Review of: "Research & Evaluation Framework 2022/23"

Paryaneh Rostami[1]

1 Blackpool Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

Review of: Research & Evaluation Framework 2022/23

Thank you for the invitation to review this article that presents a Research and Evaluation Framework to support anyone who is undertaking digital transformation in the use of research and service evaluation methods and introductions to the topic areas.

Support for incorporating research and evaluation in all elements of transformation in healthcare is of paramount importance and often overlooked. I think this article has the potential to be extremely useful for many people and is the sort of guide I have wanted to recommend for people on many occasions. The article generally reads well and provides a good introduction for beginners to research and evaluation.

As I would personally find this framework very useful and something that can be shared with the teams that I work with, I have provided rather detailed comments from my experiences of working with colleagues who are doing improvement that are new to research and evaluation. I have presented my comments in the table below and I hope that they will be useful for the authors. I have used the page numbers that appear when the article is downloaded as a PDF document.

Comment	Page
General	
The title of the article could specify that this is TEC's Research and Evauation Framework to make it easier for people to find when it is mentioned or recommended to people.	-
To help those reading printed copes – would be useful to number section in section title. I.e., "1": What is Research and Evaluation	-
Great idea to include hyperlinks throughout	-
Agree with other reviewers that Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) should be mentioned sooner.	-
Article would benefit from more consistency around terms, definitions and abbreviations used.	
Some minor typographical errors, like not including spaces etc. Could benefit from proofreading by a non-author.	
I know hyperlinks are provided for references but using a Vancouver or Harvard referencing style would also be helpful for those who may want to print the article as a guide as I know it would certainly be a useful resource in our physical QI Hub/ library at my Trust.	
I think linking to examples o quality improvement reports or papers etc where things have been done well would be good – i.e., PPI, mixed-methods etc.	

Abstract	
Considering an abstract is a short summary of the entire text – I think more information would be useful. Perhaps a one summary line about each section.	1
Great idea to include hyperlinks throughout.	-
Table of Contents	
Sometimes use "and" other times use "&" – can be confusing to know if talking about a different framework.	2
"TEC" and "PDSA" abbreviated without being expanded prior (does happen later)	2
Introduction	
Very similar to abstract – I know that the following sections introduce different areas in more detail, but I think the introduction could provide more background about why an article like this is so needed. This could include information from current literature about how more transformation is occurring and perhaps mention current national and international focus and strategies.	2
There are also research papers that mention how research and evaluation is often overlooked, this could help set the scene and provide examples of when using this framework could be most useful.	2
Why use a Research and Evaluation framework?	
I don't feel that this section answers the question in the title. I would expect a general referenced definition of what a framework is and why it is useful before then being specific about how this particular framework can support people undertaking digital transformation.	3
Good points about how historically many projects are taken without approaches to research and evaluation – I would have this at the beginning of the section to set the scene before saying why a framework is needed.	3
Great that the framework will be shared iterated and improved over time, but this is not the right section to mention this. Perhaps would have been better placed in the introduction.	3
What is Research and Service Evaluation	
Should this section go before discussing frameworks perhaps? I feel it would follow on better to say what research and evaluation are and then says that frameworks can support with research and evaluation.	3
Also have jumped from just saying "evaluation" to "service evaluation" within this section – maybe useful to define what the authors mean if any different.	3
Table 2 is very helpful – but where was Table 1?	4
With regards to Diagram 1, publishing QI is not just for stakeholders but also for learning purposes. A key difference is that publishing peer reviewed Quality Improvement Reports are not just about adding a new finding to the literature but also reporting on what went well and what failed so others can learn. Suggest using information from BMJ Open Quality improvement reports. Need to be careful from not deterring people from publishing QI Reports when we know more of this needs to happen!	5
What is Quality Improvement (QI)?	
Is there a need to abbreviate QI in the title? It was already written in full then expanded in the section before and you could still keep in full in titles only. It wasn't abbreviated in the abstract – even through PPI etc where…	5
QI is expanded and abbreviated again at the beginning of this section. Perhaps a glossary could help the authors if they are worried abbreviations will confuse readers.	6
The Health Foundation resource linked is an ideal reference for the readers – great that you have included.	6
Space required after Wales.	6 (paragraph 1)
Another Table 2? Check Table numbering.	6
I am not sure what the authors mean when they say "brands" of QI – could you provide examples?	6
I think the first sentence in the first paragraph starting "There are many types or "brands" …." could be clearer.	6
Some references for the principles would be helpful for the reader.	6
Missing full stop on penultimate point.	6
The second Table 2 requires referencing to IOM to say it was adapted from there in case anyone uses it as a standalone Table etc.	7
The "Quality Improvement Approaches & Principles" heading uses an "&" sign, but other headings have "and" – either is fine but needs to be consistent.	7
Some references are needed for the history of QI approaches so people can read further if required.	7

Review sentence starting "In TEC Cymru some of the QI approaches and tools…." Would advise re-ordering sentence structure to make it clearer.	7
Data "are" gathered not "is" as data are plural.	7
The authors have done well to provide concise descriptions of different methods and appropriate links for further information. Would also suggest referencing properly for those reading printed copies as mentioned above.	8
I like the measurement section – once again be mindful of being consistent with full stops after bullet points.	8
The three tools on page 9 are all numbered "1".	9
Sentence starting with "This traditional QI approach…" – unclear which approach is being referred to.	9
Space between "see" and "here" required in sentence starting "To find out more…"	9
TECs Four-step phased approach	
Sentence starting "This approach is tried…" – should be past tense and therefore "has".	9
In this introductory section about the framework, more referencing is needed for the statements made or needs to specify if the statements are anecdotal.	9/10
Good points made about wasting time with improving data collection system if there will be no engagement/worth.	11
Space after "you merely want to know"	11
Missing "that" in sentence starting "often within the NHS, all is required"	11
Sometimes the Phase numbers are in letters and other times in numbers – can be confusing. Either is fine but needs consistency.	11/12
Using Mixed methodologies	
Good section – very important. Examples of when mixed methods have been used well would be good here.	13/14
The paragraph spacing etc. I find confusing but this may just be the way that it has printed out for me.	14
Using Patient and Public Involvement	
This section would particularly benefit from examples of when it has been done well, there are a few in BMJ Open Quality or other journals.	14/15

I understand that some comments may not be relevant and they are just suggestions. I would also advise that the authors ask someone new to the concepts to read the paper for piloting purposes, if they have not already, as I have previously gained many useful suggestions that would not have crossed my mind as someone use to these concepts.

I look forward to seeing the framework improved over time and recommending it to others.