningful local identity. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Invest in building collaborative relationships at all levels of the system. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Promote and value system leadership. 3) Workforce Management - Integrate at different levels of the system. |

| Anna Charles, Lillie Wenzel, Matthew Kershaw, Chris Ham, Nicola Walsh | 2018 | A Year of Integrated Care Systems: Reviewing the journey so far | N/A - Snowball | The King's Fund | Report | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/2018-09/Yea r-of-integ rated-care-systems-2 | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Collaborative relationships. 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships with local authorities. 3) Organisational Culture - Shared vision and purpose. 4) Organisational Culture - A meaningful local identity. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Invest in building collaborative relationships at all levels of the system. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Promote and value system leadership. 3) Workforce Management - Integrate at different levels of the system, |
| Page | Reviewing Journey So-Far Report.pdf | 4) Organisational Culture - Frequently changing language and the lack of a clear narrative. | 5) Intrinsic value of leadership - System leadership. | building up from places and neighbourhoods. |
|------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 5) Economic - Leaders face competing demands. | 6) Economic - Funding pressures. | 7) Workforce Management - Established models of integrated working. | 8) Economic - Stability of local finances and performance. | 4) Workforce Management - Draw on the skills and leadership of frontline staff. |
| 6) Economic - Funding pressures. | 7) Workforce Management - Develop governance in an evolutionary way to support delivery. | 6) Workforce Management - Develop system-wide capabilities to gather, share and act on public insights. | 7) Workforce Management - Develop active strategies to facilitate wider adoption of new care models. | 5) Workforce Management - Build robust evaluation into the ICS programme that supports learning and improvement and measures progress. |
| 8) Economic - Stability of local finances and performance. | 9) Economic - Funding to support transformation. | 7) Workforce Management - Develop active strategies to facilitate wider adoption of new care models. | 8) Economic - Stability of local finances and performance. | 5) Workforce Management - Build governance in an evolutionary way to support delivery. |
| 9) Economic - Funding to support transformation. | 10) Political - A permissive and supportive national programme. | 6) Workforce Management - Develop system-wide capabilities to gather, share and act on public insights. | 7) Workforce Management - Develop active strategies to facilitate wider adoption of new care models. | 5) Workforce Management - Build robust evaluation into the ICS programme that supports learning and improvement and measures progress. |
| 10) Political - A permissive and supportive national programme. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inadequate collaboration continues to result in poor quality, efficiency and effectiveness of care. | 7) Workforce Management - Inadequate workforce planning. | 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved. | 7) Workforce Management - Develop active strategies to facilitate wider adoption of new care models. |
| 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inadequate collaboration continues to result in poor quality, efficiency and effectiveness of care. | 2) Organisational Culture - Culture of impatience and cynicism. | 3) Workforce Management - Inadequate workforce planning. | 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved. | 8) Economic - Stability of local finances and performance. |
| 2) Organisational Culture - Culture of impatience and cynicism. | 3) Workforce Management - Inadequate workforce planning. | 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of evidence on how the third sector and independent services would be involved. | 5) Economic - Funding pressures. | 6) Workforce Management - Develop system-wide capabilities to gather, share and act on public insights. |

Axel Kaehne, Alison J Petch, Robin Stewart Miller 2017 Bringing Integration Home: Policy on health and social care integration in the four nations of the UK BNI Journal of Integrated Care Qualitative Study DOI: 10.1108/JICA-12-2016-0049
|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   |   |   |   |
| 5) Political - Complex governance arrangements. |
| 6) Economic - Difficulties in agreeing budgets. |
| 7) Political - Lack of understanding of what the drivers and essential requirements are for successful integration between health and social care and how to use policy to steer care organisations through this change. |
1) Political - Pressure by national and local policy-makers to demonstrate the success of new integration initiatives at a stage too early in the programme's implementation.

2) Economic - Acute/community trusts or social services departments suffered from significant financial deficit and were subject to 'special measures', which diverted senior management attention away from Pioneer activity.

3) Economic - The growing demand for costly A&E services by patients at a time when integration seeks to reduce usage - diverts resources and slows the pace of transformation.

4) Political - Strategic direction from the national government is fragmented. Differences in approach: DCLG reportedly favouring more locally devolved responsibility, while DH/NHSE adopt a more 'command and control' approach.

5) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated information system between organisations to enable sharing of patient/service user records or having suitable facilities for cross-agency and/or multi-disciplinary teams.

6) Workforce Management - Experienced staff.

7) Economic - Uncommitted funding.

1) Organisational Culture - Trust and shared values that are largely developed locally.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Being part of a national Pioneer programme, which provided an impetus for local professionals to work together to improve care locally.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Building and maintaining good working relationships across organisations and professions at all levels built on trust, so that people could speak frankly, come to understand each other's perspectives, and develop a shared vision and understanding of what the Pioneer was aiming to achieve.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Health care and social care have different regulatory frameworks and the regulator does not examine systems such as integrated services, instead only...
|   | Looking at individual organisations. |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 6 | Workforce Management - Integration was less of a priority where stakeholders had urgent competing demands (e.g. meeting 4-hour waiting time A&E targets). |
| 7 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Some Pioneers were very complex with a large number of stakeholders and/or a large geographic footprint, which made partnership working more complex in terms of size, communication, governance, etc. |
| 8 | Collaboration between Organisation - Inadequate local engagement/‘buy-in’ of the independent, community and voluntary sectors, in part, because they were often required to compete against each other for contracts, making working together particularly challenging. |
| 9 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inadequate local engagement/‘buy-in’ of the mental health sector, due in part to the legacy of underfunding and ‘Cinderella’ status of the sector. |
| 10 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - In some Pioneers with multiple partners, a sense that |
| 11 | Workforce Management - Staff involvement in developing integration initiatives and encouraging their ‘ownership’ of new service models. |
| 12 | Political - Supportive legislation. |
| 13 | Workforce Management - Local champions. |
| 14 | Workforce Management - Collecting the right information/indicators so that impact/success can be measured and visible to staff, patients/service users and the local population. |
| 15 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Co-location of operational teams facilitated communication and partnership working between different professionals. |
| 16 | Organisational Culture - Freedom to try things out, not having a ‘culture of blame’ if things go wrong, and piloting new initiatives and sharing the learning before roll-out. Reassuring staff so they ‘feel safe’ in the face of change. |
transformation could happen only at the pace of the 'slowest', most conservative or risk averse stakeholder.

11) Economic - PbR incentives for acute providers to increase activity against providing more care outside hospital.

12) Economic - Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a larger one.

13) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Information sharing was seen as critical, but the level of integration of information and intelligence needed was technically difficult to achieve across multiple IT platforms and with obstructive information governance regulations.

14) Organisational Culture - Differences between the health and social care sectors in terms of language and conceptions of health and wellbeing, professional cultures and working practices.

15) Organisational Culture - Different priorities between professions: e.g. the people of most concern to social workers were not
necessarily the same as those of most concern to GPs.

16) Organisational Culture - 'Blame culture' within and across local health and social care sectors located responsibility for failures in integration elsewhere in the system.

17) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of agreement on priorities among local system leaders.

18) Workforce Management - Multiple challenges of engaging frontline staff

19) Organisational Culture - Scepticism about NHS initiatives that had previously been seen to 'come and go'.

20) Organisational Culture - Previous initiatives did not live up to expectations leading to demoralisation.

21) Workforce Management - Difficulties recruiting staff particularly in certain areas of the country.

22) Workforce Management - High staff turnover (especially following health care reforms) negatively affected longer-term strategic planning and
23) Organisational Culture - Promoting a 'play-it-safe' work culture can be detrimental to 'barrier busting'.

24) Existing approaches to training professionals do not produce trainees equipped for integrated working, and not enough trainees to meet demand.
| Author(s) | Year | Title | Journal | Qualitative Study | URL | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-----------|------|-------|---------|-------------------|-----|---|---|---|---|
| Carolyn Wilkins | 2020 | An Allied Approach to Success in Oldham | HMIC Municipal Journal | Qualitative Study | URL: https://www.themj.co.uk/An-allied-approach-to-success-in-Oldham/216663# | 1) Political - Co-operative council with an understanding of communities which helps to target resources and further develop interventions. | 2) Organisational Culture - Positive and trusting relationships. | 3) Organisational Culture - A culture of innovation, creativity and empowerment and not micro-management based on old fashioned contractual approaches. | 4) Intrinsic value of leadership - System leaders who work together to support frontline practitioners to overcome bureaucratic barriers. |
| Chris Ham, Judith Smith and Elizabeth Eastmure | 2011 | Commissioning integrated care in a liberated NHS | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust Report | URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/commissioning-integrated-care-in-a-liberated-nhs | 1) Economic - Needs assessment and service specification is time, effort and resource consuming. | 1) Economic - Using PMS and APMS contracts to facilitate payments. | 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Managerial leadership in combination with clinician leadership. |
| 1 | Danial Naqvi, Anam Malik, Mohaimen Al-Zubaidy, Falak Naqvi, Anas Tahir, Ali Tarfeeq, Sarina Vara, and Edgar Meyer | 2019 | The general practice perspective on barriers to integration between primary and social care: a London, United Kingdom-based qualitative interview study | EMBA | BMJ OPEN | Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029702 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Workforce Management - Lack of awareness of roles and services: uncertainty about which roles are carried out by which social service provider and how best to contact these individuals. |
| 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Often numbers in practice diaries and on websites are out of date, so staff have to ask the patient directly what social care they receive and how to contact relevant departments, slowing down both communication and any attempts at collaborative working. |
| 3) Workforce Management - Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision. |
| 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Communication between primary care and social care is logistically challenging, as doctors are busy with patients during the day and social care staff are working in the community, making joint conversations about patients nearly impossible. |
5) Organisational Culture - All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of regular contact: most GPs and PMs explained regular contact with social care teams is necessary for effective information transfer and a multidisciplinary approach to patient care. However, currently, contact is through forms and emails with minimal face-to-face contact, which professionals find inefficient and a barrier to continuity of care.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inefficient MDT meetings.

8) Economic - Low staffing levels.

9) Workforce Management - Inadequate training of staff.
|   |   |   |   | 10) Economic - Insufficient funding.  
|   |   |   |   | 11) Inter-organisational Collaboration: Interoperability between information systems: the lack of shared information systems. |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| DOH 2008 | The Evidence Base for Integrated Care | HMIC | DOH Report |
| URL: https://webarc.hive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130124044156/http://www.dh.gov.uk/produ... @en/documents/digitalassets/dh_089371.pdf |
|   |   |   |   |
| 1) Workforce Management - The objectives of integration need to be made explicit. |
| 2) Workforce Management - Begin integration at the frontline, which impacts directly on the patient experience; based on this, the most apt organisational supports for service provision might be identified. |
| 3) Workforce Management - The right incentives: it is important that frontline staff recognise and buy into the integration process. |
| 4) Organisational Culture - A culture of quality improvement. |
| 5) Organisational Culture - A history of trust between partner organisations. |
| 6) Organisational Culture - Personnel who are open to collaboration and innovation. |
| 7) Organisational Culture - Awareness of local cultural differences: organisational cultures evolve separately over decades. |
8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Local leaders who are supportive of integration.

9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Effective and complementary communications and IT systems.

10) Political - Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes.

1) Organisational Culture - The need to develop a culture in which people are comfortable and competent in working across organisational boundaries to serve the needs of patients more effectively and strive continuously to improve the quality of care.

2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Staff working within integrated care must have (or develop) emotional intelligence and empathy in dealing with patients and users, be willing to work in teams with shared accountability, and be prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of shared data.

4) Organisational Culture - Lack of shared accountability.
| Authors | Year | Title | Journal | DOI | 1) Barriers | 2) Facilitators |
|---------|------|-------|---------|-----|------------|---------------|
| Elena Urizar, Roberto Nuño, Caridad Alvarez, Fernández Concepción, Carles Blay, Andrea Quiroga | 2018 | Barriers and facilitators for the implementation of Integrated Care Pathways ICPs: a systemic perspective | CINAH L International Journal of Integrated Care | DOI: 10.5334/ijic.s2131 | Organisational Culture - At macro level there is a general lack of strategic vision towards integrated care from a systems perspective. | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Better Information Systems. |
| | | | | | Inter-organisational Collaboration - At meso level, the historical fragmentation of organizations poses a strong challenge towards care coordination. | Organisational Culture - Strategic Alignment. |
| | | | | | Intrinsic value of leadership - At the micro level a lack of clinical leadership and buy-in hinders the needed multidisciplinary and collaborative work. | Workforce Management - Improving data collection, continuous monitoring and evaluation, feedback looping to professionals. |
| Gerald Wistow, Matt Gaskins, Holly Holder, Judith Smith | 2016 | Why implementing integrated care is so much harder than designing it: experience in North West London. | CINAH L International Journal of Integrated Care | DOI: http://doi.org/10.5334/ijic.2856 | Workforce Management - Balance between: collective leadership and local autonomy; integrated commissioning and integrated provision; NHS leadership and local authority engagement; local variation and programme-wide consistency; investment in design and support for ongoing implementation and change. | Workforce Management - Incentives and training healthcare professionals in communication and team-work skills. |
| | | | | | Intrinsic value of leadership - Systems leadership. NHS leaders have relatively little training or experience in managing systems as opposed to organisations. | Organisational Culture - Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning. |
| | | | | | 1) Workforce Management - A clear, timetabled route map, together with roles of the programme management team and its resources were seen as valuable enablers. | 2) Workforce Management - The role of the programme management team and its resources were seen as valuable enablers. |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Gwyn Bevan; Katharina Janus** | **2011** | **Why hasn't integrated health care developed widely in the United States and not at all in England?** | **PubMed** | **Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law.** | **Report** | **DOI:** 10.1215/03616878-1191135 |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Securing data-sharing and information governance.** | **4) Economic - Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives.** | **5) Workforce Management - Maintaining acute provider viability while reducing hospital admissions.** | **6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Balancing competition and collaboration.** |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |
| **1) Workforce Management - Governance by hierarchy (ownership) or a mode that is close to a hierarchy (through long-term contractual relationships).** | **2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Full integration compared with arrangements of different autonomous insurers and providers reduces costs of information, negotiation, contracting, control, and adaptation and is hence more efficient.** | **3) Economic - Finance by capitation. Payment per member for coverage for all care provided by the IHCDS (typically in an annual contract with monthly payments), as the principal reimbursement method acts as a powerful pricing strategy that generates substantial savings.** |   |
| Hermina Harnagea, Yves Couturier, Richa Shrivastava, Felix Girard, Lise Lamotte, Christophe Pierre Bedos, Elham Emami | 2017 | Barriers and facilitators in the integration of oral health into primary care: a scoping review | HMIC Scoping Review BMJ Open DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016078 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Political - Lack of political leadership and healthcare policies and a poor understanding of the population and low prioritisation on the political agenda as well the absence of appropriate policies at the macro level. |
| 2) Economic - The cost of integrated services, human resources issues (workload of personnel, staff turnover, time constraints and scarcity of various trained human resources such as care coordinators, public health workforce and allied professionals) and deficient administrative infrastructure (the absence of health records, cross- |
| 4) Economic - A commitment to cost control and high-quality care. |
| 5) Workforce Management - Good management and information systems. In a well-organized IHCDs, tight management controls its bureaucratic costs (which can otherwise result in hierarchy failure), sophisticated data management enables it to react quickly to developments in health care and markets, and standardisation in care management facilitates health care provision and thereby economises on transaction costs. |
| 6) Workforce Management - Durability and size. | 1) Economic - Supportive policies and resource allocation: financial support from governments, stakeholders and non-profit organisations at the macro level. |
| 2) Workforce Management - Interprofessional education. |
| 3) Workforce Management - Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management [including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)] and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference). |
| 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Geographical |
| Jenna M. Evans, Agnes Grudniewicz, G. Ross Baker, Walter P. Wodchis | HSE 2016 | Organizational Context and Capabilities for Integrating Care: A Framework for Improvement | International Journal of Integrated Care | Systematic Literature Review | DOI: 10.5334/imij.24 |

1. Workforce Management - Basic Structures and Design: Physical Structures, Human and Material Resources, Organizational Design, Governance, Accountability, and Information Technology.

2. Intrinsic value of leadership - Leadership and Strategy: Leadership Approach, Clinician Engagement and Leadership, Strategic Focus on Improvement.

3. Workforce Management - Discipline-oriented education and lack of competencies.

4. Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of continuity of care and services: unstructured mechanism for care coordination at the micro level and lack of practice guidelines and types of practice at the meso level. Discontinuity in the integrated care process associated with poor referral systems, deficient interface and poor connection between public health section, primary care and academic institutions.

5. Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.

6. Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader in building teamwork and communities' capacities.

7. Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.
|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | John Deffenbaugh | 2018 | Becoming an integrated (accountable) care system | EMCA RE | DOI: 10.12968/bjhc2018.4.4.175 |
| 2 | British Journal of Healthcare Management | Qualitative Study | 1) Economic - An agreed allocation of resources and risk sharing system to achieve maximum results across the system. |
| 3 | 2) Organisational Culture - Common priorities: move from what's in it for their organisation mindset to how they can help other organisations be successful. |
| 4 | 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Overarching strategy. |
| 5 | 4) Organisational Culture - Getting into the shoes of others. |
| 6 | 5) Organisational Culture - Agreed objectives. |
| 7 | 6) Organisational Culture - Common narrative. |
| 8 | 7) Workforce Management - Engaging |
| 9 | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - System leadership is harder than organisational leadership - there are conflicting performance measures. |
| 10 | 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders need to see the larger picture, be more reflective and shift focus from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future. |
| 11 | 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leadership roles must change to become facilitators of change (no more competition). |
| 12 | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders understanding the motivation of partners enabling unconditional commitment, collective ownership - debts, income etc. |
| 13 | 1) Organisational Culture - Stop clashes and set a common goal (no PBR from NHSI conflicting with CCGs from NHSE) - end artificial divides. |
| 14 | 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Long-term perspective needs to be maintained and the stakeholders must be motivated. |
| 15 | 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leadership roles must change to become facilitators of change (no more competition). |
|   | Organisational Culture - Social and cultural differences including those related to knowledge, organisation and power. |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | Political - The Health and Social Care Act 2012 re-emphasised the role of competition and implicitly encouraged more extensive use of for-profit and third sector providers alongside mainstream NHS-managed services. Yet there has been a parallel emphasis on collaboration and integration so Commissioners have therefore had to explore ways of balancing apparently contradictory pressures: to promote provider competition through contracting and procurement, while simultaneously securing collaborative service delivery through strategic purchasing. |   |
|   | Workforce Management - Define specifically what changes to services are intended. |   |
|   | Workforce Management - Convene stakeholders to plan for and support implementation continuously. |   |
|   | Workforce Management - See outcomes as something for which commissioners and providers are jointly accountable. |   |

8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders who get along.

Judith Smith, Gerald Wistow, Holly Holder & Matthew Gaskins 2019

Evaluating the design and implementation of the whole systems integrated care programme in North West London: why commissioning proved (again) to be the weakest link.

DOI: 10.1186/s12913-019-4013-5.
Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care

1) Political - Conceptual challenges: lack of clarity on what constitutes integrated care. When drafting and implementing integrated care, there are three fundamental questions that should be considered by every policy-maker: (1) how the integration will be organised; (2) what kind of integration is intended; (3) what outcome is intended. Because of the conceptual complexity and ideological choices, it is particularly difficult to determine when and to what degree integration of care is a success.

2) Political - Empirical challenges: when drafting policy on integrated care, policymakers are likely to make use of the available empirical evidence. There are at least three different sources of such evidence. First, policymakers might learn from places where policies on integrated care have already been put into place. Second, policymakers can make use of the available research literature. Third, policymakers can gather their own data. However, each of these sources of evidence can pose substantial challenges. Successfully transferring policy requires not just learning about particular policy (such as by reading

3) Political - Tailor policy to the particular context in which it will be implemented. The successful integration of a given policy in a particular health care context might not be automatically transferrable to another health care context. Policymakers should critically assess the available scientific literature and look at examples of places where comparable policies have been implemented. One cannot simply copy policy from somewhere else and expect it to work. Policymakers should preferably not only learn about what happened in other places, but instead learn from other places.

1) Political - Reflect on the type and level of integration you want to promote. As we have argued, integrated care is a broad concept that encompasses various sorts of integration and collaboration. It is necessary as a policymaker to be aware of the level of integration that you want to achieve as, without proper prior thought, it will be impossible to determine the success of the policy afterwards.

2) Political - Reflect beforehand on what you hope to achieve with integrated care. We have argued throughout that integrated care should be seen as a means to a number of possible ends (e.g., economic efficiency or increased quality of care). Knowing what one hopes to achieve by promoting integrated care is crucial to being able to later evaluate the success or failure of the policy. This also allows policymakers to install a mechanism for evaluation, allowing the health policy to be re-evaluated after a period.

3) Political - Tailor policy to the particular context in which it will be implemented. The successful integration of a given policy in a particular health care context might not be automatically transferrable to another health care context. Policymakers should critically assess the available scientific literature and look at examples of places where comparable policies have been implemented. One cannot simply copy policy from somewhere else and expect it to work. Policymakers should preferably not only learn about what happened in other places, but instead learn from other places.
policy documents), but also learning from particular policies. Policymakers can make use of an increasing amount of existing and published evidence from research, however, how to translate this knowledge into political action is far from evident. Also, while many case studies have been published there may be publication or reporting bias, whereby successful networks are more likely to be published than unsuccessful ones.

3) Economic - Resource challenges: integrated care is often believed to allow for ‘improved efficiency of services, and reduced overall cost’, however there is research suggesting that creating integrated care and health care collaborations might actually require a great investment of resources before there is any efficiency pay-off. The resources needed are : (1) expertise, (2) time, and (3) funding.

4) Economic - Be committed to investing the resources needed to genuinely run and evaluate a policy. Research shows how successfully promoting integration may require resources such as time, expertise, and funding. As we have argued, policy-makers who fail to invest the necessary amount of money might afterwards incorrectly conclude that a particular policy implementation does not work.

5) Organisational Culture - Provide the stakeholders with sufficient freedom and autonomy. Research shows that successful integration cannot be fully mandated and requires a willingness from stakeholders and a relationship of trust between them.

