

What can participatory Theory of Change development add to implementation science in global mental health?

Erica Breuer^{1,2}

¹ Senior Researcher, Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Medical Faculty and University Hospital, University of Heidelberg, Germany

² Honorary lecturer, School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Newcastle, Newcastle, NSW, Australia

Author Note

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0952-6650>

Although there is increasing evidence for what works to improve mental health globally, many successful interventions are not implemented in practice (Bauer & Kirchner, 2020). Implementation science, which systematically researches how best to improve the implementation of research findings in routine practice (Eccles & Mittman, 2006), is increasingly being applied to improve the implementation and uptake of mental health interventions globally (McKay et al., 2020; Myers et al., 2024; Rose et al., 2022; Seward et al., 2021; Singla et al., 2021).

Implementation science in global mental health

Implementation science has contributed substantially to understanding, evaluating and systematizing many aspects of implementation. These include the process of implementation, for example, the Quality Implementation Framework (Meyers et al., 2012), and the determinants of successful implementation, exemplified by the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (Damschroder et al., 2009). It also encompasses the outcomes of successful implementation, for example, Proctor's implementation outcomes (Proctor et al., 2009), as well as implementation strategies, such as the ERIC taxonomy (Powell et al., 2015). Additionally, it



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License.

addresses optimal research designs for measuring implementation effectiveness (Wolfenden et al., 2021).

However, in the field global mental health, with its explicit focus on equitably improving mental health (Patel & Prince, 2010), implementation science methods and frameworks developed in well-resourced settings are harder to apply (Bartels et al., 2022). Many implementation science approaches ignore the existing challenges and inherent complexity of the implementation contexts (Sarkies et al., 2022) and ignore equity considerations (Brownson et al., 2021). However, low resource settings (and low – and middle- income countries in particular), often have substantial barriers to the implementation and scale up of evidence-based interventions. These include limited financial, material and human resources, inadequate supply chains and lack of suitability of the interventions for the socio-cultural environment (Bulthuis et al., 2020; Mugisha et al., 2017; Saraceno et al., 2007). However, low-resource settings may also have many facilitators to implementation including political will, advocacy, developing strategic plans, collaboration and partnership, which can facilitate scale up (Bulthuis et al., 2020). Communities may be valuable resources to support implementation and scale up (Selamu et al., 2015).

Addressing implementation challenges in under-resourced health systems often goes beyond existing frameworks and taxonomies. The detailed strategies outlined in the ERIC taxonomy of implementation strategies were developed by and with North American stakeholders (Waltz et al., 2015) and are often adequate to describe implementation strategies in detail. For example, community engagement activities such as village talks and meetings with district managers would both be classified as “conduct educational meetings” despite their different purpose and format. In addition, complex global mental health interventions often include multiple interventions and outcomes at different levels. For example, anti-stigma talks by volunteers in the community may be important both to reduce stigma as well as function as an implementation strategy to increase acceptability and uptake of a primary healthcare based mental care intervention (Breuer, Subba, et al., 2018; Jordans et al., 2016).

Program theory and Theory of Change

All well-designed interventions, programs and policies are underpinned by an implicit program theory – a theory about how and why that specific program brings about a set of outcomes. Hawe (2015) proposes that having a robust and clear a priori program theory is an important step in understanding whether an intervention is likely to work prior to implementation and evaluation. Similarly, Moore and Evans (2017) argue that we need to carefully theorise how interventions work in order to implement and evaluate them. Although, there is some recent work by Smith et al. (2020) who adapted the pipeline logic model for implementation research, there is less guidance on how program theory can be developed.

Participatory Theory of Change (ToC) is increasingly being used to develop and make explicit a priori program theories during intervention development in global mental health

(Abayneh et al., 2018; Asher et al., 2015; Erica Breuer et al., 2016; Breuer et al., 2023; Chibanda et al., 2016). ToC is flexible approach that can be used at a meso, micro and macro level to support the development of contextually relevant implementation strategies and interventions in global mental health. It provides a framework which we can use to unpack causal pathways and mechanisms of interventions while also understanding the long term outcomes and impact of the program (De Silva et al., 2014). In addition, a good ToC can be used to provide a framework for evaluating the intervention (E. Breuer, M. J. De Silva, et al., 2016).