6) Political - Consider beforehand how the actual implementation of the policy can be evaluated: Despite there being empirical challenges, a lot can be learned from the example of other countries and the experiences of other policy makers. There is also the option of setting up pilot projects or policy experiments to gather relevant feedback. Finally, policy makers should also consider the installation and use of feedback mechanisms to gain insight into the implementation of policy once it is underway.

| Laura G. González-Ortiz, Stefano Calciolari, Viktoria Stein, Nick Goodwin | 2018 | The core dimensions of integrated care: a literature review to support the development of a | HMIC | Internatio\nal\nJournal\nof\nIntegrated Care | Systematic Literature Review | DOI: 10.5334/ijic.4198 | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Local leadership and long-term commitments. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Local leadership and long-term commitments. |
| 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders with a clear vision on integrated care. |
|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
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| 1 | Political - Recognising that planning and implementing large-scale service changes takes time e.g. Kaiser Permanente. |
|---|---|
| 2 | Workforce Management - Establish feedback loops. |
| 3 | Workforce Management - Engage physicians, patients and families. |
| 4 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Generalisability and context are important - each area |
| 5 | Intrinsic value of leadership - Blend designated leadership with distributed leadership. |
| 6 | Workforce Management - Defining the intervention clearly and what it is meant to achieve and how, and implement it well. |
| 7 | Workforce Management - Being explicit about how desired outcomes will arise, and using interim markers of success. |

| Martin Bardsley, Adam Steventon, Judith Smith and Jennifer Dixon | 2013 | Evaluating integrated and community-based care | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report | URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/evaluating-integrated-and-community-based-care-how-do-we-know-what-works |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Economic - Identification of target population. |
| 2 | Economic - Adequate financing. |
| 3 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - IT infrastructure. |
| 4 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Leadership coalition. |
| 5 | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Involvement of primary, community and social care. |
| 6 | Workforce Management - Evaluation models. |
| 7 | Organisational Culture - Common values. |
| 8 | Organisational Culture - Changing clinical cultures. |
| 9 | Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical Leadership. |

Problems in the long-term sustainability of integration.

2) Economic - For integrative care to be successful, a long-term plan with adequately protected support and funding must be provided. Financial incentives must be directed toward integrated pathways and designed to redistribute incentives to stakeholders.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Without an infrastructure framework, the coordination of care is stifled; for example, robust shared electronic patient record platforms, which can be accessed by all those involved in providing care to the target patient population.

4) Economic - Identification of target population.

5) Economic - Adequate financing.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - IT infrastructure.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Leadership coalition.

8) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Involvement of primary, community and social care.

9) Workforce Management - Evaluation models.

10) Organisational Culture - Common values.

11) Organisational Culture - Changing clinical cultures.

12) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical Leadership.
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will have specific success factors but the aim must be the same.

| NHS Future Forum | 2011 | Clinical advice and leadership: a report from the NHS Future Forum. | HMIC | N/A | Report | URL: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213750/dh_127542.pdf |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated information systems need to be developed, commissioned and implemented. |
| 2) Workforce Management - Data about quality and outcomes of care is collected, shared and used in a transparent way to support informed patient choice and continuous improvement. |
| 3) Organisational Culture - A duty to promote research and innovation and the use of research evidence. |
| 4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Substantial multi-professional clinical leadership embedded within it including visible leadership for key groups and conditions, for example children, women, older people, mental health and learning disabilities. |
| 5) Workforce Management - Continuing professional development. |
| 6) Intrinsic value of leadership - All |
organisations, particularly new ones, should ensure that appropriate leadership development and support are in place.

7) Workforce Management - Responsible officers continuing to be in place to support doctors in improving care and ensuring their fitness to practice through revalidation.

8) Organisational Culture - Strong and visible clinical and professional leadership at all levels, focused on increasing trust and encouraging positive behaviour.

---

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders in ICSs need to be skilled at:
   - identifying and scaling innovation (e.g. from pilots)
   - having a strong focus on outcomes and population health
   - building strong relationships with other leaders, and often working with them informally to develop joint priorities and plans
   - establishing governance structures which drive faster change, often going further into

1) Workforce Management - Strategies and agendas that are imposed by NHS England on local areas rather than being clinically-led and driven by local need.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of coordination and alignment at national level between NHS England and NHS Improvement.

3) Workforce Management - Complex accountability structures and configurations.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Different performance regimes and

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Stability in senior leadership positions across organisations.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Relationships before structures: drawing on established working relationships built over the years.

3) Workforce Management - Involving staff and service users.

4) Organisational Culture - Having the security to make long-term plans.

5) Organisational Culture - Trust and delegation of autonomy from the centre: a permissive, not prescriptive, approach and national guidance that provides a broad, enabling framework.

1) Leadership Style - Leadership programmes and professional development opportunities.

2) Organisational Culture - Peer support including mechanisms for 'buddying up'.

3) Workforce Management - Local champions who will push and progress the work, and 'win hearts and minds'.

4) Workforce Management - Skilled external facilitation, to help deliver complex programmes.

5) Organisational Culture - The creation of 'safe spaces' for leaders to meet with peers and share problems and solutions.
where the commitment and energy is strongest
e) setting the overall outcomes and expectations on behaviours, but handing day-to-day decision-making to others
f) supporting the development of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs)
g) designing and facilitating whole-systems events and workshops to build consensus and deliver change
h) understanding and leading cultural change
i) building system-wide learning and evaluation frameworks
j) fostering a learning culture across the whole system.

6) Workforce Management - Clarity about how performance will be judged.
7) Workforce Management - Clarity about how accountability will work, and responsibilities of individual organisations.
8) Workforce Management - Clarity about how performance will be judged.
9) Workforce Management - Clarity about how accountability will work, and responsibilities of individual organisations.
10) Organisational Culture - More opportunities to learn from other professions and sectors.
11) Intrinsic value of leadership - Confusion about where the decision-making power lies.
12) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical leadership especially
| Nick Goodwin and Judith Smith | 2011 | The Evidence Base for Integrated Care | N/A - Snowball | The King’s Fund and the Nuffield Trust: Developing a National Strategy for the Promotion of Integrated Care | Presentation | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/Evidence-base-integrated-care2.pdf |
|-------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------|

14) Organisational Culture - Performance management and assurance processes that are not aligned to learning and self-reflection.

15) Organisational Culture - A sense that the goalposts keep moving with priorities, funding and expectations changing.

---

| Nick Goodwin, Judith Smith, Alisha Davies, Claire Perry, Rebecca Rosen, Anna Dixon, Jennifer | 2012 | Integrated care for patients and populations: Improving outcomes by working together | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/integrated-care-patient-and-populations-improving-outcomes-working |
|-------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------|

1) Organisational Culture - NHS management is permission based and has a risk averse approach where innovation is needed.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Divide between primary/secondary, health/social care: different contracts, employment, free/means tested.

3) Workforce Management - Approaches that measure experiences of patients, service users and carers in relation to integrated care.

4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Setting a clear, ambitious and measurable goal to improve the experience of patients and service users, implement change at scale and pace.
1. Organisational Culture - In contrast to the 'Pioneer' programme which has encouraged locally driven, bottom-up innovation, NHS England has adopted a much more prescriptive and top-down approach to the delivery of the Better Care Fund which is driven by an imperative to reduce emergency hospital admissions. It remains to be seen how these different policy levers and approaches fit together.

2. Economic - The personal commissioning programme is an entirely different approach again which rests on the ability of individuals rather than organisations to integrate their own care. It remains to be seen how this will fit with the Better Care Fund.

3. Inter-organisational Collaboration - Absence of robust electronic sharing record.

4. Economic - Weak incentives and local currencies.

5. Economic - New payment services based on outcomes rather than items of delivery.

6. Economic - Commissioning payment based on episodic care at hospital, PBR incentivises more activity in hospitals, mitigating against other providers, competition within the market and choice and regulation focus on organisation performance not collective system leading to single outcome framework.

7. Economic - New payment for GPs to adapt to provide services at a larger scale.

8. Economic - The personal commissioning programme is an entirely different approach again which rests on the ability of individuals rather than organisations to integrate their own care. It remains to be seen how these different policy levers and approaches fit together.

9. Economic - A new settlement that brings together all health and care funding to be shared by a single local commissioning body.

10. Economic - New payment services based on outcomes rather than items of delivery.

11. Economic - Integrated health and social care in England – Progress and prospects.

12. RH Humphries 2015 Integrated health and social care in England – Progress and prospects.
| Implementation styles will play out. | 1) Workforce Management - Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods.  
2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of performance management role (indirect influence).  
3) Economic - Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned.  
4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems.  
5) Political - Inconsistencies in national policy.  
6) Intrinsic value of leadership - Variable progress in different localities dependent on local leadership.  
1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Active medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice.  
2) Workforce Management - Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients.  
3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record.  
4) Organisational Culture - High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders.  
5) Economic - When transfer of work between organisations does not cause issues with payments.  
6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Planned increase in provider competition.  
7) Organisational Culture - Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care.  
8) Workforce Management - Staff commitment and belief that integration is doing the right thing.  
9) Workforce Management - Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems.  
1) Organisational Culture - Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs. |
|---|---|
| Rebecca Rosen, James Mountford, Geraint Lewis, Richard Lewis, Jenny Shand and Sara Shaw | 2011 | Integration in action: four international case studies | N/A - Snowball | Nuffield Trust | Case Study | URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/integration-in-action-four-international-case-studies |
10) Intrinsic value of leadership
- Skilled leaders with ability to win
  hearts and minds of frontline staff.

11) Organisational Culture
- Taking an incremental approach
  on progress.

12) Inter-organisational
Collaboration
- Involvement of all
relevant health care providers to
create broad support.
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1) Intrinsic value of leadership
- Integrated governance models must
  be built on strong clinical leadership,
  must be combined with a culture that
  promotes delivery of integrated care.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration
- Risk needs to be shared in Inter-
  organisational Collaboration rather
  than assigned individually.

Sara
Shaw,
Rebecca
Rosen and
Benedict
Rumbold
2011
What is
integrated
care?
Nuffield
Trust
Nuffield
Trust
Report
URL: https://
www.n
uffieldtr
ust.org.
uk/files/
2017-
01/wha-
t-is-
integrat-
ed-care-
1) Economic - Situate
performance measures
within wider health and
care systems:
acknowledge the level
and combination of
strategies used based on
the challenges faced in
obtaining appropriate
| Sara Shaw, Ros Levenson | 2011 | Towards integrated care in Trafford | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/towards-integrated-care-in-trafford-final.pdf |

1) Organisational Culture - Recognise that major change is needed, ensure a clear and agreed vision from GPs to specialists.

2) Economic - Work simultaneously with commissioners and service providers so that quality and budgeting is fulfilled.

3) Workforce Management - Make a clear case for change.

4) Workforce Management - Engage with stakeholders when developing integrated systems.
| Sheena Asthana, Felix Gradinger, Julian Elston, Susan Martin, Richard Byng | 2020 | Capturing the Role of Context in Complex System Change: An Application of the Canadian Context and Capabilities for Integrating Care (CCIC) Framework to an Integrated Care Organisation in the UK. | PubMed | International Journal of Integrated Care | Case Study | DOI: 10.5334/ijic.5196. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

1) **Economic** - Size/structural factors were key to integration success: the area was sufficiently small (n=36,251) to allow triage, assessment and referral in one multi-disciplinary team (MDT), whereas in the largest locality had 72,692 registered residents so the single MDT initially had much more caseloads which became unmanageable.

2) **Organisational Culture** - The small size allowed relationships to develop over time; indeed, there is a history of collaboration there (e.g. between GPs and community hospital teams and between health and social care).

3) **Intrinsic value of leadership** - A strong role of shared, bottom-up leadership. Frontline clinicians in the Coastal Locality were notable for having trusting and friendly relationships between team leads (Physio, Nurses and Matrons, Social Care).

4) **Inter-organisational Collaboration** - The integrated system appointed GPs as locality clinical directors, which was a key factor as they helped link the GP community directly into the ICO, thereby overcoming barriers between the acute and primary sectors.

5) **Organisational Culture** - There was a commitment to learning by leaders. The Coastal leads...
insisted on collecting their own performance data despite being asked to discontinue doing so and devised their own performance management system (measuring performance). Priority to measure performance; there was a willingness in Coastal to genuinely question the process and outcomes of integrated care.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - The partnering and the organisation of inter-professional teamwork and joint care planning as critical determinants of success, especially informal partnership which relies on trusting relationships at all levels. A balance of top-down and bottom-up committees and system-wide steering functions facilitated the emergence over time of trusting relationships and iteratively evolving teams at locality level. This in turn allowed for better service delivery.

Sian E. Maslin-Prothero, Amy E. Bennion 2010 Integrated team working: a literature review HSE International Journal of Integrated Care Systematic Literature Review URL: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2832377

1) Political - The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance.

2) Organisational Culture - Need for a shared understanding of the purpose of the joint venture and a mutual understanding of, and

1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Divide between social care staff and medical staff: differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, and status inequalities.

2) Organisational Culture - The mismatch in cultures, behaviours and understanding of services creates a divide between the disciplines. Organisational boundaries resulted in staff feeling pressured, and the process
commitment to, the vision of the venture across the organizations involved.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - It is important for integrated services to work together across agency boundaries; this has been facilitated by the removal of structural constraints through the Health Act 1999, which permitting pooled budgets and integrated provision.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated teams must be able to exchange knowledge easily between agencies; effective shared information technology (IT) systems are key to the success of integrated working.

5) Organisational Culture - Need for the development of a shared culture.

6) Workforce Management - Establishment of new roles to support new ways of working

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Exhibiting a past history of joint working.

8) Political - Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms of collaborative working led to unrealistic expectations being placed on staff.

3) Workforce Management - A lack of clarity of purpose for integration, and a failure to agree partnership outcomes.

4) Workforce Management - The lack of understanding and clarity of others’ roles, leading to conflict between team managers.

5) Workforce Management - Imbalance of power and poor communication.

6) Workforce Management - Short-term contract working, lack of clear career structure, and limited opportunities for promotion (unless they left the service) created a dilemma: a trade-off between present job satisfaction and future career progression for staff in integrated care teams.

7) Economic - Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available.
| Stephanie Best | 2016 | Facilitating integrated delivery of services across organisational boundaries: Essential enablers to integration | HMIC British Journal of Occupational Therapy Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.1177/030802816688019 | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Horizontal communication.  
2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of support.  
3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Overestimated expectations.  
3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Autocratic leadership style.  
1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Setting direction, setting the vision.  
3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Accessibility through visibility both within and across organisations.  
4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Joint decision-making.  
5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Authority to influence across organisations.  
6) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Joint training offers an opportunity to build |
relationships with colleagues across organisations and recognise each other’s areas of expertise. Overall, participants expressed a wish to see improved working relationships, as this has the potential to lead to ‘fluidity in thinking’ when managing difficult or complex situations.

Factors enabling implementation of integrated health and social care: a systematic review

CINAH British Journal of Community Nursing Systematic Literature Review DOI: 10.12968/bjcn.2016.2.82

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Management and leadership support was identified as an enabler in four of the seven studies, with Coupe (2013) suggesting that leadership support was essential for the successful implementation of integrated health and social care teams.

2) Workforce Management - Change management can be complex, and Thomas et al (2006) suggest that changes are more likely to be adopted when the change meets an identified need. Ling et al (2012: 4) support this belief, as they reported that ‘where staff felt that change was being forced upon them then they were less likely to support the new activity.

3) Organisational Culture - Ling et al (2012) further reported that pilot sites were more successful when there was evidence of a shared vision, along with a commitment from management in relation to longevity of the change.

4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Thistlethwaite (2011) partially attributed the success in Torbay to the stable leadership within Torbay and the ongoing
managerial support to deliver on the integration project.

5) Economic - Resources and capacity have been identified as a key enabler in five out of the seven studies. Coupe (2013) attributed the main cause of under-performance of the integrated health and social care teams to a lack of investment in the teams, which is required to embed the change into practice. Ling et al (2012) also reported that the lack of resources in the integrated health and social care teams resulted in an increased workload, which had an adverse effect on staff motivation.

6) Political - National policy was considered an enabler in four of the studies. Coupe (2013) identified that the NHS payment systems, such as payment by results and block contracts, do not incentivise the delivery of care in the community, and thus pose a barrier to integrated health and social care teams.

7) Economic - Sheaff et al (2009) also referred to the NHS financial system, suggesting that paying hospitals for each case treated was an actual incentive to increase admissions, which completely conflicts with the aims of integrated health and social care teams.

8) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Shared information technology (IT) systems were identified as an enabler in two studies. This may pose a concern for a number of organisations
| 1 | Workforce Management | 1) Size and complexity: simple, smaller integration made more rapid progress and had the ability and authority to come to quick decisions. 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration: Compatible IT systems and good management of the sharing of private data. 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration: Good existing relationships between individuals and/or organisations with clear communication about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work. 4) Organisational Culture: Widespread agreement and shared values among participating staff promoted engagement and motivation. 5) Intrinsic value of leadership: Success when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be strongly committed to implementing lasting change. 6) Inter-organisational Collaboration: Ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner. |
| 2 | Workforce Management | 1) Staff demotivated when an absence of clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. Where staff felt the change was being forced upon them, they were less likely to support the new activity. 2) Lack of training led to staff being unclear whether |
| 3 | Workforce Management | 1) Size and complexity: multiple components in integration reported greater challenges of managing change, and they were often greater and longer to implement than they had anticipated. Difficult to communicate the details to all parties and identify the role of each participant group. |
| 4 | Workforce Management | 1) Workforce Management: Size and complexity; multiple components in integration reported greater challenges of managing change, and they were often greater and longer to implement than they had anticipated. Difficult to communicate the details to all parties and identify the role of each participant group. |
| 5 | Workforce Management | 1) Workforce Management |
they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling unprepared to take on new roles.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Different IT systems in partner organisations caused difficulties in data-sharing and communicating, especially across health and social care teams. On occasions, these difficulties were not caused by the IT itself but by how their introduction was managed, such as failure to address privacy concerns where organisations were reluctant to share patient data.

5) Collaboration Between Organisations: Absence of relationships between individuals and/or organisations. Poor communication and disagreement about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner organisations.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of co-location: lack of working together face-to-face in the organisations. 7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Co-location: working together face-to-face in the same building improved the quality and frequency of communication, and expedited problem-solving by allowing quicker access to colleagues' professional knowledge. 8) Organisational Culture - Feelings of being involved with planning from the beginning. 9) Workforce Management - Staff were motivated when there was clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. 10) Organisational Culture - Willingness to engage. Creating shared beliefs about the benefits of change was described by staff as critical to progress. 11) Intrinsic value of leadership - 'Good' leadership. 12) Workforce Management - Thorough training led to staff being clear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling prepared to take on new roles. The provision of training specific to the service change was important, particularly when the work involved required new or changed roles of participants. 13) Organisational Culture - Supportive, transparent organisational culture: the ability to modify existing systems and practices and to create new ones was especially dependent on organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries. 14) Workforce Management - External
| No. | Category                          | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11  | Organisational Culture           | Feelings of being sidelined, or uninvolved with planning from the beginning.                                                                                                                                 |
| 12  | Organisational culture           | Reluctance to engage was a major barrier.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 13  | Organisational culture           | Poor organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries.                                                                                                                                 |
| 14  | Political                         | A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS 'blame culture'.                                                                                                                                            |
| 15  | Organisational Culture           | Staff feeling permitted to take risks.                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 16  | Inter-organisational Collaboration| Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer.                                                                                                       |

facilitation has been very helpful in getting two organisations to work together, which is a method well rehearsed in the wider literature on managing change. 15) Organisational Culture - Staff feeling permitted to take risks. 16) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer.
distribution were perceived as a barrier to innovation.
15) Economic - Staff cuts.
### Appendix C: Synthesis of Results

| Source of Information | Factors Identified |
|-----------------------|--------------------|
| **Author** | **Organisational Culture | Workforce Management | Inter-Organisational Culture | Leadership | Economic | Political |
| Alison Tweed, Andrew Singfield, Julia RA Taulor, Lucy Gilbert, Paul Mount | Creating Allegiance: Leading transformational change within the NHS | Facilitators: 1) Shared Visions (espoused theories) need to be outlined and translated into everyday practice and visions of previous leaders or schemes must be erased. | Facilitators: 1) Connecting through practice: involving frontline staff and all stakeholders in decisions and key pieces of the transformation to integrated care. | Facilitators: 1) Leaders should be non-partisan integrators rather than assign themselves to an organisation - have an allegiance to the system. 2) Leaders should build high quality relationships involving emotional intelligence and positive role modelling. | Recommendations: 1) Connecting is a key theme in managing system or transformational change and occurs through three mediums: relational, with purpose and vision and through practice. 2) To further research the concept of allegiance creation as it appears under-represented within the literature, particularly as part of the process of transformational change, rather than as an outcome of change or behaviours towards leaders. |
| **A Year of Integrated Care Systems: Reviewing the journey so far** | **Barriers:**  
1) A legacy of competitive behaviours.  
2) Frequently changing language and the lack of a clear narrative. | **Facilitators:**  
1) Established models of integrated working. | **Recommendations:**  
1) Integrate at different levels of the system, building up from places and neighbourhoods.  
2) Draw on the skills and leadership of frontline staff.  
3) Build governance in an evolutionary way to support delivery.  
4) Develop system-wide capabilities to gather, share and act on public insights.  
5) Develop active strategies to facilitate wider adoption of new care models.  
6) Build robust evaluation into the ICS programme that supports learning and improvement and measures progress.  
| **Barriers:**  
1) Leaders face competing demands.  
2) Funding pressures. | **Facilitators:**  
1) System leadership.  
2) Clinical leadership and engagement. | **Recommendations:**  
1) Promote and value system leadership.  
2) Funding to support transformation. | **Facilitators:**  
1) Collaborative relationships.  
2) Partnerships with local authorities. | **Barriers:**  
1) The legislative context does not support system working.  
2) Regulation and oversight is not aligned. | **Facilitators:**  
1) A permissive and supportive national programme. |

**Bringing Integration Home: Policy on health and social care integration in** | **Barriers:**  
1) Culture of impatience and cynicism. | **Barriers:**  
1) Inadequate workforce planning. | **Barriers:**  
1) Inadequate collaboration continues to result in poor quality, efficiency and | **Barriers:**  
1) Difficulties in agreeing budgets. | **Barriers:**  
1) Complex governance arrangements.  
2) Lack of understanding of what the drivers and essential requirements are for successful integration between

For peer review only
Barriers:
1) Differences between the health and social care sectors in terms of language and conceptions of health and wellbeing, professional cultures and working practices.
2) Different priorities between professions: e.g. the people of most concern to social workers were not necessarily the same as those of most concern to GPs.
3) ‘Blame culture’ within and across local health and social care sectors located responsibility for failures in integration elsewhere in the

Barriers:
1) Integration was less of a priority where stakeholders had urgent competing demands (e.g. meeting 4-hour waiting time A&E targets.
2) Multiple challenges of engaging frontline staff.
3) Difficulties recruiting staff particularly in certain areas of the country.
4) High staff turnover (especially following health care reforms) negatively affected longer-term strategic planning and service provision aiming for integration.
5) Existing approaches to training professionals do not produce

Barriers:
1) Lack of agreement on priorities among local system leaders.

Barriers:
1) Health care and social care have different regulatory frameworks and the regulator does not examine systems such as integrated services, instead only looking at individual organisations.
2) Some Pioneers were very complex with a large number of stakeholders and/or a large geographic footprint, which made partnership working more complex in terms of size, communication, governance, etc.

Barriers:
1) Acute/community trusts or social services departments suffered from significant financial deficit and were subject to ‘special measures’, which diverted senior management attention away from Pioneer activity.
2) The growing demand for costly A&E services by patients at a time when integration seeks to reduce usage – diverts resources and slows the pace of transformation.
3) PbR incentives for acute services, instead only examining systems such as integrated services, instead only looking at individual organisations.
4) Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a

Barriers:
1) Supportive legislation.

Facilitators:
1) Good leadership and vision was identified as critical at all levels from local authority councillors through to senior managers, supported by appropriate governance structures.

Facilitators:
1) Supportive legislation.
4) Scepticism about NHS initiatives that had previously been seen to ‘come and go’.

5) Previous initiatives did not live up to expectations leading to demoralisation.

6) Promoting a ‘play-it-safe’ work culture can be detrimental to ‘barrier busting’.

**Facilitators:**

1) Trust and shared values that are largely developed locally.

2) Freedom to try things out, not having a ‘culture of blame’ if things go wrong, and piloting new initiatives and sharing the learning before roll-out. Reassuring staff so they ‘feel safe’ in the face of change.

trainees equipped for integrated working, and not enough trainees to meet demand.

particularly challenging.

5) Inadequate local engagement/buy-in of the mental health sector, due in part to the legacy of underfunding and ‘Cinderella’ status of the sector.

6) In some Pioneers with multiple partners, a sense that transformation could happen only at the pace of the ‘slowest’, most conservative or risk averse stakeholder.

7) Information sharing was seen as critical, but the level of integration of information and intelligence needed was technically difficult to achieve across multiple IT platforms and with obstructive information governance regulations.

**Facilitators:**

1) Uncommitted funding.

trainees equipped for integrated working, and not enough trainees to meet demand.

**Facilitators:**

1) Experienced staff.

2) Staff involvement in developing integration initiatives and encouraging their ‘ownership’ of new service models.

3) Local champions.

4) Collecting the right information/indicators so that impact/success can be measured and visible to staff, patients/service users and the local population.

1) Being part of a national Pioneer programme, which provided an impetus for local professionals to work together to improve care locally.

2) Building and maintaining good working relationships across organisations and professions at all levels built on trust, so that people could speak
| Facilitators: | Barriers: |
|--------------|-----------|
| 1) Positive and trusting relationships. | 1) Needs assessment and service specification is time, effort and resource consuming. |
| 2) A culture of innovation, creativity and empowerment and not micro-management based on old fashioned contractual approaches. | |
| 3) Integrated information system between organisations to enable sharing of patient/service user records or having suitable facilities for cross-agency and/or multi-disciplinary teams. | |
| 4) Co-location of operational teams facilitated communication and partnership working between different professionals. | |
| Facilitators: | |
| 1) System leaders who work together to support frontline practitioners to overcome bureaucratic barriers. | |
| Facilitators: | |
| 1) Co-operative Council with an understanding of communities which helps to target resources and further develop interventions. | |

Carolyn Wilkins  
An Allied Approach to Success in Oldham

Chris Ham, Judith Smith and Elizabeth Eastmure  
Commissioning integrated care in a liberated NHS
| Barriers: | Facilitators: |
|---|---|
| 1) All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making. 2) Poor interprofessional culture: All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making. 3) Inadequate training of staff. | 1) Using PMS and APMS contracts to facilitate payments. |
| 1) Lack of awareness of roles and services: uncertainty about which roles are carried out by which social service provider and how best to contact these individuals. 2) Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision. 3) Inadequate training of staff. | Barriers: |
| 1) Often numbers in practice diaries and on websites are out of date, so staff have to ask the patient directly what social care they receive and how to contact relevant departments, slowing down both communication and any attempts at collaborative working. 2) Communication between primary care and social care is logistically challenging, as doctors are busy with patients during the day and social care staff are working in the community, making joint conversations about patients nearly impossible. 3) Lack of regular contact: most GPs and PMs explained regular contact with social care teams is necessary for effective information transfer and a multidisciplinary approach to patient care. However, currently, contact is through forms and emails with minimal face-to-face contact, | 1) Low staffing levels. 2) Insufficient funding. |
| DOH | The Evidence Base for Integrated Care | Recommendations: |
|-----|-------------------------------------|------------------|
|     | 1) A culture of quality improvement. | 1) The objectives of integration need to be made explicit. |
|     | 2) A history of trust between partner organisations. | 2) Begin integration at the frontline, which impacts directly on the patient experience; based on this, the most apt organisational support for service provision might be identified. |
|     | 3) Personnel who are open to collaboration and innovation. | 3) The right incentives: it is important that frontline staff recognise and buy into the integration process. |
|     | 4) Awareness of local cultural differences: organisational cultures evolve separately over decades. | 4) Effective and complementary communications and IT systems. |

| E Paice, S Hasan | Educating for integrated care | Needs: |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------|
|                 | 1) The need to develop a culture in which people are comfortable and competent in working across organisational boundaries to serve patients | 1) Financial incentives do not encourage collaboration. |
|                 |                             | 2) Lack of shared data. |
|                 |                             | 1) Staff working within integrated care must have (or develop) emotional intelligence and empathy in dealing with patients and users, be willing to work in teams with shared accountability, and be |

4) Inefficient MDT meetings.
5) Interoperability between information systems: the lack of shared information systems.

Recommendations:
1) Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes.

4) Awareness of local cultural differences: organisational cultures evolve separately over decades.

Recommendations:
1) Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes.
the needs of patients more effectively and strive continuously to improve the quality of care.

**Barriers:**
1) Lack of shared accountability.

**Facilitators:**
1) Strategic alignment.

---

| Elena Urizar, Roberto Nuño, Caridad Alvarez, Fernández Concepción, Carles Blay, Andrea Quiroga | Barriers and facilitators for the implementation of Integrated Care Pathways (ICPs): a systemic perspective |
|---|---|
| **Barriers:**
1) At macro level there is a general lack of strategic vision towards integrated care from a systems perspective. |
| **Facilitators:**
1) Improving data collection, continuous monitoring and evaluation, feedback looping to professionals. 2) Incentives and training healthcare professionals in communication and teamwork skills. |
| **Barriers:**
1) At meso level, the historical fragmentation of organizations poses a strong challenge towards care coordination. |
| **Facilitators:**
1) Better information systems. |

---

| Gerald Wistow, Matt Gaskins, Holly Holder, Judith Smith | Why implementing integrated care is so much harder than designing it: experience in North West London. |
|---|---|
| **Facilitators:**
1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning. |
| **Barriers:**
1) Balance between collective leadership and local autonomy; integrated commissioning and integrated provision; NHS leadership and local authority engagement; local variation and programme-wide consistency; investment in design and support for ongoing implementation and development. |
| **Barriers:**
1) Securing data-sharing and information governance 2) Balancing competition and collaboration. |
| **Barriers:**
1) Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives. |

---

| prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care. | prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care. | prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care. | prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care. |
2) Maintaining acute provider viability while reducing hospital admissions.

Facilitators:
1) A clear, timetabled route map, together with roles of the programme management team and its resources were seen as valuable enablers.

Facilitators:
1) Full integration compared with arrangements of different autonomous insurers and providers reduces costs of information, negotiation, contracting, control, and adaptation and is hence more efficient.

Facilitators:
1) Finance by capitation. Payment per member for coverage for all care provided by the IHCDS (typically in an annual contract with monthly payments), as the principal reimbursement method acts as a powerful pricing strategy that generates substantial savings through internal incentives for preventive care.
2) A commitment to cost control and high-quality care.

Gwyn Bevan, Katharina Janus

Why hasn’t integrated health care developed widely in the United States and not at all in England?

Facilitators:
1) Governance by hierarchy (ownership) or a mode that is close to a hierarchy (through long-term contractual relationships).
2) Good management and information systems. In a well-organized IHCDS, tight management controls its bureaucratic costs (which can otherwise result in hierarchy failure), sophisticated data management enables it to react quickly to developments in health care and markets, and standardisation in care management.
facilitates health care provision and thereby economises on transaction costs.

3) Durability and size.

| Hermina Harnagea, Yves Couturier, Richa Shrivastava, Felix Girard, Lise Lamotthe, Christophe Pierre Bedos, Elham Emami |
| Barriers and facilitators in the integration of oral health into primary care: a scoping review |
| Barriers: |
| 1) Discipline-oriented education and lack of competencies. |
| 2) Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management (including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)] and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference). |
| Facilitators: |
| 1) Interprofessional education. |
| 2) Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management (including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)] and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference). |

| Jenna M. Evans, Agnes Grudniewicz, G. Ross |
| Organization Context and Capabilities for Needs: |
| 1) Social and Psychological Context: Readiness for Change, |
| 2) Basic Structures and Design: Physical Structures, Human and Material |
| Needs: |
| 1) Processes: Partnering, Teamwork, Delivering Care, and Improving |
| Needs: |
| 1) Leadership and Strategy: Leadership Approach, Clinician Engagement and |

Barriers: 1) Lack of political leadership and healthcare policies and a poor understanding of the population and low prioritisation on the political agenda as well the absence of appropriate policies at the macro level.
Baker, Walter P. Wodchis

Integrating Care: A Framework for Improvement

Organisational Culture, and Work Environment.

Resources, Organizational Design, Governance, Accountability, and Information Technology.

Quality.

Leadership, Strategic Focus on Improvement, and Performance Measurement.

John Deffenbaugh

Becoming an integrated (accountable) care system

Needs:
1) Common priorities: move from what’s in it for their organisation mindset to how they can help other organisations be successful.
2) Getting into the shoes of others.
3) Agreed objectives.
4) Common narrative.

Recommendations:
1) Stop clashes and set a common goal (no PBR from NHSI conflicting with CCGs from NHSE) - end artificial divides.

Needs:
1) Engaging citizens and communities.

Barriers:
1) System leadership is harder than organisational leadership - there are conflicting performance measures.
2) Leaders need to see the larger picture, be more reflective and shift focus from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future.

Facilitators:
1) Leaders understand the motivation of partners enabling unconditional commitment, collective ownership - debts, income etc.

Recommendations:
1) Long-term perspective needs to be maintained and the stakeholders must be motivated.

Needs:
1) Overarching strategy.
2) Leaders who get along.

Needs:
1) An agreed allocation of resources and risk sharing system to achieve maximum results across the system.
| Barriers: | Recommendations: | Barriers: |
|----------|------------------|----------|
| 1) Social and cultural differences including those related to knowledge, organisation and power. | 1) Define specifically what changes to services are intended. 2) Convene stakeholders to plan for and support implementation continuously. 3) See outcomes as something for which commissioners and providers are jointly accountable. | 1) The Health and Social Care Act 2012 re-emphasised the role of competition and implicitly encouraged more extensive use of for-profit and third sector providers alongside mainstream NHS-managed services. Yet there has been a parallel emphasis on collaboration and integration so Commissioners have therefore had to explore ways of balancing apparently contradictory pressures: to promote provider competition through contracting and procurement, while simultaneously securing collaborative service delivery through strategic purchasing. |

Judith Smith, Gerald Wistow, Holly Holder & Matthew Gaskins

Evaluating the design and implementation of the whole systems integrated care programme in North West London: why commissioning proved (again) to be the weakest link.
Kasper Raus, Eric Mortier & Kristof Eecklo

Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care

Recommendations:
1) Provide the stakeholders with sufficient freedom and autonomy. Research shows that successful integration cannot be fully mandated and requires a willingness from stakeholders and a relationship of trust between them.

Barriers:
1) Resource challenges: integrated care is often improved efficiency of services, and reduced overall cost, however there is research suggesting that creating integrated care collaborations might actually require a great investment of resources before there is any efficiency pay-off. The resources needed are:(1) expertise, (2) time, and (3) funding.

Recommendations:
1) Be committed to investing the resources needed to genuinely run and evaluate a policy. Research shows how successfully promoting integration may require resources such as time, expertise, and funding. As we have argued, policy-makers who fail to invest the necessary amount of money might afterwards incorrectly conclude that a particular policy implementation does not work.

Barriers:
1) Conceptual challenges: lack of clarity on what constitutes integrated care. When drafting and implementing integrated care, there are three fundamental questions that should be considered by every policy-maker: (1) how the integration will be organised; (2) what kind of integration is intended; (3) what outcome is intended. Because of the conceptual complexity and ideological choices, it is particularly difficult to determine when and to what degree integration care is a success.

Recommendations:
1) Reflect on the type and level of integrated care you want to promote. As we have argued, integrated care is a broad concept and there are different ways to implement it. Research shows that policymakers need to reflect on their specific objectives and how they can best achieve them.

Barriers:
1) Empirical challenges: when drafting policy on integrated care, policymakers are likely to make use of the available evidence. There are at least three different sources of evidence. First, policymakers might learn from places where policies on integrated care have already been put into place. Second, policymakers can consult the available research literature. Third, policymakers can gather their own data. However, each of these sources of evidence can pose challenges. For example, the available research literature might not be comprehensive or up-to-date, and policymakers might have difficulty interpreting the results.

Recommendations:
1) Be committed to using the available evidence to inform policy-making. Research shows how policymakers can make use of an increasing amount of existing and published evidence from research, but also from other sources, to inform their decisions.
concept that encompasses various sorts of integration and collaboration. It is necessary as a policy-maker to be aware of the level of integration that you want to achieve, as, without proper prior thought, it will be impossible to determine the success of the policy afterwards.

2) Reflect beforehand on what you hope to achieve with integrated care. We have argued throughout that integrated care should be seen as a means to a number of possible ends (e.g., economic efficiency or increased quality of care). Knowing what one hopes to achieve by promoting integrated care is crucial to being able to later evaluate the success or failure of the policy. This also allows policy-makers to install a mechanism for evaluation, allowing the health policy to be re-evaluated after a period.

3) Tailor policy to the particular context in which it will be implemented. The successful integration of a given policy in a particular health care context might not be automatically transferrable to another health care context. Policy-makers should critically assess the available scientific literature and look at examples of places where comparable policies have been implemented. One cannot simply copy policy from somewhere else and expect it to work. Policy-makers should preferably not only learn about what happened in other places, but instead learn from other places.

4) Consider beforehand how the actual implementation of the policy can be evaluated: Despite there being empirical challenges, a lot can be learned from the example of other countries and the experiences of other
policy makers. There is also the option of setting up pilot projects or policy experiments to gather relevant feedback. Finally, policy makers should also consider the installation and use of feedback mechanisms to gain insight into the implementation of policy once it is underway.

Laura G. González-Ortiz, Stefano Calciolari, Viktoria Stein, Nick Goodwin

The core dimensions of integrated care: a literature review to support the development of a comprehensive framework for implementing integrated care.

Facilitators:
1) Shared vision and values for the purpose of integrated care.
2) An integration culture institutionalised through policies and procedures.
3) Striving towards an open culture for discussing possible improvements for care partners.

Facilitators:
1) Planned/organised meetings.
2) Information sharing.

Facilitators:
1) Local leadership and long-term commitments.
2) Leaders with a clear vision on integrated care.
3) Distributed leadership.
4) Managerial leadership.
5) Visionary leadership.
6) Clinical leadership.
7) Organisational leadership for providing optimal chronic care.
| Mahiben Maruthappu | Enablers and Barriers in Implementing Integrated Care |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| **Barriers:**       | 1) A change of culture is required, at both clinical and management levels, without which may lead to a lack of shared vision and problems in the long-term sustainability of integration. |
| **Facilitators:**   | 1) Common values. 2) Changing clinical cultures. |

| Martin Bardsley, Adam Steventon, Judith Smith and Jennifer Dixon | Evaluating integrated and community-based care |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| **Facilitators:** 1) Defining the intervention clearly and what it is meant to achieve and how, and implement it well. 2) Being explicit about how desired outcomes will arise, and use interim markers of success. | **Barriers:** 1) Without an infrastructure framework, the coordination of care is stifled; for example, robust shared electronic patient record platforms, which can be accessed by all those involved in providing care to the target patient population. |
| **Facilitators:** 1) IT infrastructure. 2) Leadership coalition. 3) Involvement of primary, community and social care. | **Facilitators:** 1) Clinical leadership. |
| **Facilitators:** 1) Generalisability and context are important - each area will have specific success factors but the aim must be the same. | **Barriers:** 1) For integrative care to be successful, a long-term plan with adequately protected support and funding must be provided. Financial incentives must be directed toward integrated pathways and designed to redistribute incentives to stakeholders. |
| **Facilitators:** 1) Funding realignment. 2) Identification of target population. 3) Adequate financing. | **Facilitators:** 1) Supportive regulation. 2) Flexible administrative reorganisation. |

**Recommendations:** 1) Blend designated leadership with distributed leadership.
| NHS Future Forum | Clinical advice and leadership: a report from the NHS Future Forum. | **Recommendations:**  
1) Establish feedback loops.  
2) Engage physicians, patients and families. |  |  |  |  |
| Needs:  
1) A duty to promote research and innovation and the use of research evidence.  
2) Strong and visible clinical and professional leadership at all levels, focused on increasing trust and encouraging positive behaviour. | **Needs:**  
1) Data about quality and outcomes of care is collected, shared and used in a transparent way to support informed patient choice and continuous improvement.  
2) Continuing professional development.  
3) Responsible officers continue to be in place to support doctors in improving care and ensuring their fitness to practice through revalidation. | **Needs:**  
1) Integrated information systems need to be developed, commissioned and implemented. | **Needs:**  
1) Substantial multi-professional clinical leadership embedded within it including visible leadership for key groups and conditions, for example children, women, older people, mental health and learning disabilities.  
2) All organisations, particularly new ones, should ensure that appropriate leadership development and support are in place. |
Barriers:

1) Performance management and assurance processes that are not aligned to learning and self-reflection.
2) A sense that the goalposts keep moving with priorities, funding and expectations changing.
3) A culture of blame towards leaders.

Facilitators:

1) Having the security to make long-term plans.
2) Trust and delegation of autonomy from the centre: a permissive, not prescriptive, approach and national guidance that provides a broad, enabling framework.

Recommendations:

1) Peer support including mechanisms for 'buddying up'.
2) The creation of

Barriers:

1) Strategies and agendas that are imposed by NHS England on local areas rather than being clinically-led and driven by local need.
2) Complex accountability structures and configurations.
3) Insufficient development, support and peer support for leaders.

Facilitators:

1) Involving staff and service users.
2) Clarity about how performance will be judged.
3) Clarity about how accountability will work, and responsibilities of individual organisations.

Recommendations:

1) Local champions who will push and progress the work, and 'win hearts and minds'.
2) Skilled external

Barriers:

1) Lack of coordination and alignment at national level between NHS England and NHS Improvement.
2) Different performance regimes and cultures, including between the NHS and local authorities.

Facilitators:

1) Relationships before structures: drawing on established working relationships built over the years.

Needs:

1) Leaders in ICSs need to be skilled at:
   a) identifying and scaling innovation (e.g. from pilots).
   b) having a strong focus on outcomes and population health.
   c) building strong relationships with other leaders, and often working with them informally to develop joint priorities and plans.
   d) establishing governance structures which drive faster change, often going where the commitment and energy is strongest.
   e) setting the overall outcomes and expectations on behaviours, but handing day-to-day decision-making to others.
   f) supporting the development of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs).
   g) designing and facilitating whole-systems events and workshops to build consensus and deliver change.
   h) understanding and leading cultural change.
   i) building system-wide learning and evaluation

Barriers:

1) Lack of a coherent view of whole population needs.
2) Sheer volume of bureaucracy involved in getting service changes through.
'safe spaces' for leaders to meet with peers and share problems and solutions.

3) More opportunities to learn from other professions and sectors.

facilitation, to help deliver complex programmes.

3) Systems leadership development for middle managers across the system.

4) Masterclasses on: co-production theory and practice, finance and risk-sharing, scaling innovation, understanding local government and social care, large-scale and large-group facilitation, working and influencing across multiple layers of governance.

frameworks.

j) fostering a learning culture across the whole system.

Barriers:

1) Capacity and capability of local leaders, pressure and stress in these roles, uncertainty about the future.

2) People in leadership roles finding the job lonely and feeling isolated.

3) High turnover of the leadership workforce, resulting in loss of experience and skills.

4) Confusion about where the decision-making power lies.

5) Clinical leadership is especially challenged by bureaucratic constraints.

Facilitators:

1) Stability in senior leadership positions across organisations.

Recommendations:

1) Leadership programmes and professional development opportunities.
| Nick Goodwin, Judith Smith, Alisha Davies, Claire Perry, Rebecca Rosen, Anna Dixon, Jennifer Dixon, Chris Ham |
|---|
| **Integrated care for patients and populations: Improving outcomes by working together** |
| **Barriers:** |
| 1) NHS management is permission based and has a risk averse approach where innovation is needed. |
| **Facilitators:** |
| 1) Clear articulation of benefits to patients, service users and carers. |
| 2) Approaches that measure experiences of patients, service users and carers in relation to integrated care. |
| 3) Need for GPs to adapt to provide services at a larger scale |
| **Barriers:** |
| 1) Divide between primary/secondary, health/social care: different contracts, employment, free/means tested. |
| 2) Absence of robust electronic sharing record. |

| R Humphries |
|---|
| **Integrated health and social care in England – Progress and prospects** |
| **Barriers:** |
| 1) In contrast to the ‘Pioneer’ programme which has encouraged locally driven, bottom-up innovation, NHS England has adopted a much more prescriptive and top-down approach to the delivery of the Better Care Fund which is driven by an imperative to reduce emergency hospital admissions. |
| **Barriers:** |
| 1) The personal commissioning programme is an entirely different approach again which rests on the ability of individuals rather than organisations to integrate their own care. It remains to be seen how the inevitable tensions between these very different policy levers and implementation styles will play out. |

| **Barriers:** |
| 1) Setting a clear, ambitious and measurable goal to improve the experience of patients and service users, implement change at scale and pace. |
| **Barriers:** |
| 1) Weak commissioning payment based on episodic care at hospital, PBR incentivises more activity in hospitals, mitigating against other providers, competition within the market and choice and regulation focuses on organisation performance not collective system leading to single outcomes framework. |
| **Facilitators:** |
| 1) New payment incentives and local currencies. 2) Commission services based on outcomes rather than items of delivery. |

**Recommendations**

1) A new settlement that brings together all health
### Integration in action: four international case studies

| Facilitators: | Barriers: | Recommendations: |
|---------------|-----------|------------------|
| 1. Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care.  
2. Taking an incremental approach on progress.  
3. High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders. | 1. Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods. | 1. Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs.  
2. Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems.  
3. Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care.  
4. Taking an incremental approach on progress.  
5. High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders. |
| Recommendations: | Barriers: | Barriers: |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|
| 1. Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support.  
2. Planned increase in provider competition. | 1. Lack of performance management role (indirect influence).  
2. Variable progress in different localities is dependent on local leadership. | 1. Time needed to integrate services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems. |
| Facilitators: | Barriers: | Barriers: |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| 1. Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients.  
2. High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders. | 1. Active Medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice.  
2. Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record. | 1. When transfer of work between organisations does not cause issues with payments. |

### Across the pond - Lessons from the US on Integrated Healthcare

| Recommendations: | Recommendations: |
|------------------|------------------|
| 1. Risk needs to be shared in collaboration between organisations rather than assigned individually. | 1. Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, and must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care. |
What is integrated care?