The ToC of a future intervention and its implementation strategies is usually developed in workshops which include people with lived experience, health professionals, future program implementers and managers (Breuer et al., 2014; Kokota et al., 2023). The workshops usually start with identifying the challenges and facilitators related to the intervention and implementation and then ask the stakeholders to identify the potential impact of the intervention. Then the group identifies the short-, medium- and long-term outcomes which need to be in place for the impact to occur as well as the activities needed to reach these outcomes. The group also articulates the assumptions underlying the program. The additional evidence underlying the intervention and its ToC as well as the evaluation framework is usually developed by researchers after the workshop. These are usually represented visually on a ToC map. A ToC can also be developed during the implementation of an intervention or at the point of evaluation, using other data such as program documents, observations and interviews (E. Breuer, L. Lee, et al., 2016).

Once the ToC has been developed with an outline of the intervention and implementation strategy, co-design strategies can be used together with ToC to operationalize these and to develop a formalized intervention and implementation strategies. As the project progresses, the ToC is refined to become more precise and detailed in line with the implementation and evaluation of a set of interventions and their implementation strategies. For example, in the Psychosis Recovery Orientation in Malawi by Improving Service and Engagement (PROMISE) we are using a series of ToC workshops to iteratively develop the intervention and implementation strategies to implement the identification and referral of people with psychosis by community health workers in Malawi (Lawrie et al., 2023).

Using Theory of Change together with Implementation Science in global mental health

There is much potential for participatory ToC development to be used together with implementation science in global mental health (Seward et al., 2021). ToC can support implementation science by clarifying how interventions and implementation strategies will effect change. This a priori program theory, which can be peer-reviewed by others to assess the likelihood of the program having an effect, can provide a flexible but systematic way to understand how multiple interventions and implementation strategies are linked and clarify which constructs need to be evaluated (De Silva et al., 2014). A key advantage of participatory ToC is that it provides a formal way in which stakeholders can participate in intervention development rather than being consulted superficially. Inclusion of stakeholders helps to develop

contextually relevant interventions which actively incorporate the contextual changes required to implement the intervention. This serves both to gain stakeholder buy-in and to allow stakeholders to offer solutions to complex problems (Breuer et al., 2014). For example, during ToC workshops for the development of a district mental healthcare plan, policy makers were able to provide solutions to access psychotropic medications during implementation and supported the subsequent addition of these medications on the free drug list (Breuer, Hanlon, et al., 2018). In addition, ToC can also be used to understand the changes in the system needed to reach the long term impact (Breuer et al., 2021).

However, using participatory ToC does require specific facilitation and ToC development skills and requires substantial time investment on the part of the researchers and other stakeholders to ensure that ToCs can adequately guide the research and intervention development.

We have provided some useful guidance documents in Box 1.

Box 1. Theory of Change Guidelines

The Mental Health Innovation Theory of Change toolkit (Mental Health Innovation Network, 2014)

PROMISE Theory of Change workshop guidance (Kokota et al., 2023)

STRiDE Theory of Change Workshops: Guidance and Resources (Breuer et al., 2019)

Implementation science can also formally influence and strengthen participatory ToC. One example is using implementation frameworks such as the Theoretical Domains Framework to understand and choose implementation strategies based on theory rather than those suggested by stakeholders and researchers in workshops. Taylor et al. (2023) recently showed that only about 20% of intuitive implementation strategies developed by stakeholders were based on implementation science theory. Implementation scientists can be included in participatory ToC to help guide the development and choice of implementation strategies, frameworks, models and theories and measuring implementation in the same way that mental health experts are included in the development of a mental health intervention. However, implementation science models, frameworks, theories and taxonomies need to be developed for and applied in various global settings not just in high income countries. This would help global health researchers to describe, use and formally test these to generate additional global evidence for implementation science.