**Needs:**
1) Standardised, validated tools and indicators that measure integration across different settings relative to a set of models, structures and processes.
2) Improvement through audit of medical records, analysis of register data on hospitalisation rates, self assessment for managers, annual surveys, questionnaires for clinical leaders, qualitative interviews with executives, leaders, staff and managers.
3) Longitudinal methods that move beyond simple snapshots of integrated care and follow integrative processes through time, allowing evaluators to assess not only the long-term implications for integrated delivery, organisation and outcomes, but also the way in which planned change is actually experienced for those with long-term conditions.

**Needs:**
1) Situate performance measures within wider health and care systems: acknowledge the level and combination of strategies used based on the challenges faced in obtaining appropriate quality care for local communities and user groups and consider the contextual factors that affect development and delivery.
2) Qualitative and mixed methods approaches (such as comparative case study research and/or realistic evaluation) that facilitate understanding of which integrative processes work, for whom, and in what circumstances.
| Recommendations: | Facilitators: |
|------------------|--------------|
| 1) Recognise that major change is needed, ensure a clear and agreed vision from GPs to specialists | 1) The small size allowed relationships to develop over time; indeed, there is a history of collaboration there (e.g. between GPs and community hospital teams and between health and social care). 2) There was a commitment to learning by leaders. The Coastal leads insisted on collecting their own performance data despite being asked to discontinue doing so and devised their own performance management system (measuring performance). Priority to measure | 1) The integrated system appointed GPs as locality clinical directors, which was a key factor as they helped link the GP community directly into the ICO, thereby overcoming barriers between the acute and primary sectors. 2) The partnering and the organisation of interprofessional teamwork and joint care planning as critical determinants of success, especially informal partnership which relies on trusting relationships at all levels. A balance of top-down and bottom-up committees and system-wide steering functions facilitated the emergence over time of trusting relationships and | 1) A strong role of shared, bottom-up leadership. Frontline clinicians in the Coastal Locality were notable for having trusting and friendly relationships between team leads (Physio, Nurses and Matrons, Social Care). |
| 2) Engage with stakeholders when developing integrated systems | | | 1) Size/structural factors were key to integration success: the area was sufficiently small (n=36,251) to allow triage, assessment and referral in one multi-disciplinary team (MDT), whereas in the largest locality had 72,692 registered residents so the single MDT initially had much more caseloads which became unmanageable. |
| Sian E. Maslin-Prothero and Amy E. Bennion | Integrated team working: a literature review | Needs: 1) Need for a shared understanding of the purpose of the joint venture and a mutual understanding of, and commitment to, the vision of the venture across the organizations involved. 2) Need for the development of a shared culture. 3) The promotion of professional values of service to users and socialisation into the immediate work group. | Needs: 1) Establishment of new roles to support new ways of working. Barriers: 1) A lack of clarity of purpose for integration, and a failure to agree partnership outcomes. 2) The lack of understanding and clarity of others’ roles, leading to conflict between team managers. 3) Imbalance of power and poor communication. 4) Short-term contract working, lack of clear career structure, and limited opportunities for promotion (unless they left the service) created a dilemma: a trade-off between present job satisfaction and future career progression for staff in integrated care. | Needs: 1) It is important for integrated services to work together across agency boundaries; this has been facilitated by the removal of structural constraints through the Health Act 1999, which permitting pooled budgets and integrated provision. 2) Integrated teams must be able to exchange knowledge easily between agencies; effective shared information technology (IT) systems are key to the success of integrated working. 3) Exhibiting a past history of joint working. | Barriers: 1) Divide between social care staff medical staff: differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, and status inequalities. 2) Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available. | Needs: 1) The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance. 2) Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas. |
| # | Stephanie Best | Facilitating integrated delivery of services across organisational boundaries: Essential enablers to integration |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | **Needs:** | 1) Horizontal communication. |
| 7 | **Facilitators:** | 1) Communication: Intra- and Inter-professional; staff kept informed; spontaneously shared knowledge across organisations; top-down communication is acknowledged with the need to set a vision and strategic direction identified within leadership; bottom-up communication is seen as essential to actively supporting new ways of working and to sharing a common understanding of operational circumstances. 2) Joint training offers an opportunity to build relationships with colleagues across organisations and recognise each other’s areas of expertise. Overall, participants expressed a wish to see improved working |
| 8 | **Barriers:** | 1) Lack of support. 2) Overestimated expectations. 3) Autocratic leadership style |
| 9 | **Facilitators:** | 1) Setting direction, setting the vision. 2) Accessibility through visibility both within and across organisations. 3) Joint decision-making. 4) Authority to influence across organisations. |
| 10 | | |
relationships, as this has the potential to lead to a 'fluidity in thinking' when managing difficult or complex situations.

Facilitators:

1) Ling et al (2012) further reported that pilot sites were more successful when there was evidence of a shared vision, along with a commitment from management in relation to longevity of the change.

2) Thomas et al (2006) suggest that changes are more likely to be adopted when the change meets an identified need. Ling et al (2012: 4) support this belief, as they reported that 'where staff felt that change was being forced upon them then they were less likely to support the new activity.'

3) Shared information technology (IT) systems were identified as an enabler in two studies. This may pose a concern for a number of organisations considering data sharing owing to issues with information governance and maintaining patient confidentiality.

4) Management and leadership support was identified as an enabler in four of the seven studies. Coupe (2013) suggests that leadership support was essential for the successful implementation of integrated health and social care teams.

5) Thistlethwaite (2011) partially attributed the success in Torbay to the stable leadership within Torbay and the ongoing managerial support to deliver on the integration project.

6) Sharpe et al (2009) also referred to the NHS financial system, suggesting that paying hospitals for each case treated was an actual incentive to increase admissions, which completely conflicts with the aims of integrated health and social care teams.

7) Resources and capacity have been identified as a key enabler in five of the seven studies. Coupe (2013) attributed the main cause of under-performance of the integrated health and social care teams to a lack of investment in the teams, which is required to embed the change into practice. Ling et al (2012) also reported that the lack of resources in the integrated health and social care teams resulted in an increased workload, which had an adverse effect on staff motivation.

8) National policy was considered an enabler in four of the studies. Coupe (2013) identified that the NHS payment systems, such as payment by results and block contracts, do not incentivise the delivery of care in the community, and thus pose a barrier to integrated health and social care teams.
| Tom Ling, Laura Brereton, Annalijn Conklin | Barriers: 1) Feelings of being sidelined, or uninvolved with planning from the beginning. 2) Reluctance to engage was a major barrier. 3) Poor organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries. 4) A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS ‘blame culture’. | Facilitators: 1) Widespread agreement and shared values among participating staff promoted engagement and motivation. 2) Feelings of being involved with planning from the beginning. 3) Willingness to engage. Creating shared beliefs about the benefits of change was described by staff as... | Barriers: 1) Size and complexity: multiple components in integration reported greater challenges of managing change, and they were often greater and longer to implement than they had anticipated. Difficult to communicate the details to all parties and identify the role of each participant group. 2) Staff demotivated when an absence of clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. Where staff felt the change was being forced upon them, they were less likely to support the new activity. 3) Lack of training led to staff being unclear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling unprepared to take on new roles. | Facilitators: 1) Success when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be strongly committed to implementing lasting change. 2) ‘Good’ leadership. | Barriers: 1) Failure when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be weakly committed to implementing lasting change. 2) ‘Poor’ leadership blamed for lack of shared beliefs about the benefits of change. | Barriers: 1) Staff cuts. | Barriers: 1) Chains of managerial approval among multiple organisations and slow decisions about resource distribution were perceived as a barrier to innovation. |
4) Supportive, transparent organisational culture: the ability to modify existing systems and practices and to create new ones was especially dependent on organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries.

5) Staff feeling permitted to take risks.

1) Size and complexity: simple, smaller integration made more rapid progress and had the ability and authority to come to quick decisions.

2) Staff were motivated when there was clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants.

3) Thorough training led to staff being clear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling prepared to take on new roles. The provision of training specific to the service change was important, particularly when the work involved required new or changed roles of participants.

4) External facilitation has been very helpful in getting two organisations to work together, which is a method well rehearsed in the wider literature on colleagues' professional knowledge.

Facilitators:

1) Compatible IT systems and good management of the sharing of private data.

2) Good existing relationships between individuals and/or organisations with clear communication about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work.

3) Ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner organisations.

4) Co-location: working together face-to-face in the same building improved the quality and frequency of communication, and expedited problem-solving by allowing quicker access to colleagues' professional knowledge.

5) Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer.
managing change.
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ABSTRACT

Objectives:

The NHS has been moving towards integrated care for the best part of two decades to address the growing financial and service pressures created by an ageing population. Integrated healthcare systems (IHSs) join up health and social care services and have been established to manage the care of individuals with complex chronic conditions but with varied success. It is therefore imperative to conduct a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) to identify and understand the factors that influence their successful functioning, and ascertain the factor with the greatest influence, in order to ensure positive outcomes when establishing future IHSs.

Methods:

Articles published between 1st January 1997 - 8th March 2020 were analysed from the following six databases: Healthcare Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Nuffield Trust, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), PubMed, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Evidence and Health Systems Evidence (HSE). Those deemed relevant after title and abstract screening were procured for subsequent review of the full-text article.

Results:

Thirty-three finalised articles were analysed in this SLR to provide a comprehensive overview of the factors that influence the functioning of IHSs. Factors were stratified into six key categories: organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, leadership ability of staff, economic factors and political factors. Leadership was deemed to be the most influential factor due to its intrinsic and instrumental role in influencing the other key factors.

Conclusions:

The findings of this SLR may serve as a guide to developing tailor-made recommendations and policies that address the identified key factors and thereby improve the functioning of present and future IHSs. Furthermore, due to both its overarching influence and the inadequacy of literature in this field, there is a strong case for further research exploring leadership development specifically for IHSs.

Keywords: Integrated Care, NHS, Leadership, Organisational Culture, Workforce Management, Inter-organisational Collaboration

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This is an in-depth systematic literature review uncovering important factors that can be applied when developing policies pertinent to the effective functioning of IHSs in the NHS.
- The selection of studies was based on a specific eligibility criteria, which ensured that the articles in this study were specific to the NHS and IHSs.
- The literature search was conducted across six electronic databases enabling good breadth for selection of papers.
- 17 articles were excluded due to the full-texts being unobtainable, resulting in the possibility that important contributions on the factors influencing the success of IHSs were not considered.
INTRODUCTION

The ever-changing healthcare needs of the UK population present a constant challenge for the National Health Service (NHS). An ageing population together with a rise in the prevalence of long standing illness amongst the younger population has shifted the focus from preventing premature death due to acute illness to managing complex chronic conditions, which requires a coordinated and collaborative effort between families, carers, and the health and social care systems.[1, 2] The growing financial and service pressures facing the NHS, which have been exacerbated further by the current COVID-19 pandemic,[3] cannot be tackled without transforming how health and social care are delivered.[4] Old models of care, which have focussed primarily on providing episodic treatment for acute illness, must be replaced with new patient-centred models that integrate health and care services to meet today’s population health needs.[1] Constant evaluation of these models is crucial to ensure the constituent organisations synergise together and fulfil the larger systemic goals of the NHS. The COVID-19 pandemic has necessitated the synergistic working resulting from integrated care in order to achieve more efficient and effective communication between organisations. Such benefits have played a vital role in the coordination of the national vaccine programme in managing COVID-19, and will undeniably be crucial in any future pandemics and, in the wider context, the development of the system to better fulfil the healthcare needs of the population.

Integrated care has been a feature of NHS policy for the best part of two decades. However, despite initiatives by successive governments, system-wide integration has not yet been achieved. Progress to date has been slow and has not delivered all of the expected benefits for patients, the NHS or local authorities.[5] The term was first described in ‘The New NHS’ in 1997, and several integrated healthcare systems (IHSs) have since been introduced to join up health and social care services, such as Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) in 2017 and the current form of Integrated Care Systems (ICSs), which were introduced in the NHS Long Term Plan in 2019 and have evolved out of the set of existing network of STPs. In April 2021, all 42 parts of England were declared ICSs and, in July 2021, the government set to publish legislation proposing statutory ICSs for Parliament to consider, with implementation set for April 2022.

Rationale:

As the NHS advances further towards integrated care, it is necessary to identify and study these factors to harness the facilitators and address the barriers. While existing reviews have identified these factors acting as facilitators and barriers to implementing integrated care, there lies a gap in the literature regarding which factor is the most influential. This review aims to comprehensively identify the factors acting as facilitators and barriers to integrated care and subsequently deduce any underpinning factors that have the most influence. A broad understanding of these factors, and the factor(s) with the most influence, is needed to enable their optimisation and ensure positive outcomes when establishing future IHSs in the NHS.

Objectives:

- To comprehensively identify the factors that influence the functioning of IHSs
- To deduce any underpinning factors that have the most influence in the functioning of IHSs

BACKGROUND TO THEORY:

What is the NHS?
The National Health Service (NHS) refers to the UK's government-funded health care system. Health services are provided 'free at the point of delivery', meaning that any UK resident can visit a doctor who will offer diagnosis or treatment for an illness without asking the individual for payment during or after the visit. As these health and care services are 'publicly funded', money has been allocated by the government to pay for this visit to the doctor through UK residents paying tax.[6]

What is Integration and Integrated Care?

Over 175 competing definitions for ‘integration’ and ‘integrated care’ exist within literature,[7] reflecting what Kodner describes as 'an imprecise hodgepodge'.[8] Nonetheless, one of the earliest and most robust definitions from a review by Kodner and Spreeuwenberg states that:

‘Integration is a coherent set of methods and models on the funding, administrative, organisational, service delivery and clinical levels designed to create connectivity, alignment and collaboration within and between the cure and care sectors. The goal of these methods and models is to enhance quality of care and quality of life, consumer satisfaction and system efficiency for patients with complex, long term problems cutting across multiple services, providers and settings. The result of such multi-pronged efforts to promote integration for the benefit of these special patient groups is called ‘integrated care’'.[9]

In essence, ‘integration’ involves bringing organisations together with the ultimate aim of improving outcomes and service experience for patients who require access to multiple health and care services through the practice of ‘integrated care’ at various levels. There are three levels to integration: the macro level where integrated care is delivered to whole populations, the meso level where it is delivered to a particular care group or population with the same condition (e.g. heart disease), and the micro level where integrated care is delivered to individual service users and their carers.[10] In addition, integration can occur horizontally when two or more organisations or services that deliver care at a similar level come together (e.g. mergers of acute hospitals), or vertically when two or more organisations or services delivering care at differing levels come together (e.g. mergers of acute hospitals with community health services). There are also six key requirements for effective integration.[11] This includes:

- Organisation integration, where organisations are brought together by mergers and/or structural change, or virtually via contracts between separate organisations
- Functional integration, where non-clinical support and back-office functions are integrated
- Service integration, where different clinical services provided are integrated at organisational level
- Clinical integration, where patient care is integrated in a single process both within and across professions, e.g. use of shared guidelines
- Normative integration, where there exist shared values in co-ordinating work and securing collaboration in delivering healthcare
- Systemic integration, where there is coherence of rules and policies at all organisational levels

What are Integrated healthcare systems (IHSs)?

The term IHS has been used to denote the working together of different healthcare organisations as a single cohesive body with the aim of addressing population health needs. This encompasses STPs and ICSs, the latter of which is the latest among initiatives to integrate care in the NHS. By this definition, an ICS is an integrated healthcare system; however, integrated healthcare systems aren't limited exclusively to ICSs and can refer to any integrated body tasked with delivering integrated care such as STPs.
What is a Successful IHS?

The NHS has traditionally based its definition of success on performance metrics that are specific to the production process of the NHS, which involves inputs (funding), processes (patient waiting times), and outputs (number of patients treated).[12] However, there has been a lack of emphasis placed upon the ultimate outcome, which is high quality patient care. Alongside the need to provide more holistic outcomes, as well as the NHS moving towards integrated care, a new understanding of success is required. For the purpose of this study, the success of IHSs should be defined as patients having a seamless experience across all health and social care services they interact with, reducing inefficiencies and non-value steps in the patient journey and ultimately improving outcomes at a lower cost.[1, 13]

METHODOLOGY

Protocol:
This systematic literature review (SLR) was reported using the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis) framework, which was developed according to published guidance by the EQUATOR (Enhancing the Quality and Transparency Of health Research) Network.[14]

Eligibility criteria:
As outlined in Table 1, this review will consider qualitative studies that address factors that influence the establishment and/or functioning of IHSs within the UK. The NHS has a unique organisational structure including national bodies, local clinical commissioning groups, and healthcare providers. For this reason, articles were excluded that pertain to the private health and care sector, the business sector, and international IHSs in order to make findings specific to this unique context. Articles were limited to the English language to be legible by the authors.

This review considered literature published in the years 1997-2020, as ‘The New NHS’, published on the 8th December 1997, represents one of the earliest examples of literature calling to ‘replace the internal market with integrated care’, thereby serving as the starting point for research activity on the topic of integration in the NHS.[15]

| INCLUSION                                      | EXCLUSION                                      |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Articles relevant to the health and care sector | Articles relevant to other sectors such as the business sector |
| Articles addressing the implementation of IHSs specifically within the UK | Articles that pertain to International IHSs with different organisational structure to the UK |
Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for articles selected in this study

| Articles published after 1997 | Articles published prior to 1997 |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Articles with a full-text accessible for thorough analysis | Articles that only had an accessible abstract, not allowing for comprehensive analysis |
| Articles relevant to the public health and care sector | Articles relevant to the private health and care sector |
| Articles written in the English language | Articles not written in the English language |

Information sources:
The search was implemented on 08/04/2020 across six electronic databases: Healthcare Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Nuffield Trust, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), PubMed, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Evidence, and Health Systems Evidence (HSE).

To supplement the comprehensive literature search, a ‘snowball’ technique was adopted, whereby the reference list for all relevant articles was scanned to identify further relevant articles.

Articles found through this literature search consisted of thought pieces as well as those which were empirically driven or peer reviewed. As a result, the contributions of each article were also assessed in accordance with the hierarchy of evidence.[16] The categorisation of these articles are detailed in Table 2.

Search:
The search strategy was developed through consensus-based discussion and agreement between all authors. The final search string was as follows:

("Integrated Health" OR "Integrating Health" OR "Integrated Care") AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

The search query was tailored to the specific requirements of each database. The adapted electronic search strings for each database can be found in Appendix A.

Selection of sources of evidence:
Initially, all authors independently screened only the title and abstract (or background in white papers) of each article to preclude the waste of time and energy from reviewing full-text articles that fail to meet the eligibility criteria. To ensure consistency among all authors,
a pilot screening was initially completed in which each author screened the same 200 articles independently. From this, all reviewers independently agreed on all but 4 articles; however this was resolved upon discussion to clarify the eligibility criteria, which was then amended to increase specificity and clarity. Consequently, the pilot ended in comprehensive agreement on the eligibility criteria and resulted in the reviewers having the same view on which papers should be accepted or rejected.

All articles deemed relevant after title and abstract screening were procured for subsequent review of the full-text article. The full-text articles were then assessed for eligibility and a proportion were excluded, resulting in a final selection of studies to be included in the SLR. As this was an unfunded project, 17 articles were unobtainable through our institutional search and due to these financial limitations access to the full-text versions of abstracts that were found on database searches was restricted.

**Data Extraction Chart:**
The following key identifiable information was extracted from each article: the author(s), year of publication, title, database the article was retrieved from, journal, study type, DOI or URL. The articles were also stratified under the following headings: needs identified, barriers identified, facilitators identified and recommendations. The categories were identified qualitatively through the language used in articles to describe each factor, with a quantitative record of the number of mentions in each article also noted. The categories were found to be highly interdependent and therefore it must be noted that there was some overlap between them. The findings were reported in a ‘Data Extraction Chart’ table format (see Appendix B). The main revision to the headings in the chart included the addition of 'Recommendations' as articles often framed influential factors in the form of recommended actions to improve IHSs.

All authors jointly extracted the data from each article using 'Google Sheets', discussed the results and continuously iterated the data extraction chart. An interpretivist approach was then used to draw the factors that were identified from the data extraction chart into the corresponding themes and subsequently identify any underpinning factors that have the most influence in the functioning of IHSs. This particular approach is one of social construction as opposed to objectivity, and thus was used to analyse the various subjective perspectives of the authors within the literature. This method involved an initial extraction in which each author had the opportunity to further research independently into the content of the literature. This process enabled diversity of thought into the subject matter with each author developing their own interpretations of the data extraction. Furthermore this enhanced reflectivity and analysis of key themes, a crucial component towards a rigorous review process.

**Patient and Public Involvement**
Patients or the public were not involved in the design of this study.

**RESULTS:**

**Search Results:**

The overall search resulted in 33 finalised articles to be included in the SLR. The flow of records in the search process is conveyed in Figure 1.

**Figure 1:** Process of identifying search results, screening, assessing for eligibility and inclusion.

**Characteristics of sources of evidence:**
Table 2 describes the categories into which the data from each article was inserted, accompanied by the year of publication, database and study type.

| Characteristic           | Number (n = 33) | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| **Publication year**     |                 |                |
| 1997-2004                | 0               | 0.0            |
| 2005-2009                | 2               | 6.1            |
| 2010-2014                | 11              | 33.3           |
| 2014-2019                | 17              | 51.5           |
| >2020                    | 3               | 9.1            |
| **Study Type**           |                 |                |
| Qualitative Study        | 9               | 27.3           |
| Report                   | 15              | 45.5           |
| Scoping Narrative Literature Review | 1 | 3.0 |
| Systematic Literature Review | 5 | 15.2 |
| Case Study               | 3               | 9.1            |
| **Database**             |                 |                |
| EMCARE                   | 3               | 9.1            |
| HMIC                     | 7               | 21.2           |
| BNI                      | 1               | 3.0            |
| HSE                      | 2               | 6.1            |
| EMBASE                   | 1               | 3.0            |
| CINAHL                   | 3               | 9.1            |
| Nuffield Trust           | 6               | 18.2           |
| PubMed                   | 5               | 15.2           |
| N/A                      | 5               | 15.2           |
| **Data Categories**      |                 |                |
| Needs                    | 9               | 27.3           |
| Barriers                 | 20              | 60.6           |
| Facilitators             | 21              | 63.6           |
| Recommendations          | 16              | 48.5           |

Table 2: Characteristics of Sources of Evidence
Summary of evidence:
From 1997 to 2019, an increasing number of selected articles were published (0% in 1997-2004, 6.1% in 2005-2009, 33.3% in 2010-2014, and 51.5% in 2014-2019). This reflects the growing field of research into IHSs leading up to The NHS Long-Term Plan, influencing its strategic focus on integration.[17]

The factors that influence the functioning of IHSs were framed as needs in 27.3% of articles, barriers and facilitators in 60.6% of articles, and as recommendations in 48.5%. On the basis of the language used to describe each factor, all factors were categorised into themes. The themes identified were:

1. Organisational Culture - an informal organisational system of shared values (i.e. what is important) and beliefs (i.e. how things work), that influence the environment and produce behavioural norms (i.e. the way we do things around here).
2. Workforce Management - the formal organisational arrangements that enable staff to carry out the tasks at hand as productively as possible.
3. Inter-organisational collaboration - the formal and informal organisational arrangements that build trust and collective relationships between organisations.
4. Leadership Ability of Staff - an informal organisational system by which one individual influences others toward attaining defined goals.
5. Economic factors - formal organisational arrangements relating to the consumption and supply of resources.
6. Political factors - formal organisational arrangements relating to the government or public affairs of a country.

See Appendix B to view the ‘Data Extraction Chart’ displaying the exact language used by each article to describe the identified factors, and their categorisation into each of the themes listed above. See Appendix C to view the ‘Synthesis of Results’ displaying all findings from each article stratified by the identified themes.

In this SLR of 33 articles, each factor identified influences the functioning of IHSs by either shaping their planning and implementation, or their ongoing functioning, or both. The factors that pertain to each stage are made clear in the summaries below. Furthermore, integration poses its own unique challenges and requires a unique set of factors to meet these challenges. The factors outlined below are described in the context of IHSs, rather than in the context of a conventional organisation. Although these themes are clearly defined, it is worth noting that they are not mutually exclusive and are highly interdependent.

Organisational Culture
82% of articles cited issues relating to organisational culture, including the need for leaders to communicate a shared vision to effectively plan and implement integration.[18-23] This demands a mutual understanding of and commitment to the vision across the organisations involved.[24] Differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, status inequalities, professional cultures, working practices and priorities can lead to divides between staff from different organisations, creating conflict and a ‘blame culture’ that stifles ongoing integrated working.[25-29] Fostering an ethos of learning and self-reflection was also shown to yield positive outcomes as staff continue to work together long-term.[26, 28, 30]

Workforce Management
Factors relating to workforce management were expressed in 76% of articles, such as the need to provide staff with adequate incentives to ‘buy into’ the integration process as the new style of working is established in the NHS.[31, 32] Healthcare staff need to be trained for the new roles they may need for integrated work.[33] and leaders must encourage staff to
take 'ownership' of new service models as they are planned and implemented by involving them in decision making.[25, 34] Furthermore, integrating services often requires increased workloads at the start and overworking staff can reduce motivation to collaborate with other sectors, yielding high staff turnover and poorer outcomes. Therefore, managing the workload of staff is key in both the initial stages of implementation and the ongoing functioning of IHSs.[25, 27]

**Inter-organisational Collaboration**

As IHSs involve cooperation between different organisations, 70% of articles demonstrated the need for factors relating to inter-organisational collaboration to both achieve and sustain integrated care. These include: inter-professional teamwork involving both top-down and bottom-up communication,[24, 25, 35] the formation of good working relationships built on trust,[26, 35, 36] and the presence of shared information technology (IT) platforms between organisations to enable easy data-sharing.[20, 21, 24-26, 31, 37, 38] The lack of ongoing planned communication between members of partnering organisations leads to contact often being limited to emails with minimal face-to-face interaction, and was often cited as a barrier to long-term collaboration.[27]

**Leadership Ability of Staff**

82% of articles addressed leadership ability of staff, outlining that successful integration requires a combination of clear leadership and governance from senior managers at the macro level with strong involvement of frontline staff as clinical leaders at the micro level,[21, 35, 38-41] together with local authority figures acting as local leaders.[19, 25, 31, 33]

The unique challenges posed by planning and implementing integration include: high levels of pressure and stress faced by staff, high turnover of staff as personnel changes are made, and a lack of stability among the leadership workforce as their roles are adapted.[28] These challenges require leaders to support the emotional wellbeing of staff, set clear and measurable goals, identify and scale innovation from pilot programmes, and establish governance structures that drive faster change.[20, 28]

The ongoing functioning of IHSs is highly influenced by the ability of leaders to shift from organisational leadership (leading individuals within one organisation) towards 'systems leadership' (leading individuals across multiple organisations),[18, 30, 34, 42, 43] part of which involves the creation of strong relationships with team members and allegiances within leadership groups.[28, 34, 44]

**Economic Factors**

Economic factors, such as the reluctance of commissioning organisations to pool budgets, and low levels of funding and staff, often with inadequate training, were cited as barriers to planning and implementing integrated care in 61% of articles,[30, 32, 33] and the need to devise long-term plans with an appropriate level of funding was expressed as vital to preserve the ongoing functioning of IHSs.[18, 27] Providing a manageable caseload without overstretching human resources is also a crucial success factor for the long-term functioning of IHSs,[33] as it was in the case of Coastal Locality in Torbay and South.[35] Payment methods such as Payment by Results (PbR) that incentivise activity in hospitals over other providers and were also identified as barriers to the continued functioning of IHSs.[25]

**Political Factors**

Political barriers to the planning and implementation of IHSs were expressed in 52% of articles, examples of which include the fragmented strategic direction from national government with conflicting leadership approaches by different government entities,[32, 24, 25, 33] together with difficulties in agreeing budgets and uncertainty regarding the level of integration that is desired.[45] Furthermore, failures of policy makers to evaluate and learn
from the pitfalls of existing policies and translate published evidence into political action served as barriers to the ongoing delivery of integrated care.[45]

**DISCUSSION**

After synthesising the results, the categories of factors identified were ascertained to be under the responsibility of either leaders within IHSs (organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, leadership ability of staff) or policymakers above (economic and political factors).

Detailed analysis carried out by all reviewers identified a significant overlap between leadership and the three core factors (organisational culture, workforce management and inter-organisational collaboration) during the review process. 82% of articles emphasised the importance of organisational culture, which is determined by the core values cultivated by leaders in order to establish a shared culture in which all members feel represented. Moreover, 76% of articles emphasised the importance of workforce management in IHSs. In managing the workforce, compassionate leadership should be employed to mould an environment through ‘consistently listening, understanding, empathising and helping’ staff. [46] Leadership which is more enabling and facilitative of the workforce leads to increased productivity, resulting in better delivery of care and ultimately improved health outcomes for patients. The third principal factor discussed in the results is inter-organisational collaboration, discussed in 70% of articles. It can be inferred that effective leadership has the potential to create an atmosphere consistent with achieving a common goal by cooperating effectively with other organisations. However, IHSs carry a lot of ‘uncertainty and ambiguity’,[47] which further stresses the need for a leader to create a network of trust and communicate a shared vision across multiple organisations.[48]

As a result, group reflection amongst reviewers revealed that leadership has an intrinsic and instrumental role in influencing the other three key factors, as depicted in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2: The underpinning role of leadership in influencing other key factors in integrated care

In the argument for leadership being the most influential factor, both Charles et al. and Tweed et al. expressed the need for ‘systems leadership’ to implement the system-wide change required for integrated care.[19, 35] Charles et al. describes that systems leadership involves the creation of a positive organisational culture by ‘communicat(ing) a shared vision and purpose’; effective management of the workforce through ‘frequent personal contact with others and resolv(ing) conflicts’; and the need to facilitate organisational collaboration by ‘build(ing) trust and rapport with partner organisations to move away from competition and towards forming long-term collaborative relationships’.[19] Systems leadership is a concept that is supported by the views of Kellerman who states, ‘Leadership is a system not a person’ and incorporates the followers and the context within which they work in addition to the leaders themselves. [49] This implies that all members in the organisation play a key role in effective leadership, in that individuals can adopt the role of leadership in each task they carry out. This role can vary depending on the context of the task.

Tweed et al. developed on this further by introducing a model of ‘connecting’ (Figure 3) to create an allegiance based upon qualitative research involving the active participation of leaders achieving transformational change. The conceptualisation of leadership as a system is further justified through the responsibilities of leaders included in this model: leading with ‘purpose’ and ‘vision’, shaping organisational culture, and managing the workforce in a ‘relational’ manner ‘through practice’ by collaborating between organisations, which correspond with the key themes identified in the results. [35]
When considering the ‘followers’ and the ‘context’ components of leadership as a system, it is important to note that collaboration between multiple healthcare bodies requires leaders to work with numerous organisational cultures. For example, in a study by Smith et al., there are clear differences in the culture between healthcare and social care bodies, which create two distinct uni-professional cultures. These are two key aspects that integrated care aims to converge, through the use of inter-organisational collaboration.[35]

Another responsibility of leaders in IHSs is to effectively implement a clear governance system that creates an overarching structure overseeing the functioning of IHSs. This is necessary in creating order, accountability, and setting a clear direction in a relatively recent healthcare structure that lacks a distinct ‘rule book’, [51] thereby ensuring that integrated operations are sustained long-term.

The SLR also identified economic and political factors to be crucial in the function of IHSs. These were interpreted to be largely in the hands of governments and policy makers who determine the strategic direction of integration, resource availability, and payment mechanisms. The capacity to amend these factors is relatively inflexible, while leadership and its overarching factors can be optimised despite any systemic economic and political constraints.

Thus, leadership is not only the most influential factor, but also the factor with the greatest capacity to be influenced. However, leadership cannot be changed overnight and requires the development of leadership skills across the organisation. This necessitates an extended period of time to develop, resulting in a gradual change in functioning rather than a quick fix.

It has been suggested that the successful implementation of integrated care has improved certain patient outcomes, such as hospital admission rates, length of hospital stay and patient satisfaction.[52, 53] It can therefore be inferred that strong leadership in IHSs is extremely valuable in the delivery of high quality healthcare to patients. However, the relationship between integrated care and the long lasting outcomes on patient health requires further follow-up and research.[54]

Ultimately, a gap lies in this field of literature. Evans et al. noted that, while ‘Leadership Approach’ and ‘Clinician Engagement and Leadership’ are among the most important capabilities shaping the capacity of organisations to implement integrated care, they have not been consistently studied.[39] As such, there is much value to be gained by undertaking further research to explore deeper the role leadership plays in influencing its attributed factors.

**LIMITATIONS**

When analysing the selected full-text articles, the authors found issues discussed in literature to be multi-faceted, leading to overlap between the factors identified when synthesising the results. Interpretation and categorisation of these factors may have been subject to individual bias.

17 articles were excluded from this study due to the full-texts being unobtainable due to reasons explained in the methodology. These were excluded after title and abstract screening, resulting in a proportion of papers and their contribution on factors influencing IHSs being forgone and thus limiting the extent of the SLR. Therefore, it is recommended that future researchers invest in payments to journals to be given access to the full scope of articles.
Due to the evolving nature of IHSs there is an inevitable lack of widespread IHS-related terminology across literature. As a result it is likely that relevant studies were missed during the search process reducing the breadth of information available for analysis.

In addition, the inclusion of grey literature in the search uncovered challenges such as the lack of extensive search tools for these papers which resulted in web searching - a method that is not as thorough as the use of databases.

CONCLUSION
This SLR presented an overview of a multitude of key factors that influence the functioning of IHSs in the NHS relating to organisational culture, workforce management, inter-organisational collaboration, the leadership ability of staff, economic and political factors. Within ICSs in the NHS, ‘system leadership’ was found to be vital to achieve the transformational change required to integrate care and meet the ideals of The NHS Long Term Plan. This is a concept that has been identified in other articles - underlining that leaders in healthcare must develop more in the domains of collaborative working and coalition.

The current available literature includes material which discusses the ideal implementation of integrated healthcare, such as the work from Jon Glasby and Helen Dickinson who explore specific challenges related to delivering integrated care. However, the shift of the NHS towards integrated healthcare is an ongoing narrative and the findings of this SLR provide a topical review of the literature. This will help to better contextualise the current state of IHSs and act as a key stepping stone towards the development of tailor-made recommendations and policies to address and optimise these factors within present and future IHSs in the NHS. In addition, there is a strong case for further research exploring leadership development, due to its underpinning influence on the other categories of factors and the identified gap within the literature that pertains to this field.
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Figure 1: Process of identifying search results, screening, assessing for eligibility and inclusion.
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Figure 2: The underpinning role of leadership in influencing other key factors in integrated care
Figure 3: Visual representation of the ‘Connecting’ model [33]
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Appendix A: Search Strings

**HMIC:**

(“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 2000 - Current

**Nuffield Trust:**

(“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits:

Years: 1997-2020

Content Type: Report, Journal Article

**CINAHL:**

NHS AND (“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: December 1997 - April 2020, English Language

**PubMed:**

NHS AND (“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 08/12/1997-08/04/2020, English Language

**NICE Evidence:**

NHS AND (“Integrated Health*” OR “Integrating Health*” OR “Integrated Care*”) AND (Factor* OR Perform* OR Success* OR Fail*)

Limits: 2000-2020
HSE:

(“Integrated Health” OR “Integrating Health” OR “Integrated Care”) AND (Factor OR Perform OR Success OR Fail)

Limits: 2000-2020
| Author                           | Year of Publication | Title                                                                 | Database | Journal | Study Type | DOI/URL                        | Needs Identified                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Barriers Identified                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Facilitators Identified                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Recommendations                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Alison Tweed, Andrew Singfield, Julia RA Taulor, Lucy Gilbert, Paul Mount | 2018                | Creating Allegiance: Leading transformational change within the NHS | EMCA RE  | BMJ Leader | Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.1136/leader-2018-000088 | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders should be non-partisan integrators rather than assign themselves to an organisation - have an allegiance to the system.  
2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders should build high quality relationships involving emotional intelligence and positive role modelling.  
3) Organisational Culture - Shared visions (espoused theories) need to be outlined and translated into everyday practice and visions of previous leaders or schemes must be erased.  
4) Workforce Management - Connecting through practice: involving frontline staff and all stakeholders in decisions and key pieces of the transformation to integrated care. |                                                                 | 1) Political - The legislative context does not support system working.  
2) Political - Regulation and oversight is not aligned.  
3) Organisational Culture - A legacy of competitive behaviours. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Collaborative relationships.  
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships with local authorities.  
3) Organisational Culture - Shared vision and purpose.  
4) Organisational Culture - A meaningful local identity. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Invest in building collaborative relationships at all levels of the system.  
2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Promote and value system leadership.  
3) Workforce Management - Integrate at different levels of the system. |
| Anna Charles, Lillie Wenzel, Matthew Kershaw, Chris Ham, Nicola Walsh | 2018                | A Year of Integrated Care Systems: Reviewing the journey so far   | N/A - Snowball | The King's Fund | Report | URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/2018-09/Yea r-of-integrat ed-care-system s- |                                                                 | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Collaborative relationships.  
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships with local authorities.  
3) Organisational Culture - Shared vision and purpose.  
4) Organisational Culture - A meaningful local identity. |                                                                  | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Invest in building collaborative relationships at all levels of the system.  
2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Promote and value system leadership.  
3) Workforce Management - Integrate at different levels of the system. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Organisational Culture | 4) Organisational Culture - Frequently changing language and the lack of a clear narrative. | 5) Intrinsic value of leadership - System leadership. |
| Economic | 6) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical leadership and engagement. |
| Workforce Management | 7) Workforce Management - Established models of integrated working. |
| Economic | 8) Economic - Stability of local finances and performance. |
| Workforce Management | 9) Economic - Funding to support transformation. |
| Political | 10) Political - A permissive and supportive national programme. |

Building up from places and neighbourhoods.

4) Workforce Management - Draw on the skills and leadership of frontline staff.

5) Workforce Management - Build governance in an evolutionary way to support delivery.

6) Workforce Management - Develop system-wide capabilities to gather, share and act on public insights.

7) Workforce Management - Develop active strategies to facilitate wider adoption of new care models.

8) Workforce Management - Build robust evaluation into the ICS programme that supports learning and improvement and measures progress.

1) To further research specific policy analysis domains, i.e. investigate policy formation, policy implementation or service delivery outcomes in integrated or co-ordinated health and social care services.
5) Political - Complex governance arrangements.
6) Economic - Difficulties in agreeing budgets.
7) Political - Lack of understanding of what the drivers and essential requirements are for successful integration between health and social care and how to use policy to steer care organisations through this change.
| 2017 Early Evaluation of the Integrated Care and Support Pioneers Programme: Final Report | N/A - Snowball | Policy Innovation Research Unit | Report URL: https://piru.ac.uk/assets/files/Early_evaluation_of_IC_Pioneers_Final_Report.pdf | 1) Political - Pressure by national and local policymakers to demonstrate the success of new integration initiatives at a stage too early in the programme’s implementation.  
2) Economic - Acute/community trusts or social services departments suffered from significant financial deficit and were subject to ‘special measures’, which diverted senior management attention away from Pioneer activity.  
3) Economic - The growing demand for costly A&E services by patients at a time when integration seeks to reduce usage – diverts resources and slows the pace of transformation.  
4) Political - Strategic direction from the national government is fragmented. Differences in approach: DCLG reportedly favouring more locally devolved responsibility, while DH/NHSE adopt a more ‘command and control’ approach.  
5) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Health care and social care have different regulatory frameworks and the regulator does not examine systems such as integrated services, instead only 1) Organisational Culture - Trust and shared values that are largely developed locally.  
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Being part of a national Pioneer programme, which provided an impetus for local professionals to work together to improve care locally.  
3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Building and maintaining good working relationships across organisations and professions at all levels built on trust, so that people could speak frankly, come to understand each other’s perspectives, and develop a shared vision and understanding of what the Pioneer was aiming to achieve.  
4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated information system between organisations to enable sharing of patient/service user records or having suitable facilities for cross-agency and/or multi-disciplinary teams.  
5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Good leadership and vision was also identified as critical at all levels from local authority councillors through to senior managers, supported by appropriate governance structures.  
6) Workforce Management - Experienced staff.  
7) Economic - Uncommitted funding. |
6) Workforce Management - Integration was less of a priority where stakeholders had urgent competing demands (e.g. meeting 4-hour waiting time A&E targets).

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Some Pioneers were very complex with a large number of stakeholders and/or a large geographic footprint, which made partnership working more complex in terms of size, communication, governance, etc.

8) Collaboration between Organisation - Inadequate local engagement/’buy-in’ of the independent, community and voluntary sectors, in part, because they were often required to compete against each other for contracts, making working together particularly challenging.

9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inadequate local engagement/’buy-in’ of the mental health sector, due in part to the legacy of underfunding and ‘Cinderella’ status of the sector.

10) Inter-organisational Collaboration - In some Pioneers with multiple partners, a sense that...
transformation could happen only at the pace of the 'slowest', most conservative or risk averse stakeholder.

11) Economic - PbR incentives for acute providers to increase activity against providing more care outside hospital.

12) Economic - Commissioning organisations were sometimes reluctant to pool budgets as it meant giving up complete control over their own budget in order to have influence over a larger one.

13) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Information sharing was seen as critical, but the level of integration of information and intelligence needed was technically difficult to achieve across multiple IT platforms and with obstructive information governance regulations.

14) Organisational Culture - Differences between the health and social care sectors in terms of language and conceptions of health and wellbeing, professional cultures and working practices.

15) Organisational Culture - Different priorities between professions: e.g. the people of most concern to social workers were not
necessarily the same as those of most concern to GPs.

16) Organisational Culture
- 'Blame culture' within and across local health and social care sectors located responsibility for failures in integration elsewhere in the system.

17) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of agreement on priorities among local system leaders.

18) Workforce Management - Multiple challenges of engaging frontline staff

19) Organisational Culture - Scepticism about NHS initiatives that had previously been seen to 'come and go'.

20) Organisational Culture - Previous initiatives did not live up to expectations leading to demoralisation.

21) Workforce Management - Difficulties recruiting staff particularly in certain areas of the country.

22) Workforce Management - High staff turnover (especially following health care reforms) negatively affected longer-term strategic planning and
23) Organisational Culture - Promoting a 'play-it-safe' work culture can be detrimental to 'barrier busting'.

24) Existing approaches to training professionals do not produce trainees equipped for integrated working, and not enough trainees to meet demand.
| Authors             | Year | Title                                                                 | Journal          | Qualitative Study | URL                                                                 | Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Carolyn Wilkins     | 2020 | An Allied Approach to Success in Oldham                              | HMIC Municipal Journal | Qualitative Study | URL: https://www.themj.co.uk/An-allied-approach-to-success-in-Oldham/216693# | 1) Political - Co-operative council with an understanding of communities which helps to target resources and further develop interventions. 2) Organisational Culture - Positive and trusting relationships. 3) Organisational Culture - A culture of innovation, creativity and empowerment and not micro-management based on old fashioned contractual approaches. 4) Intrinsic value of leadership - System leaders who work together to support frontline practitioners to overcome bureaucratic barriers. |
| Chris Ham, Judith Smith and Elizabeth Eastmure | 2011 | Commissioning integrated care in a liberated NHS                    | Nuffield Trust Nuffield Trust Report | URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/commissioning-integrated-care-in-a-liberated-nhs | 1) Economic - Needs assessment and service specification is time, effort and resource consuming. 1) Economic - Using PMS and APMS contracts to facilitate payments. 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Managerial leadership in combination with clinician leadership. |
1) Workforce Management - Lack of awareness of roles and services: uncertainty about which roles are carried out by which social service provider and how best to contact these individuals.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Often numbers in practice diaries and on websites are out of date, so staff have to ask the patient directly what social care they receive and how to contact relevant departments, slowing down both communication and any attempts at collaborative working.

3) Workforce Management - Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Communication between primary care and social care is logistically challenging, as doctors are busy with patients during the day and social care staff are working in the community, making joint conversations about patients nearly impossible.
5) Organisational Culture - All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of regular contact: most GPs and PMs explained regular contact with social care teams is necessary for effective information transfer and a multidisciplinary approach to patient care. However, currently, contact is through forms and emails with minimal face-to-face contact, which professionals find inefficient and a barrier to continuity of care.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Inefficient MDT meetings.

8) Economic - Low staffing levels.

9) Workforce Management - Inadequate training of staff.
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10)   | Economic - Insufficient funding. |   |   |   |   |
| 11)   | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Interoperability between information systems: the lack of shared information systems. |   |   |   |   |

1) Workforce Management - The objectives of integration need to be made explicit.

2) Workforce Management - Begin integration at the frontline, which impacts directly on the patient experience; based on this, the most apt organisational supports for service provision might be identified.

3) Workforce Management - The right incentives: it is important that frontline staff recognise and buy into the integration process.

4) Organisational Culture - A culture of quality improvement.

5) Organisational Culture - A history of trust between partner organisations.

6) Organisational Culture - Personnel who are open to collaboration and innovation.

7) Organisational Culture - Awareness of local cultural differences: organisational cultures evolve separately over decades.
|   |   | 8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Local leaders who are supportive of integration.  
|   |   | 9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Effective and complementary communications and IT systems.  
|   |   | 10) Political - Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes.  
|   |   | **1) Organisational Culture**  
|   |   | - The need to develop a culture in which people are comfortable and competent in working across organisational boundaries to serve the needs of patients more effectively and strive continuously to improve the quality of care.  
|   |   | 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Staff working within integrated care must have (or develop) emotional intelligence and empathy in dealing with patients and users, be willing to work in teams with shared accountability, and be prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care.  
|   |   | **3) Inter-organisational Collaboration**  
|   |   | - Financial incentives do not encourage collaboration.  
|   |   | - Lack of shared data.  
|   |   | **4) Organisational Culture**  
|   |   | - Lack of shared accountability.  
|   |   | **E Paice, S Hasan**  
|   |   | 2013  
|   |   | Educating for Integrated Care  
|   |   | PubMe d  
|   |   | London Journal of Primary Care  
|   |   | Report  
|   |   | DOI: 10.1080/17571472.2013.11493374
| Elena Urizar, Roberto Nuño, Caridad Alvarez, Fernández Concepción, Carles Blay, Andrea Quiroga | Barriers and facilitators for the implementation of Integrated Care Pathways ICPs: a systemic perspective | CINAH International Journal of Integrated Care | Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.5334/ijic.s2131 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Organisational Culture - At macro level there is a general lack of strategic vision towards integrated care from a systems perspective. | 2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - At meso level, the historical fragmentation of organizations poses a strong challenge towards care coordination. | 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - At the micro level a lack of clinical leadership and buy-in hinders the needed multidisciplinary and collaborative work. | |

| Gerald Wistow, Matt Gaskins, Holly Holder, Judith Smith | Why implementing integrated care is so much harder than designing it: experience in North West London. | CINAH International Journal of Integrated Care | Qualitative Study | DOI: http://doi.org/10.5334/ijic.2856 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) Workforce Management - Balance between: collective leadership and local autonomy; integrated commissioning and integrated provision; NHS leadership and local authority engagement; local variation and programme-wide consistency; investment in design and support for ongoing implementation and change. | 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Systems leadership. NHS leaders have relatively little training or experience in managing systems as opposed to organisations. | 1) Inter-organisational Collaboration- Better Information Systems. | 2) Organisational Culture - Strategic Alignment. | 3) Workforce Management - Improving data collection, continuous monitoring and evaluation, feedback looping to professionals. | 4) Workforce Management - Incentives and training healthcare professionals in communication and team-work skills. |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Securing data-sharing and information governance. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4) Economic - Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5) Workforce Management - Maintaining acute provider viability while reducing hospital admissions. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Balancing competition and collaboration. |   |   |   |   |   |

1) Workforce Management - Governance by hierarchy (ownership) or a mode that is close to a hierarchy (through long-term contractual relationships).

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Full integration compared with arrangements of different autonomous insurers and providers reduces costs of information, negotiation, contracting, control, and adaptation and is hence more efficient.

3) Economic - Finance by capitation. Payment per member for coverage for all care provided by the IHCDS (typically in an annual contract with monthly payments), as the principal reimbursement method acts as a powerful pricing strategy that generates substantial savings.
1) Political - Lack of political leadership and healthcare policies and a poor understanding of the population and low prioritisation on the political agenda as well the absence of appropriate policies at the macro level.

2) Economic - The cost of integrated services, human resources issues (workload of personnel, staff turnover, time constraints and scarcity of various trained human resources such as care coordinators, public health workforce and allied professionals) and deficient administrative infrastructure (the absence of health records, cross-

3) Workforce Management - Interprofessional education.

4) Workforce Management - Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management [including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)] and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference).

5) Workforce Management - Inter-organisational Collaboration - Geographical

6) Workforce Management - Durability and size.
| Domain/Issue                                                                 | Description                                                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Workforce Management - Basic Structures and Design:                      | Physical Structures, Human and Material Resources, Organizational Design, Governance, Accountability, and Information Technology.             |
| 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leadership and Strategy: Leadership      | Approach, Clinician Engagement and Leadership, Strategic Focus on Improvement,                                                                 |
| 3) Workforce Management - Discipline-oriented education and lack of         | competencies.                                                                                                                                 |
| 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of continuity of care and      | services: unstructured mechanism for care coordination at the micro level and lack of practice guidelines and types of practice at the meso level. |
| 5) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision      | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 6) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader  | in building teamwork and communities' capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 7) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 8) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                            |                                                                                                                                              |
| 9) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision      | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 10) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 11) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 12) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                           |                                                                                                                                              |
| 13) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision    | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 14) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 15) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 16) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                           |                                                                                                                                              |
| 17) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision    | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 18) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 19) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 20) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                           |                                                                                                                                              |
| 21) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision    | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 22) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 23) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 24) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                           |                                                                                                                                              |
| 25) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision    | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 26) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 27) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 28) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                           |                                                                                                                                              |
| 29) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision    | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 30) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 31) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 32) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                           |                                                                                                                                              |
| 33) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision    | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 34) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 35) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 36) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                           |                                                                                                                                              |
| 37) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision    | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 38) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 39) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 40) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                           |                                                                                                                                              |
| 41) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision    | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 42) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| 43) Domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes)                  | at the meso and macro levels.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 44) Proximity of interdisciplinary organisations.                           |                                                                                                                                              |
| 45) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Partnerships and common vision    | among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations.                                               |
| 46) Intrinsic value of leadership - The strategic role of the local leader | in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                                                                                                                                                 |
| in building teamwork and communities’ capacities.                         |                                                                                                                                              |
| John Deffenbaugh | 2018 | Becoming an integrated (accountable) care system | EMCA RE | British Journal of Healthcare Management | Qualitative Study | DOI: 10.12968/bjhc.2018.4.4.175 |
|-----------------|------|---------------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1) Economic - An agreed allocation of resources and risk sharing system to achieve maximum results across the system. | 2) Organisational Culture - Common priorities: move from what’s in it for their organisation mindset to how they can help other organisations be successful. | 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Overarching strategy. | 4) Organisational Culture - Getting into the shoes of others. | 5) Organisational Culture - Agreed objectives. | 6) Organisational Culture - Common narrative. | 7) Workforce Management - Engaging |
| 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - System leadership is harder than organisational leadership - there are conflicting performance measures. | 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders need to see the larger picture, be more reflective and shift focus from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future. | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders understanding the motivation of partners enabling unconditional commitment, collective ownership - debts, income etc. | 1) Organisational Culture - Stop clashes and set a common goal (no PBR from NHSI conflicting with CCGs from NHSE) - end artificial divides. | 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Long-term perspective needs to be maintained and the stakeholders must be motivated. | 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leadership roles must change to become facilitators of change (no more competition). |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Judith Smith, Gerald Wistow, Holly Holder & Matthew Gaskins | 2019 | Evaluating the design and implementation of the whole systems integrated care programme in North West London: why commissioning proved (again) to be the weakest link. | PubMe d | BMC Health Services Research | Systematic Literature Review | DOI: 10.1186/s12913-019-4013-5. |

1) Organisational Culture - Social and cultural differences including those related to knowledge, organisation and power.

2) Political - The Health and Social Care Act 2012 re-emphasised the role of competition and implicitly encouraged more extensive use of for-profit and third sector providers alongside mainstream NHS-managed services. Yet there has been a parallel emphasis on collaboration and integration so Commissioners have therefore had to explore ways of balancing apparently contradictory pressures: to promote provider competition through contracting and procurement, while simultaneously securing collaborative service delivery through strategic purchasing.

1) Workforce Management - Define specifically what changes to services are intended.

2) Workforce Management - Convene stakeholders to plan for and support implementation continuously.

3) Workforce Management - See outcomes as something for which commissioners and providers are jointly accountable.
| Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care |
| PubMe d | BMC Health Services Research | Report | DOI: 10.1186/s12913-020-4950-z. |

1) Political - Conceptual challenges: lack of clarity on what constitutes integrated care. When drafting and implementing integrated care, there are three fundamental questions that should be considered by every policymaker: (1) how the integration will be organised; (2) what kind of integration is intended; (3) what outcome is intended. Because of the conceptual complexity and ideological choices, it is particularly difficult to determine when and to what degree integration of care is a success.

2) Political - Empirical challenges: when drafting policy on integrated care, policymakers are likely to make use of the available empirical evidence. There are at least three different sources of such evidence. First, policymakers might learn from places where policies on integrated care have already been put into place. Second, policymakers can make use of the available research literature. Third, policymakers can gather their own data. However, each of these sources of evidence can pose substantial challenges. Successfully transferring policy requires not just learning about particular policy (such as by reading

3) Political - Tailor policy to the particular context in which it will be implemented. The successful integration of a given policy in a particular health care context might not be automatically transferrable to another health care context. Policymakers should critically assess the available scientific literature and look at examples of places where comparable policies have been implemented. One cannot simply copy policy from somewhere else and expect it to work. Policymakers should preferably not only learn about what happened in other places, but instead learn from other places.
policy documents), but also learning from particular policies. Policymakers can make use of an increasing amount of existing and published evidence from research, however, how to translate this knowledge into political action is far from evident. Also, while many case studies have been published there may be publication or reporting bias, whereby successful networks are more likely to be published than unsuccessful ones.

3) Economic - Resource challenges: integrated care is often believed to allow for 'improved efficiency of services, and reduced overall cost', however there is research suggesting that creating integrated care and health care collaborations might actually require a great investment of resources before there is any efficiency pay-off. The resources needed are: (1) expertise, (2) time, and (3) funding.

4) Economic - Be committed to investing the resources needed to genuinely run and evaluate a policy. Research shows how successfully promoting integration may require resources such as time, expertise, and funding. As we have argued, policy-makers who fail to invest the necessary amount of money might afterwards incorrectly conclude that a particular policy implementation does not work.

5) Organisational Culture - Provide the stakeholders with sufficient freedom and autonomy. Research shows that successful integration cannot be fully mandated and requires a willingness from stakeholders and a relationship of trust between them.

6) Political - Consider beforehand how the actual implementation of the policy can be evaluated: Despite there being empirical challenges, a lot can be learned from the example of other countries and the experiences of other policy makers. There is also the option of setting up pilot projects or policy experiments to gather relevant feedback. Finally, policy makers should also consider the installation and use of feedback mechanisms to gain insight into the implementation of policy once it is underway.

Laura G. González-Ortiz, Stefano Calciolar, Viktoria Stein, Nick Goodwin 2018
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1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Local leadership and long-term commitments.

2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders with a clear vision on integrated care.
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1 | Comprehensive framework for implementing integrated care. |   |   |   |   |
| 2 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10 | Organisational Culture - A change of culture is required, at both clinical and management levels, without which may lead to a lack of shared vision and 1) Political - Supportive regulation. 2) Political - Flexible administrative reorganisation. 3) Economic - Funding realignment. |   |   |   |   |
| 11 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14 |   |   |   |   |   |

Mahiben Maruthappu 2016

Enablers and Barriers in Implementing Integrated Care

N/A - Snowball

Health Systems and Reform

Report DOI: 10.1080/23288604.2015.1077301

3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Distributed leadership.

4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Managerial leadership.

5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Visionary leadership.

6) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical leadership.

7) Intrinsic value of leadership - Organisational leadership for providing optimal chronic care.

8) Organisational Culture - Shared vision and values for the purpose of integrated care.

9) Organisational Culture - An integration culture institutionalised through policies and procedures.

10) Organisational Culture - Striving towards an open culture for discussing possible improvements for care partners.

11) Organisational Culture - Linking cultures.

12) Organisational Culture - Trust (on colleagues, caregivers and organisations).

13) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Information sharing.

14) Planned/organised meetings.
| Problems in the long-term sustainability of integration. | 2) Economic - For integrative care to be successful, a long-term plan with adequately protected support and funding must be provided. Financial incentives must be directed toward integrated pathways and designed to redistribute incentives to stakeholders. | 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Without an infrastructure framework, the coordination of care is stifled; for example, robust shared electronic patient record platforms, which can be accessed by all those involved in providing care to the target patient population. | 4) Economic - Identification of target population. | 5) Economic - Adequate financing. | 6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - IT infrastructure. | 7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Leadership coalition. | 8) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Involvement of primary, community and social care. | 9) Workforce Management - Evaluation models. | 10) Organisational Culture - Common values. | 11) Organisational Culture - Changing clinical cultures. | 12) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical Leadership. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Martin Bardsley, Adam Steventon, Judith Smith and Jennifer Dixon 2013 | Evaluating integrated and community-based care | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report | URL: https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/evaluating-integrated-and-community-based-care-how-do-we-know-what-works | 1) Political - Recognising that planning and implementing large-scale service changes takes time e.g. Kaiser Permanente. | 2) Workforce Management - Defining the intervention clearly and what it is meant to achieve and how, and implement it well. | 3) Workforce Management - Being explicit about how desired outcomes will arise, and using interim markers of success. | 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Generalisability and context are important - each area | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Blend designated leadership with distributed leadership. | 2) Workforce Management - Establish feedback loops. | 3) Workforce Management - Engage physicians, patients and families. |
### NHS Future Forum 2011

**Clinical advice and leadership: a report from the NHS Future Forum.**

**HMIC**

**Report URL:** [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213750/dh_127542.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213750/dh_127542.pdf)

1. **Inter-organisational Collaboration**—Integrated information systems need to be developed, commissioned and implemented.

2. **Workforce Management - Data**
   
   About quality and outcomes of care is collected, shared and used in a transparent way to support informed patient choice and continuous improvement.

3. **Organisational Culture**
   
   - A duty to promote research and innovation and the use of research evidence.

4. **Intrinsic value of leadership**
   
   - Substantial multi-professional clinical leadership embedded within it including visible leadership for key groups and conditions, for example children, women, older people, mental health and learning disabilities.

5. **Workforce Management - Continuing professional development.**

6. **Intrinsic value of leadership - All**
| NHS Leadership Academy | 2018 Leadership in Integrated Care Systems (ICSs) | N/A - Snowball | Social Care Institute for Excellence: Future of Care | URL: [https://www.scie.org.uk/integrated-care/leadership/systems#future info](https://www.scie.org.uk/integrated-care/leadership/systems#future info) | 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Leaders in ICSs need to be skilled at: 
   a) identifying and scaling innovation (e.g. from pilots) 
   b) having a strong focus on outcomes and population health 
   c) building strong relationships with other leaders, and often working with them informally to develop joint priorities and plans 
   d) establishing governance structures which drive faster change, often going organisations, particularly new ones, should ensure that appropriate leadership development and support are in place. 
7) Workforce Management - Responsible officers continuing to be in place to support doctors in improving care and ensuring their fitness to practice through revalidation. 
8) Organisational Culture - Strong and visible clinical and professional leadership at all levels, focused on increasing trust and encouraging positive behaviour. | 1) Workforce Management - Strategies and agendas that are imposed by NHS England on local areas rather than being clinically-led and driven by local need. 
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Lack of coordination and alignment at national level between NHS England and NHS Improvement. 
3) Workforce Management - Complex accountability structures and configurations. 
4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Different performance regimes and 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Stability in senior leadership positions across organisations. 
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Relationships built over the years. 
3) Workforce Management - Involving staff and service users. 
4) Organisational Culture - Having the security to make long-term plans. 
5) Organisational Culture - Trust and delegation of autonomy from the centre: a permissive, not prescriptive, approach and national guidance that provides a broad, enabling framework. | 1) Leadership Style - Leadership programmes and professional development opportunities. 
2) Organisational Culture - Peer support including mechanisms for 'buddying up'. 
3) Workforce Management - Local champions who will push and progress the work, and 'win hearts and minds'. 
4) Workforce Management - Skilled external facilitation, to help deliver complex programmes. 
5) Organisational Culture - The creation of 'safe spaces' for leaders to meet with peers and share problems and solutions. |
where the commitment and energy is strongest
e) setting the overall outcomes and expectations on behaviours, but handing day-to-day decision-making to others
f) supporting the development of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs)
g) designing and facilitating whole-systems events and workshops to build consensus and deliver change
h) understanding and leading cultural change
i) building system-wide learning and evaluation frameworks
j) fostering a learning culture across the whole system.
cultures, including between the NHS and local authorities.
5) Political - Lack of a coherent view of whole population needs.
6) Political - Sheer volume of bureaucracy involved in getting service changes through.
7) Workforce Management - Insufficient development, support and peer support for leaders.
8) Intrinsic value of leadership - Capacity and capability of local leaders, pressure and stress in these roles, uncertainty about the future.
9) Intrinsic value of leadership - People in leadership roles finding the job lonely and feeling isolated.
10) Organisational Culture - A culture of blame towards leaders.
11) Intrinsic value of leadership - High turnover of the leadership workforce, resulting in loss of experience and skills.
12) Intrinsic value of leadership - Confusion about where the decision-making power lies.
13) Intrinsic value of leadership - Clinical leadership especially
6) Workforce Management - Clarity about how performance will be judged.
7) Workforce Management - Clarity about how accountability will work, and responsibilities of individual organisations.
8) Workforce Management - More opportunities to learn from other professions and sectors.
7) Workforce Management - Systems leadership development for middle managers across the system.
8) Workforce Management - Masterclasses on: co-production theory and practice, finance and risk-sharing, scaling innovation, understanding local government and social care, large-scale and large-group facilitation, working and influencing across multiple layers of governance.
| Nick Goodwin and Judith Smith | 2011 | The Evidence Base for Integrated Care | N/A - Snowball | The King's Fund and the Nuffield Trust: Developing a National Strategy for the Promotion of Integrated Care | Challenge by bureaucratic constraints.
14) Organisational Culture - Performance management and assurance processes that are not aligned to learning and self-reflection.
15) Organisational Culture - A sense that the goalposts keep moving with priorities, funding and expectations changing. |

| Nick Goodwin, Judith Smith, Alisha Davies, Claire Perry, Rebecca Rosen, Anna Dixon, Jennifer | 2012 | Integrated care for patients and populations: Improving outcomes by working together | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report URL: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/integrated-care-patient-and-populations-improving-outcomes-working
1) Organisational Culture - NHS management is permission based and has a risk averse approach where innovation is needed.
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Divide between primary/secondary, health/social care: different contracts, employment, free/means tested.
3) Workforce Management - Approaches that measure experiences of patients, service users and carers in relation to integrated care.
4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Setting a clear, ambitious and measurable goal to improve the experience of patients and service users, implement change at scale and pace. |
| Dixon, Chris Ham | 3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Absence of robust electronic sharing record. 4) Economic - Weak commissioning payment based on episodic care at hospital, PBR incentivises more activity in hospitals, mitigating against other providers, competition within the market and choice and regulation focuses on organisation performance not collective system leading to single outcomes framework. |
| --- | --- |
| | 4) Workforce Management - Need for GPs to adapt to provide services at a larger scale. 5) Economic - New payment incentives and local currencies. 6) Economic - Commission services based on outcomes rather than items of delivery. |
| RH Humphries | 1) Organisational Culture - In contrast to the 'Pioneer' programme which has encouraged locally driven, bottom-up innovation, NHS England has adopted a much more prescriptive and top-down approach to the delivery of the Better Care Fund which is driven by an imperative to reduce emergency hospital admissions. 2) Economic - The personal commissioning programme is an entirely different approach again which rests on the ability of individuals rather than organisations to integrate their own care. It remains to be seen how the inevitable tensions between these very different policy levers and |
| 2015 | 1) Economic - A new settlement that brings together all health and care funding into a single, ring fenced budget and overseen by a single local commissioner. |
| Implementation styles will play out. |
|-------------------------------------|
| 1) Workforce Management - Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods. |
| 2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of performance management role (indirect influence). |
| 3) Economic - Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned. |
| 4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems. |
| 5) Political - Inconsistencies in national policy. |
| 6) Intrinsic value of leadership - Variable progress in different localities dependent on local leadership. |
| 1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Active medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice. |
| 2) Workforce Management - Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients. |
| 3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record. |
| 4) Organisational Culture - High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders. |
| 5) Economic - When transfer of work between organisations does not cause issues with payments. |
| 6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Planned increase in provider competition. |
| 7) Organisational Culture - Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care. |
| 8) Workforce Management - Staff commitment and belief that integration is doing the right thing. |
| 9) Workforce Management - Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. |
| 1) Organisational Culture - Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs. |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10) Intrinsic value of leadership | Skilled leaders with ability to win hearts and minds of frontline staff. |
| 11) Organisational Culture | Taking an incremental approach on progress. |
| 12) Inter-organisational Collaboration | Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support. |

### Richard Gleave 2009

**Across the pond - Lessons from the US on Integrated Healthcare**

URL: [https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/across-the-pond-lessons-from-the-us-on-integrated-healthcare](https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/across-the-pond-lessons-from-the-us-on-integrated-healthcare)

### Sara Shaw, Rebecca Rosen and Benedict Rumbold 2011

**What is integrated care?**

URL: [https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/what-is-integrated-care](https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2017-01/what-is-integrated-care)

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care.

2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Risk needs to be shared in Inter-organisational Collaboration rather than assigned individually.
| Sara Shaw, Ros Levenson | 2011 | Towards integrated care in Trafford | Nuffield Trust | Nuffield Trust | Report URL | 1) Organisational Culture - Recognise that major change is needed, ensure a clear and agreed vision from GPs to specialists.  
2) Economic - Work simultaneously with commissioners and service providers so that quality and budgeting is fulfilled.  
3) Workforce Management - Make a clear case for change  
4) Workforce Management - Engage with stakeholders when developing integrated systems. |
|------------------------|------|------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Organisational Culture - Recognise that major change is needed, ensure a clear and agreed vision from GPs to specialists. |
| 2) Economic - Work simultaneously with commissioners and service providers so that quality and budgeting is fulfilled. |
| 3) Workforce Management - Make a clear case for change |
| 4) Workforce Management - Engage with stakeholders when developing integrated systems |

2) Workforce Management - Standardised, validated tools and indicators that measure integration across different settings relative to a set of models, structures and processes.

3) Workforce Management - Improvement through audit of medical records, analysis of register data on hospitalisation rates, self assessment for managers, annual surveys, questionnaires for clinical leaders, qualitative interviews with executives, leaders, staff and managers.

quality care for local communities and user groups and consider the contextual factors that affect development and delivery.
5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Facilitate local leadership that has good knowledge of the workings of the local systems.

1) Economic - Size/structural factors were key to integration success: the area was sufficiently small (n=36,251) to allow triage, assessment and referral in one multi-disciplinary team (MDT), whereas in the largest locality had 72,692 registered residents so the single MDT initially had much more caseloads which became unmanageable.

2) Organisational Culture - The small size allowed relationships to develop over time; indeed, there is a history of collaboration there (e.g. between GPs and community hospital teams and between health and social care).

3) Intrinsic value of leadership - A strong role of shared, bottom-up leadership. Frontline clinicians in the Coastal Locality were notable for having trusting and friendly relationships between team leads (Physio, Nurses and Matrons, Social Care).

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - The integrated system appointed GPs as locality clinical directors, which was a key factor as they helped link the GP community directly into the ICO, thereby overcoming barriers between the acute and primary sectors.

5) Organisational Culture - There was a commitment to learning by leaders. The Coastal leads
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insisted on collecting their own performance data despite being asked to discontinue doing so and devised their own performance management system (measuring performance). Priority to measure performance; there was a willingness in Coastal to genuinely question the process and outcomes of integrated care.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration- The partnering and the organisation of inter-professional teamwork and joint care planning as critical determinants of success, especially informal partnership which relies on trusting relationships at all levels. A balance of top-down and bottom-up committees and system-wide steering functions facilitated the emergence over time of trusting relationships and iteratively evolving teams at locality level. This in turn allowed for better service delivery.
commitment to, the vision of the venture across the organizations involved.

3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - It is important for integrated services to work together across agency boundaries; this has been facilitated by the removal of structural constraints through the Health Act 1999, which permitting pooled budgets and integrated provision.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Integrated teams must be able to exchange knowledge easily between agencies; effective shared information technology (IT) systems are key to the success of integrated working.

5) Organisational Culture - Need for the development of a shared culture.

6) Workforce Management - Establishment of new roles to support new ways of working

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Exhibiting a past history of joint working.

8) Political - Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms of collaborative working led to unrealistic expectations being placed on staff.

3) Workforce Management - A lack of clarity of purpose for integration, and a failure to agree partnership outcomes.

4) Workforce Management - The lack of understanding and clarity of others' roles, leading to conflict between team managers.

5) Workforce Management - Imbalance of power and poor communication.

6) Workforce Management - Short-term contract working, lack of clear career structure, and limited opportunities for promotion (unless they left the service) created a dilemma: a trade-off between present job satisfaction and future career progression for staff in integrated care teams.

7) Economic - Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available.
and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas.

9) Organisational Culture - The promotion of professional values of service to users and socialisation into the immediate work group.

Stephanie Best 2016 Facilitating integrated delivery of services across organisational boundaries: Essential enablers to integration HMIC British Journal of Occupational Therapy Qualitative Study DOI: 10.1177/03080281668019

1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Horizontal communication.

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Lack of support.

2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Overestimated expectations.

3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Autocratic leadership style

1) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Communication: Intra- and Inter-professional; staff kept informed; spontaneously shared knowledge across organisations; top-down communication is acknowledged with the need to set a vision and strategic direction identified within leadership; bottom-up communication is seen as essential to actively supporting new ways of working and to sharing a common understanding of operational circumstances.

2) Intrinsic value of leadership - Setting direction, setting the vision.

3) Intrinsic value of leadership - Accessibility through visibility both within and across organisations.

4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Joint decision-making.

5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Authority to influence across organisations.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Joint training offers an opportunity to build
relationships with colleagues across organisations and recognise each other’s areas of expertise. Overall, participants expressed a wish to see improved working relationships, as this has the potential to lead to ‘fluidity in thinking’ when managing difficult or complex situations.

1) Intrinsic value of leadership - Management and leadership support was identified as an enabler in four of the seven studies, with Coupe (2013) suggesting that leadership support was essential for the successful implementation of integrated health and social care teams.

2) Workforce Management - Change management can be complex, and Thomas et al (2006) suggest that changes are more likely to be adopted when the change meets an identified need. Ling et al (2012: 4) support this belief, as they reported that ‘where staff felt that change was being forced upon them then they were less likely to support the new activity.

3) Organisational Culture - Ling et al (2012) further reported that pilot sites were more successful when there was evidence of a shared vision, along with a commitment from management in relation to longevity of the change.

4) Intrinsic value of leadership - Thistlethwaite (2011) partially attributed the success in Torbay to the stable leadership within Torbay and the ongoing
managerial support to deliver on the integration project.

5) Economic - Resources and capacity have been identified as a key enabler in five out of the seven studies. Coupe (2013) attributed the main cause of under-performance of the integrated health and social care teams to a lack of investment in the teams, which is required to embed the change into practice. Ling et al (2012) also reported that the lack of resources in the integrated health and social care teams resulted in an increased workload, which had an adverse effect on staff motivation.

6) Political - National policy was considered an enabler in four of the studies. Coupe (2013) identified that the NHS payment systems, such as payment by results and block contracts, do not incentivise the delivery of care in the community, and thus pose a barrier to integrated health and social care teams.

7) Economic - Sheaff et al (2009) also referred to the NHS financial system, suggesting that paying hospitals for each case treated was an actual incentive to increase admissions, which completely conflicts with the aims of integrated health and social care teams.

8) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Shared information technology (IT) systems were identified as an enabler in two studies. This may pose a concern for a number of organisations.
| Tom Ling, Laura Brereton, Annalijn Conklin | 2012 | Barriers and facilitators to integrating care: experiences from the English Integrated Care Pilots | HMIC Internatio-nal Journal of Integrate-d Care | Qualitati-ve Study | DOI: 10.5334/ijic.98 | 1) Workforce Management - Size and complexity: multiple components in integration reported greater challenges of managing change, and they were often greater and longer to implement than they had anticipated. Difficult to communicate the details to all parties and identify the role of each participant group. 
2) Workforce Management - Staff demotivated when an absence of clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. Where staff felt the change was being forced upon them, they were less likely to support the new activity. 
3) Workforce Management - Lack of training led to staff being unclear whether | Considering data sharing owing to issues with information governance and maintaining patient confidentiality.

1) Workforce Management - Size and complexity: simple, smaller integration made more rapid progress and had the ability and authority to come to quick decisions. 
2) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Compatible IT systems and good management of the sharing of private data. 
3) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Good existing relationships between individuals and/or organisations with clear communication about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work. 
4) Organisational Culture - Widespread agreement and shared values among participating staff promoted engagement and motivation. 
5) Intrinsic value of leadership - Success when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be strongly committed to implementing lasting change. 
6) Inter-organisational Collaboration - Ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner
they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling unprepared to take on new roles.

4) Inter-organisational Collaboration: Different IT systems in partner organisations caused difficulties in data-sharing and communicating, especially across health and social care teams. On occasions, these difficulties were not caused by the IT itself but by how their introduction was managed, such as failure to address privacy concerns where organisations were reluctant to share patient data.

5) Collaboration Between Organisations: Absence of relationships between individuals and/or organisations. Poor communication and disagreement about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work.

6) Inter-organisational Collaboration: Lack of ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner organisations.

7) Inter-organisational Collaboration: Lack of co-location: lack of working together face-to-face in the organisations. 7) Inter-organisational Collaboration: Co-location: working together face-to-face in the same building improved the quality and frequency of communication, and expedited problem-solving by allowing quicker access to colleagues' professional knowledge. 8) Organisational Culture - Feelings of being involved with planning from the beginning. 9) Workforce Management - Staff were motivated when there was clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. 10) Organisational Culture - Willingness to engage. Creating shared beliefs about the benefits of change was described by staff as critical to progress. 11) Intrinsic value of leadership - 'Good' leadership. 12) Workforce Management - Thorough training led to staff being clear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling prepared to take on new roles. The provision of training specific to the service change was important, particularly when the work involved required new or changed roles of participants. 13) Organisational Culture - Supportive, transparent organisational culture: the ability to modify existing systems and practices and to create new ones was especially dependent on organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries. 14) Workforce Management - External
|   |   |   | same building decreased the quality and frequency of communication, and exacerbated problems by reducing access to colleagues’ professional knowledge. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8) | Intrinsic value of leadership - Failure when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be weakly committed to implementing lasting change. |
| 9) | Intrinsic value of leadership - ‘Poor’ leadership blamed for lack of shared beliefs about the benefits of change. |
| 10) | Organisational Culture - Feelings of being sidelined, or uninvolved with planning from the beginning. |
| 11) | Organisational Culture - Reluctance to engage was a major barrier. |
| 12) | Organisational culture - Poor organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries. |
| 13) | Organisational Culture - A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS ‘blame culture’. |
| 14) | Political - Chains of managerial approval among multiple organisations and slow decisions about resource facilitation has been very helpful in getting two organisations to work together, which is a method well rehearsed in the wider literature on managing change. |
| 15) | Organisational Culture - Staff feeling permitted to take risks. |
| 16) | Inter-organisational Collaboration - Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer. |
distribution were perceived as a barrier to innovation.
15) Economic - Staff cuts.
### Appendix C: Synthesis of Results

| Source of Information | Organisational Culture | Workforce Management | Inter-Organisational Culture | Leadership | Economic | Political |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| **Author**           | **Title**              | **Facilitators:**    | **Facilitators:**             | **Facilitators:** | **Facilitators:** | **Facilitators:** |
| Alison Tweed, Andrew Singfield, Julia RA Taulor, Lucy Gilbert, Paul Mount | Creating Allegiance: Leading transformational change within the NHS | 1) Shared Visions (espoused theories) need to be outlined and translated into everyday practice and visions of previous leaders or schemes must be erased. | 1) Connecting through practice: involving frontline staff and all stakeholders in decisions and key pieces of the transformation to integrated care. | 1) Leaders should be non-partisan integrators rather than assign themselves to an organisation - have an allegiance to the system. | 2) Leaders should build high quality relationships involving emotional intelligence and positive role modelling. | |
| **Facilitations:**   | **Recommendations:**   | 1) Connecting is a key theme in managing system or transformational change and occurs through three mediums: relational, with purpose and vision and through practice. | 2) To further research the concept of allegiance creation as it appears under-represented within the literature, particularly as part of the process of transformational change, rather than as an outcome of change or behaviours towards leaders. |

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
| Anna Charles, Lillie Wenzel, Matthew Kershaw, Chris Ham, Nicola Walsh | A Year of Integrated Care Systems: Reviewing the journey so far | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Recommendations: |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) A legacy of competitive behaviours. | 1) Established models of integrated working. | 1) Integrate at different levels of the system, building up from places and neighbourhoods. | 1) Collaborative relationships. | 1) System leadership. |
| 2) Frequently changing language and the lack of a clear narrative. | 2) Partnerships with local authorities. | 2) Draw on the skills and leadership of frontline staff. | 2) Clinical leadership and engagement. | 2) Funding pressures. |
| Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: |
| 1) Shared vision and purpose. | 1) Shared vision and purpose. | 1) Shared vision and purpose. | 1) System leadership. |
| 2) A meaningful local identity. | 2) A meaningful local identity. | 2) A meaningful local identity. | 2) Funding pressures. |

**Barriers:** 1) Leaders face competing demands. 2) Funding pressures. 3) Difficulties in agreeing budgets. 4) Complex governance arrangements. 5) Lack of understanding of what the drivers and essential requirements are for successful integration between...

**Facilitators:** 1) Collaborative relationships. 2) Clinical leadership and engagement. 3) Stability of local finances and performance. 4) Funding to support transformation. 5) A permissive and supportive national programme.
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4) Scepticism about NHS initiatives that had previously been seen to ‘come and go’.
5) Previous initiatives did not live up to expectations leading to demoralisation.
6) Promoting a ‘play-it-safe’ work culture can be detrimental to ‘barrier busting’.

Facilitators:
1) Trust and shared values that are largely developed locally.
2) Freedom to try things out, not having a ‘culture of blame’ if things go wrong, and piloting new initiatives and sharing the learning before roll-out. Reassuring staff so they ‘feel safe’ in the face of change.

Facilitators:
1) Experienced staff.
2) Staff involvement in developing integration initiatives and encouraging their ‘ownership’ of new service models.
3) Local champions.
4) Collecting the right information/indicators so that impact/success can be measured and visible to staff, patients/service users and the local population.

Facilitators:
1) Being part of a national Pioneer programme, which provided an impetus for local professionals to work together to improve care locally.
2) Building and maintaining good working relationships across organisations and professions at all levels built on trust, so that people could speak larger one.

Facilitators:
1) Uncommitted funding.
frankly, come to understand each other's perspectives, and develop a shared vision and understanding of what the Pioneer was aiming to achieve.

3) Integrated information system between organisations to enable sharing of patient/service user records or having suitable facilities for cross-agency and/or multi-disciplinary teams.

4) Co-location of operational teams facilitated communication and partnership working between different professionals.

Facilitators:
1) Positive and trusting relationships.
2) A culture of innovation, creativity and empowerment and not micro-management based on old fashioned contractual approaches.

Facilitators:
1) System leaders who work together to support frontline practitioners to overcome bureaucratic barriers.

Facilitators:
1) Co-operative Council with an understanding of communities which helps to target resources and further develop interventions.

Facilitators:
1) Managerial leadership in combination with clinician leadership.

Barriers:
1) Needs assessment and service specification is time, effort and resource consuming.
### Facilitators:

1. Using PMS and APMS contracts to facilitate payments.

### Barriers:

#### 1) All participants perceived the current interprofessional culture as a barrier to service integration, since many sensed a lack of mutual respect between social and primary care staff. There is often a siloed working mentality with different teams having different agendas for the patient and a lack of motivation for collaborative decision-making.

#### 2) Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision.

#### 3) Inadequate training of staff.

#### 1) Lack of awareness of roles and services: uncertainty about which roles are carried out by which social service provider and how best to contact these individuals.

#### 2) Overworked staff: local pressures have led to an increase in workload and time constraints reduce the motivation to collaborate with other sectors to develop new methods of service provision.

#### 3) Inadequate training of staff.

#### 1) Often numbers in practice diaries and on websites are out of date, so staff have to ask the patient directly what social care they receive and how to contact relevant departments, slowing down both communication and any attempts at collaborative working.

#### 2) Communication between primary care and social care is logistically challenging, as doctors are busy with patients during the day and social care staff are working in the community, making joint conversations about patients nearly impossible.

#### 3) Lack of regular contact: most GPs and PMs explained regular contact with social care teams is necessary for effective information transfer and a multidisciplinary approach to patient care. However, currently, contact is through forms and emails with minimal face-to-face contact.

#### 1) Low staffing levels.

#### 2) Insufficient funding.
| DOH | The Evidence Base for Integrated Care | Recommendations: 1) A culture of quality improvement. 2) A history of trust between partner organisations. 3) Personnel who are open to collaboration and innovation. 4) Awareness of local cultural differences: organisational cultures evolve separately over decades. | Recommendations: 1) The objectives of integration need to be made explicit. 2) Begin integration at the frontline, which impacts directly on the patient experience; based on this, the most apt organisational support for service provision might be identified. 3) The right incentives: it is important that frontline staff recognise and buy into the integration process. | Recommendations: 1) Effective and complementary communications and IT systems. | Recommendations: 1) Local leaders who are supportive of integration. | Recommendations: 1) Be patient: the time required to implement effective integration is a recurrent theme and is unsurprising given the changes required. It takes time to effect demonstrable changes in organisational structures and processes; and to have these filter down to outcomes. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E Paice, S Hasan | Educating for integrated care | Needs: 1) The need to develop a culture in which people are comfortable and competent in working across organisational boundaries to serve | Needs: 1) Financial incentives do not encourage collaboration. 2) Lack of shared data. | Needs: 1) Staff working within integrated care must have (or develop) emotional intelligence and empathy in dealing with patients and users, be willing to work in teams with shared accountability, and be | | |
| Elena Urizar, Roberto Nuño, Caridad Alvarez, Fernández Concepción, Carles Blay, Andrea Quiroga | Barriers: Prepared to take on a leadership role in improving the system of care. |
|---|---|
| Facilitators: 1) Lack of shared accountability. |
| Barriers: 1) At the macro level there is a general lack of strategic vision towards integrated care from a systems perspective. |
| Facilitators: 1) Strategic alignment. |
| Barriers: 1) At meso level, the historical fragmentation of organizations poses a strong challenge towards care coordination. |
| Facilitators: 1) Better information systems. |
| Barriers: 1) At the micro level a lack of clinical leadership and buy-in hinders the needed multidisciplinary and collaborative work. |
| Facilitators: 1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning. |
| Barriers: 1) Co-design, inclusivity (especially of lay partners), an openness to learning. |
| Facilitators: 1) Balance between: collective leadership and local autonomy; integrated commissioning and integrated provision; NHS leadership and local authority engagement; local variation and programme-wide consistency; investment in design and support for ongoing implementation and |
| Barriers: 1) Systems leadership. NHS leaders have relatively little training or experience in managing systems as opposed to organisations. |
| Facilitators: 1) Developing payment and accountability systems aligned with integrated care objectives. |

Gerald Wistow, Matt Gaskins, Holly Holder, Judith Smith

Barriers and facilitators for the implementation of Integrated Care Pathways ICPs: a systemic perspective
| Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1) Governance by hierarchy (ownership) or a mode that is close to a hierarchy (through long-term contractual relationships). | 1) Full integration compared with arrangements of different autonomous insurers and providers reduces costs of information, negotiation, contracting, control, and adaptation and is hence more efficient. | 1) Finance by capitation. Payment per member for coverage for all care provided by the IHCDS (typically in an annual contract with monthly payments), as the principal reimbursement method acts as a powerful pricing strategy that generates substantial savings through internal incentives for preventive care. | 2) A commitment to cost control and high-quality care. |
| 2) Good management and information systems. In a well-organized IHCDS, tight management controls its bureaucratic costs (which can otherwise result in hierarchy failure), sophisticated data management enables it to react quickly to developments in health care and markets, and standardisation in care management. | | | |

Why hasn’t integrated health care developed widely in the United States and not at all in England? Gwyn Bevan, Katharina Janus
### Barriers and facilitators in the integration of oral health into primary care: a scoping review

| Barriers: | Facilitators: |
|-----------|---------------|
| 1) Disciplined-oriented education and lack of competencies. | 1) Interprofessional education. |
| 2) Three subthemes: perceived responsibility and role identification, case management [including choice and flexibility in service delivery at multiple levels (administrative and/or clinical)] and incremental approach (gradual modification in the workflow based on staff experience and preference). | **Facilitators:**
| 1) Geographical proximity of interdisciplinary organisations. |
| 1) The lack of continuity of care and services: unstructured mechanism for care coordination at the micro level and lack of practice guidelines and types of practice at the meso level. Discontinuity in the integrated care process associated with poor referral systems, deficient interface and poor connection between public health section, primary care and academic institutions. | 1) Partnerships and common vision among governments, communities, academia, various stakeholders and non-profit organisations. |

### Barriers: 1) Lack of continuity of care and services, human resources issues (workload of personnel, staff turnover, time constraints and scarcity of various trained human resources such as care coordinators, public health workforce and allied professionals) and deficient administrative infrastructure (the absence of health records, cross-domain interoperability and domain-specific act codes) at the meso and macro levels.

### Facilitators: 1) Supportive policies and resource allocation: financial support from governments, stakeholders and non-profit organisations at the macro level.

### Needs: 1) Basic Structures and Design: Physical Structures, Human and Material

### Needs: 1) Processes: Partnering, Teamwork, Delivering Care, and Improving

### Needs: 1) Leadership and Strategy: Leadership Approach, Clinician Engagement and
| Baker, Walter P. Wodchis | Integrating Care: A Framework for Improvement | Organisational Culture, and Work Environment. | Resources, Organizational Design, Governance, Accountability, and Information Technology. | Quality. | Leadership, Strategic Focus on Improvement, and Performance Measurement. |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| John Deffenbaugh         | Becoming an integrated (accountable) care system | Needs: 1) Common priorities: move from what's in it for their organisation mindset to how they can help other organisations be successful. 2) Getting into the shoes of others. 3) Agreed objectives. 4) Common narrative. | Needs: 1) Engaging citizens and communities. | Needs: 1) Overarching strategy. 2) Leaders who get along. | Needs: 1) An agreed allocation of resources and risk sharing system to achieve maximum results across the system. |

**Barriers:**
1) System leadership is harder than organisational leadership - there are conflicting performance measures. 2) Leaders need to see the larger picture, be more reflective and shift focus from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future.

**Facilitators:**
1) Leaders understand the motivation of partners enabling unconditional commitment, collective ownership - debts, income etc.

**Recommendations:**
1) Long-term perspective needs to be maintained and the stakeholders must be motivated.

**Needs:**
1) Engaging citizens and communities.
| Barriers:                                                                 | Recommendations:                                                                 | Barriers:                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Social and cultural differences including those related to knowledge, organisation and power. | 1) Define specifically what changes to services are intended.                   | 1) The Health and Social Care Act 2012 re-emphasised the role of competition and implicitly encouraged more extensive use of for-profit and third sector providers alongside mainstream NHS-managed services. Yet there has been a parallel emphasis on collaboration and integration so Commissioners have therefore had to explore ways of balancing apparently contradictory pressures: to promote provider competition through contracting and procurement, while simultaneously securing collaborative service delivery through strategic purchasing. |
| 2) Convene stakeholders to plan for and support implementation continuously. | 3) See outcomes as something for which commissioners and providers are jointly accountable. |                                                                                                                                                           |
Challenges in turning a great idea into great health policy: the case of integrated care

**Recommendations:**

1) Provide the stakeholders with sufficient freedom and autonomy. Research shows that successful integration cannot be fully mandated and requires a willingness from stakeholders and a relationship of trust between them.

**Barriers:**

1) Resource challenges: integrated care is often believed to allow for ‘improved efficiency of services, and reduced overall cost’, however there is research suggesting that creating integrated care and health care collaborations might actually require a great investment of resources before there is any efficiency pay-off. The resources needed are: (1) expertise, (2) time, and (3) funding.

**Recommendations:**

1) Be committed to investing the resources needed to genuinely run and evaluate a policy. Research shows how successfully promoting integration may require resources such as time, expertise, and funding. As we have argued, policymakers who fail to invest the necessary amount of money might afterwards incorrectly conclude that a particular policy implementation does not work.

**Barriers:**

1) Conceptual challenges: lack of clarity on what constitutes integrated care. When drafting and implementing integrated care, there are three fundamental questions that should be considered by every policy-maker: (1) how the integration will be organised; (2) what kind of integration is intended; (3) what outcome is intended. Because of the conceptual complexity and ideological choices, it is particularly difficult to determine when and to what degree integration of care is a success.

2) Empirical challenges: when drafting policy on integrated care, policymakers are likely to make use of the available empirical evidence. There are at least three different sources of such evidence. First, policymakers might learn from places where policies on integrated care have already been put into place. Second, policymakers can make use of the available research literature. Third, policymakers can gather their own data. However, each of these sources of evidence can pose substantial challenges. Successfully transferring policy requires not just learning about particular policy (such as by reading policy documents), but also learning from particular policies. Policymakers can make use of an increasing amount of existing and published evidence from research, however, how to translate this knowledge into political action is far from evident.

**Recommendations:**

1) Reflect on the type and level of integration you want to promote. As we have argued, integrated care is a broad
concept that encompasses various sorts of integration and collaboration. It is necessary as a policy-maker to be aware of the level of integration that you want to achieve, as, without proper prior thought, it will be impossible to determine the success of the policy afterwards.

2) Reflect beforehand on what you hope to achieve with integrated care. We have argued throughout that integrated care should be seen as a means to a number of possible ends (e.g., economic efficiency or increased quality of care). Knowing what one hopes to achieve by promoting integrated care is crucial to being able to later evaluate the success or failure of the policy. This also allows policy-makers to install a mechanism for evaluation, allowing the health policy to be re-evaluated after a period.

3) Tailor policy to the particular context in which it will be implemented. The successful integration of a given policy in a particular health care context might not be automatically transferrable to another health care context. Policy-makers should critically assess the available scientific literature and look at examples of places where comparable policies have been implemented. One cannot simply copy policy from somewhere else and expect it to work. Policy-makers should preferably not only learn about what happened in other places, but instead learn from other places.

4) Consider beforehand how the actual implementation of the policy can be evaluated: Despite there being empirical challenges, a lot can be learned from the example of other countries and the experiences of other
There is also the option of setting up pilot projects or policy experiments to gather relevant feedback. Finally, policy makers should also consider the installation and use of feedback mechanisms to gain insight into the implementation of policy once it is underway.

| Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: | Facilitators: |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1) Shared vision and values for the purpose of integrated care. | 1) Planned/organised meetings. | 1) Information sharing | 1) Local leadership and long-term commitments. |
| 2) An integration culture institutionalised through policies and procedures. | | | 2) Leaders with a clear vision on integrated care. |
| 3) Striving towards an open culture for discussing possible improvements for care partners. | | | 3) Distributed leadership. |
| | | | 4) Managerial leadership. |
| | | | 5) Visionary leadership. |
| | | | 6) Clinical leadership. |
| | | | 7) Organisational leadership for providing optimal chronic care. |
| Mahiben Maruthappu | Facilitators: 1) Common values. 2) Changing clinical cultures. | Barriers: 1) A change of culture is required, at both clinical and management levels, without which may lead to a lack of shared vision and problems in the long-term sustainability of integration. | Facilitators: 1) Evaluation models. | Barriers: 1) Without an infrastructure framework, the coordination of care is stifled; for example, robust shared electronic patient record platforms, which can be accessed by all those involved in providing care to the target patient population. | Facilitators: 1) IT infrastructure. 2) Leadership coalition. 3) Involvement of primary, community and social care. | Facilitators: 1) Clinical leadership. | Barriers: 1) For integrative care to be successful, a long-term plan with adequately protected support and funding must be provided. Financial incentives must be directed toward integrated pathways and designed to redistribute incentives to stakeholders. | Facilitators: 1) Supportive regulation. 2) Flexible administrative reorganisation. |

| Martin Bardsley, Adam Steventon, Judith Smith and Jennifer Dixon | Facilitators: 1) Defining the intervention clearly and what it is meant to achieve and how, and implement it well. 2) Being explicit about how desired outcomes will arise, and use interim markers of success. | Evaluating integrated and community-based care | Facilitators: 1) Generalisability and context are important - each area will have specific success factors but the aim must be the same. | Facilitators: Recommendations: 1) Blend designated leadership with distributed leadership. | 1) Recognising that planning and implementing large-scale service changes takes time e.g. Kaiser Permanente. | 1) Supportive regulation. 2) Flexible administrative reorganisation. | 1) Funding realignment. 2) Identification of target population. 3) Adequate financing. | 1) Recognising that planning and implementing large-scale service changes takes time e.g. Kaiser Permanente. |
| Recommendations: | Needs: | Needs: | Needs: |
|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1) Establish feedback loops. 2) Engage physicians, patients and families. | 1) A duty to promote research and innovation and the use of research evidence. 2) Strong and visible clinical and professional leadership at all levels, focused on increasing trust and encouraging positive behaviour. | 1) Data about quality and outcomes of care is collected, shared and used in a transparent way to support informed patient choice and continuous improvement. 2) Continuing professional development. 3) Responsible officers continue to be in place to support doctors in improving care and ensuring their fitness to practice through revalidation. | 1) Substantial multi-professional clinical leadership embedded within it including visible leadership for key groups and conditions, for example children, women, older people, mental health and learning disabilities. 2) All organisations, particularly new ones, should ensure that appropriate leadership development and support are in place. |

NHS Future Forum  | Clinical advice and leadership: a report from the NHS Future Forum.
### Barriers:

1. Performance management and assurance processes that are not aligned to learning and self-reflection.
2. A sense that the goalposts keep moving with priorities, funding and expectations changing.
3. A culture of blame towards leaders.

### Facilitators:

1. Having the security to make long-term plans.
2. Trust and delegation of autonomy from the centre: a permissive, not prescriptive, approach and national guidance that provides a broad, enabling framework.

### Recommendations:

1. Peer support including mechanisms for ‘buddying up’.
2. The creation of...
'safe spaces' for leaders to meet with peers and share problems and solutions.  
3) More opportunities to learn from other professions and sectors.  
facilitation, to help deliver complex programmes.  
3) Systems leadership development for middle managers across the system.  
4) Masterclasses on: co-production theory and practice, finance and risk-sharing, scaling innovation, understanding local government and social care, large-scale and large-group facilitation, working and influencing across multiple layers of governance.  
frameworks.  
j) fostering a learning culture across the whole system.  

Barriers:  
1) Capacity and capability of local leaders, pressure and stress in these roles, uncertainty about the future.  
2) People in leadership roles finding the job lonely and feeling isolated.  
3) High turnover of the leadership workforce, resulting in loss of experience and skills.  
4) Confusion about where the decision-making power lies.  
5) Clinical leadership is especially challenged by bureaucratic constraints.  

Facilitators:  
1) Stability in senior leadership positions across organisations.  

Recommendations:  
1) Leadership programmes and professional development opportunities.
| Integrated health and social care in England – Progress and prospects | Barriers: | Facilitators: |
|---|---|---|
|  | 1) In contrast to the 'Pioneer' programme which has encouraged locally driven, bottom-up innovation, NHS England has adopted a much more prescriptive and top-down approach to the delivery of the Better Care Fund which is driven by an imperative to reduce emergency hospital admissions. | 1) Creating powerful narrative at national and local level. |
|  | Barriers: |  |
|  | 1) The personal commissioning programme is an entirely different approach again which rests on the ability of individuals rather than organisations to integrate their own care. It remains to be seen how the inevitable tensions between these very different policy levers and implementation styles will play out. | Barriers: |
|  | Recommendations: | 1) A new settlement that brings together all health |

Barriers:
1) NHS management is permission based and has a risk averse approach where innovation is needed.
2) Approaches that measure experiences of patients, service users and carers in relation to integrated care.
3) Need for GPs to adapt to provide services at a larger scale

Facilitators:
1) Clear articulation of benefits to patients, service users and carers.
2) Approaches that measure experiences of patients, service users and carers in relation to integrated care.
3) Need for GPs to adapt to provide services at a larger scale
| Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: | Facilitators: | Barriers: |
|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| 1) Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care. | 1) Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods. | 1) Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients. | 1) Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems. | 1) Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support. | 1) Lack of performance management role (indirect influence). | 1) Active Medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice. | 1) Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned. | 1) Risk needs to be shared in collaboration between organisations rather than assigned individually. | 1) Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, and must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care. |
| 2) Taking an incremental approach on progress. | 2) Staff commitment and belief that integration is doing the right thing. | 2) Staff commitment and belief that integration is doing the right thing. | 2) Variable progress in different localities is dependent on local leadership. | 2) Planned increase in provider competition. | 2) Variable progress in different localities is dependent on local leadership. | 2) Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record. | 2) Inconsistencies in national policy. | 3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 3) Skilled leaders with the ability to win the hearts and minds of frontline staff. |
| 3) High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders. | 3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems. | 1) Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs. | 1) Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs. |
| Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: |
| 1) Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs. | 1) Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care. | 1) Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients. | 1) Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support. | 1) Risk needs to be shared in collaboration between organisations rather than assigned individually. | 1) Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, and must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care. | 1) Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, and must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care. | 1) Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, and must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care. | 1) Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care. | 1) Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care. |

Rebecca Rosen, James Mountford, Geraint Lewis, Richard Lewis, Jenny Shand and Sara Shaw

Facilitators:
1) Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care.
2) Taking an incremental approach on progress.
3) High level of trust between GPs, specialists, nurses and other stakeholders.

Recommendations:
1) Patient-centred culture: focus integrated care on patient needs.

Barriers:
1) Slow uptake by some physicians due to reluctance to adapt to new methods.

Facilitators:
1) Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients.
2) Staff commitment and belief that integration is doing the right thing.

Recommendations:
1) Joint vision shared by senior officers in health and social care.

Barriers:
1) Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems.

Facilitators:
1) Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support.
2) Planned increase in provider competition.

Barriers:
1) Lack of performance management role (indirect influence).
2) Variable progress in different localities is dependent on local leadership.

Facilitators:
1) Active Medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice.
2) Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record.
3) Skilled leaders with the ability to win the hearts and minds of frontline staff.

Barriers:
1) Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned.

Facilitators:
1) When transfer of work between organisations does not cause issues with payments.

Barriers:
1) Inconsistencies in national policy.

Facilitators:
1) Multi-professional teams supporting care coordination and review of high risk patients.
2) Staff commitment and belief that integration is doing the right thing.
3) Joint training and development across organisations involved in integrated systems.

Barriers:
1) Single condition services risk silos for chronic conditions, fragmenting care for those with multiple chronic complex problems.

Facilitators:
1) Involvement of all relevant health care providers to create broad support.
2) Planned increase in provider competition.

Recommendations:
1) Integrated governance models must be built on strong clinical leadership, and must be combined with a culture that prompts delivery of integrated care.

Barriers:
1) Lack of performance management role (indirect influence).
2) Variable progress in different localities is dependent on local leadership.

Facilitators:
1) Active Medical leadership in charge of developing care standards and resources and raising awareness about expected standards of practice.
2) Respected medical leaders and high trust in leadership based on track record.
3) Skilled leaders with the ability to win the hearts and minds of frontline staff.

Barriers:
1) Limited benefit to individuals in the organisations until payment contracts have been redesigned.

Facilitators:
1) When transfer of work between organisations does not cause issues with payments.

Barriers:
1) Inconsistencies in national policy.
**What is integrated care?**

**Needs:**
1) Standardised, validated tools and indicators that measure integration across different settings relative to a set of models, structures and processes.
2) Improvement through audit of medical records, analysis of register data on hospitalisation rates, self-assessment for managers, annual surveys, questionnaires for clinical leaders, qualitative interviews with executives, leaders, staff and managers.
3) Longitudinal methods that move beyond simple snapshots of integrated care and follow integrative processes through time, allowing evaluators to assess not only the long-term implications for integrated delivery, organisation and outcomes, but also the way in which planned change is actually experienced for those with long-   

**Needs:**
1) Situate performance measures within wider health and care systems: acknowledge the level and combination of strategies used based on the challenges faced in obtaining appropriate quality care for local communities and user groups and consider the contextual factors that affect development and delivery.
2) Qualitative and mixed methods approaches (such as comparative case study research and/or realistic evaluation) that facilitate understanding of which integrative processes work, for whom, and in what circumstances.
| Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: | Recommendations: |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1) Recognise that major change is needed, ensure a clear and agreed vision from GPs to specialists | 1) Make a clear case for change | 1) Facilitate local leadership that has good knowledge of the workings of the local systems. | 1) Work simultaneously with commissioners and service providers so that quality and budgeting is fulfilled. |

**Recommendations:**

1) Facilitate local leadership that has good knowledge of the workings of the local systems.

**Facilitators:**

1) The small size allowed relationships to develop over time; indeed, there is a history of collaboration there (e.g. between GPs and community hospital teams and between health and social care).

2) There was a commitment to learning by leaders. The Coastal leads insisted on collecting their own performance data despite being asked to discontinue doing so and devised their own performance management system (measuring performance). Priority to measure

Sheena Asthana, Felix Gradinger, Julian Elston, Susan Martin, Richard Byng

Capturing the Role of Context in Complex System Change: An Application of the Canadian Context and Capabilities for Integrating Care (CCIC) Framework to an Integrated Care Organisation in the UK.

**Facilitators:**

1) A strong role of shared, bottom-up leadership. Frontline clinicians in the Coastal Locality were notable for having trusting and friendly relationships between team leads (Physio, Nurses and Matrons, Social Care).

2) The partnering and the organisation of inter-professional teamwork and joint care planning as critical determinants of success, especially informal partnership which relies on trusting relationships at all levels. A balance of top-down and bottom-up committees and system-wide steering functions facilitated the emergence of the MDT initially on time of trusting relationships and

1) Size/structural factors were key to integration success: the area was sufficiently small (n=36,251) to allow triage, assessment and referral in one multi-disciplinary team (MDT), whereas in the largest locality had 72,692 registered residents so the single MDT initially had much more caseloads which became unmanageable.
performance; there was a willingness in Coastal to genuinely question the process and outcomes of integrated care.

| Sian E. Maslin-Prothero and Amy E. Bennion | Integrated team working: a literature review |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| **Needs:**                               |                                             |
| 1) Need for a shared understanding of the purpose of the joint venture and a mutual understanding of, and commitment to, the vision of the venture across the organizations involved. |
| 2) Need for the development of a shared culture. |
| 3) The promotion of professional values of service to users and socialisation into the immediate work group. |

**Barriers:**
1) The mismatch in cultures, behaviours and understanding of services creates a divide between the disciplines. Organisational boundaries resulted in staff feeling pressured, and the process of collaborative working

| iteratively evolving teams at locality level. This in turn allowed for better service delivery. |
|---------------------------------------------|
| **Needs:**                               |                                             |
| 1) It is important for integrated services to work together across agency boundaries; this has been facilitated by the removal of structural constraints through the Health Act 1999, which permitting pooled budgets and integrated provision. |
| 2) Integrated teams must be able to exchange knowledge easily between agencies; effective shared information technology (IT) systems are key to the success of integrated working. |
| 3) Exhibiting a past history of joint working. |

**Barriers:**
1) Divide between social care staff medical staff: differences in geographical boundaries, communication boundaries, and status inequalities.

| 1) Financial limitations as to what can be addressed with the resources available. |
|---------------------------------------------|
| **Needs:**                               |                                             |
| 1) The need for clear governance arrangements: there is a need for successful management of the tension between structure and culture at a local and national level, and a recognition of the fundamentally different principles of governance. |
| 2) Recognition of grey areas in policy and organizational terms and encouraging local agencies to work together in those areas. |

| 1) The mismatch in cultures, behaviours and understanding of services creates a divide between the disciplines. Organisational boundaries resulted in staff feeling pressured, and the process of collaborative working |
| Stephanie Best | Facilitating integrated delivery of services across organisational boundaries: Essential enablers to integration | Needs: 1) Horizontal communication. |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|               |                                                                                                  | Facilitators: 1) Communication: Intra-and Inter-professional; staff kept informed; spontaneously shared knowledge across organisations; top-down communication is acknowledged with the need to set a vision and strategic direction identified within leadership; bottom-up communication is seen as essential to actively supporting new ways of working and to sharing a common understanding of operational circumstances. 2) Joint training offers an opportunity to build relationships with colleagues across organisations and recognise each other's areas of expertise. Overall, participants expressed a wish to see improved working  |
|               |                                                                                                  | Barriers: 1) Lack of support. 2) Overestimated expectations. 3) Autocratic leadership style  |
|               |                                                                                                  | Facilitators: 1) Setting direction, setting the vision. 2) Accessibility through visibility both within and across organisations. 3) Joint decision-making. 4) Authority to influence across organisations.  |
relationships, as this has the potential to lead to a 'fluidity in thinking' when managing difficult or complex situations.

Facilitators:

1) Ling et al (2012) further reported that pilot sites were more successful when there was evidence of a shared vision, along with a commitment from management in relation to longevity of the change.

2) Change management can be complex, and Thomas et al (2006) suggest that changes are more likely to be adopted when the change meets an identified need. Ling et al (2012: 4) support this belief, as they reported that 'where staff felt that change was being forced upon them then they were less likely to support the new activity.'

3) Shared information technology (IT) systems were identified as an enabler in two studies. This may pose a concern for a number of organisations considering data sharing owing to issues with information governance and maintaining patient confidentiality.

4) Management and leadership support was identified as an enabler in four of the seven studies, with Coupe (2013) suggesting that leadership support was essential for the successful implementation of integrated health and social care teams.

5) Thistlethwaite (2011) partially attributed the success in Torbay to the stable leadership within Torbay and the ongoing managerial support to deliver on the integration project.

6) Sheaff et al (2009) also referred to the NHS financial system, suggesting that paying hospitals for each case treated was an actual incentive to increase admissions, which completely conflicts with the aims of integrated health and social care teams.

7) Resources and capacity have been identified as a key enabler in five out of the seven studies. Coupe (2013) attributed the main cause of under-performance of the integrated health and social care teams to a lack of investment in the teams, which is required to embed the change into practice. Ling et al (2012) also reported that the lack of resources in the integrated health and social care teams resulted in an increased workload, which had an adverse effect on staff motivation.

8) National policy was considered an enabler in four of the studies. Coupe (2013) identified that the NHS payment systems, such as payment by results and block contracts, do not incentivise the delivery of care in the community, and thus pose a barrier to integrated health and social care teams.
| Barriers: | Barriers: | Barriers: | Barriers: |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1) Feelings of being sidelined, or uninvolved with planning from the beginning. | 1) Size and complexity: multiple components in integration reported greater challenges of managing change, and they were often greater and longer to implement than they had anticipated. Difficult to communicate the details to all parties and identify the role of each participant group. | 1) Failure when senior management or team leaders were perceived to be weakly committed to implementing lasting change. | 1) Staff cuts. |
| 2) Reluctance to engage was a major barrier. | 2) Staff demotivated when an absence of clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants. Where staff felt the change was being forced upon them, they were less likely to support the new activity. | 2) ‘Poor’ leadership blamed for lack of shared beliefs about the benefits of change. | 1) Chains of managerial approval among multiple organisations and slow decisions about resource distribution were perceived as a barrier to innovation. |
| 3) Poor organisational culture which included local perceptions of professional boundaries. | 3) Lack of training led to staff being unclear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling unprepared to take on new roles. | 3) ‘Good’ leadership. | |
| 4) A lack of openness which was part of a wider NHS ‘blame culture’. | | | |

**Facilitators:**

- Widespread agreement and shared values among participating staff promoted engagement and motivation.
- Feelings of being involved with planning from the beginning.
- Willingness to engage. Creating shared beliefs about the benefits of change was described by staff as...
1) Size and complexity: simple, smaller integration made more rapid progress and had the ability and authority to come to quick decisions.

2) Staff were motivated when there was clear and consistent communication from leaders within organisations about what work was required and contribution needed from participants.

3) Thorough training led to staff being clear whether they were permitted to take on particular tasks or feeling prepared to take on new roles. The provision of training specific to the service change was important, particularly when the work involved required new or changed roles of participants.

4) External facilitation has been very helpful in getting two organisations to work together, which is a method well rehearsed in the wider literature on colleagues' professional knowledge.

**Facilitators:**

1) Compatible IT systems and good management of the sharing of private data.

2) Good existing relationships between individuals and/or organisations with clear communication about the contributions required from different participants and the rules governing how the partnership should work.

3) Ongoing, planned communication between senior executives in the partner organisations.

4) Co-location: working together face-to-face in the same building improved the quality and frequency of communication, and expedited problem-solving by allowing quicker access to colleagues' professional knowledge.

5) Shared data systems or other information technology that aided communication and knowledge transfer.
| Section and Topic | Item | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|-------------------|------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| TITLE             |      |                |                               |
| Title             | 1    | Identify the report as a systematic review. | 1                           |
| ABSTRACT          |      |                |                               |
| Abstract          | 2    | See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist. | 2                           |
| INTRODUCTION      |      |                |                               |
| Rationale         | 3    | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | 3                           |
| Objectives        | 4    | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | 4                           |
| METHODS           |      |                |                               |
| Eligibility criteria | 5  | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | 6                           |
| Information sources | 6  | Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted. | 6                           |
| Search strategy   | 7    | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | 7                           |
| Selection process | 8    | Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | 7                           |
| Data collection process | 9 | Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | 7                           |
| Data items        |      |                |                               |
| 10a               |    | List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect. | 7                           |
| 10b               |    | List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information. | 7                           |
| Study risk of bias assessment | 11 | Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | 8                           |
| Effect measures   | 12   | Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results. | 9                           |
| Synthesis methods |      |                |                               |
| 13a               |    | Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)). | 10                          |
| 13b               |    | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. | 9                           |
| 13c               |    | Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. | 11                          |
| 13d               |    | Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. | 11                          |
| 13e               |    | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). N/A                   |
| 13f               |    | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. N/A                   |
| Reporting bias assessment | 14 | Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). | 7                           |
| Certainty         | 15   | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | 7                           |
**PRISMA 2020 Checklist**

| Section and Topic       | Item # | Checklist item                                                                                       | Location where item is reported |
|-------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **RESULTS**             |        |                                                                                                      |                                 |
| Study selection         | 16a    | Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. | 9                               |
|                         | 16b    | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | 11                              |
| Study characteristics   | 17     | Cite each included study and present its characteristics.                                               | Appendix B                      |
| Risk of bias in studies | 18     | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.                                             | Appendix B                      |
| Results of individual studies | 19 | For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots. | Appendix B                      |
| Results of syntheses    | 20a    | For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.   | Appendix B                      |
|                         | 20b    | Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect. | N/A                             |
|                         | 20c    | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.           | N/A                             |
|                         | 20d    | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | N/A                             |
| Reporting biases        | 21     | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. | 7                               |
| Certainty of evidence   | 22     | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.       | 7                               |
| **DISCUSSION**          |        |                                                                                                      |                                 |
| Discussion              | 23a    | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.                       | 13                              |
|                         | 23b    | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.                                        | 16                              |
|                         | 23c    | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.                                                   | 16                              |
|                         | 23d    | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.                          | 16                              |
| **OTHER INFORMATION**   |        |                                                                                                      |                                 |
| Registration and protocol | 24a  | Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered. | Review not registered           |
|                         | 24b    | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.         | Appendix                        |
|                         | 24c    | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.       | N/A                             |
| Support                 | 25     | Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | 17                              |
| Competing interests     | 26     | Declare any competing interests of review authors.                                                     | 17                              |
| Availability of data, code and other materials | 27 | Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. | 17                              |
PRISMA 2020 Checklist

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

For more information, visit: http://www.prisma-statement.org/