In summary, participatory ToC development is a useful adjunct to implementation science approaches in global mental health. It allows researchers to work with stakeholders to develop contextually relevant implementation strategies and interventions in global health settings. Implementation science should also be more formally integrated into the ToC process to draw on the wealth of systematized knowledge to understand how best to implement interventions into routine care.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported as part of the Psychosis Recovery Orientation in Malawi by Improving Services and Engagement (PROMISE) project funded by the Wellcome Trust [223615/Z/21/Z].

References

Abayneh, S., Lempp, H., Manthorpe, J., & Hanlon, C. (2018). Development of programme theory for integration of service user and caregiver involvement in mental health system strengthening: protocol for realist systematic review. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 12, 41–41. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-018-0220-4>

Asher, L., Fekadu, A., Hanlon, C., Mideksa, G., Eaton, J., Patel, V., & De Silva, M. J. (2015). Development of a Community-Based Rehabilitation Intervention for People with Schizophrenia in Ethiopia. *Plos ONE*, 10(11), e0143572. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0143572>

Bartels, S. M., Haider, S., Williams, C. R., Mazumder, Y., Ibisomi, L., Alonge, O., Theobald, S., Bärnighausen, T., Escallon, J. V., Vahedi, M., Ramaswamy, R., & Sarker, M. (2022). Diversifying Implementation Science: A Global Perspective. *Global Health: Science and Practice*, 10(4), e2100757. <https://doi.org/10.9745/ghsp-d-21-00757>

Bauer, M. S., & Kirchner, J. (2020). Implementation science: What is it and why should I care? *Psychiatry Res*, 283, 112376. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2019.04.025>

Breuer, E., Comas-Herrera, A., Docrat, S., Freeman, E., & Schneider, M. (2019). *STRiDE Theory of Change Workshops: Guidance and Resources. STRiDE Research Tool No.1 (version 2)*. Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, London School of Economics.

Breuer, E., Comas-Herrera, A., Freeman, E., Albanese, E., Alladi, S., Amour, R., Evans-Lacko, S., Ferri, C. P., Govia, I., Iveth Astudillo García, C., Knapp, M., Lefevre, M., López-Ortega, M., Lund, C., Musyimi, C., Ndetei, D., Oliveira, D., Palmer, T., Pattabiraman, M., Sani, T. P., Taylor, D., Taylor, E., Theresia, I., Thomas, P. T., Turana, Y., Weidner, W., & Schneider, M. (2021). Beyond the project: Building a strategic theory of change to address dementia care, treatment and support gaps across seven middle-income countries. *Dementia*, 147130122110291. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14713012211029105>

Breuer, E., Silva, M. J., Fekadu, A., Luitel, N. P., Murhar, V., Nakku, J., Petersen, I., & Lund, C. (2014). Using workshops to develop theories of change in five low and middle income countries: lessons from the programme for improving mental health care (PRIME) [journal article]. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 8(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1752-4458-8-15>

Breuer, E., De Silva, M. J., Shidaye, R., Petersen, I., Nakku, J., Jordans, M. J., Fekadu, A., & Lund, C. (2016). Planning and evaluating mental health services in low- and middle-income countries using theory of change. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 208 Suppl 56(Suppl 56), s55–62. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjop.114.153841>

Breuer, E., De Silva, M. J., Shidaye, R., Petersen, I., Nakku, J., Jordans, M. J., Fekadu, A., & Lund, C. (2016). Planning and evaluating mental health services in low-and middle-income countries using theory of change. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 208(s56), s55–s62.

Breuer, E., Hanlon, C., Bhana, A., Chisholm, D., De Silva, M., Fekadu, A., Honikman, S., Jordans, M., Kathree, T., Kigozzi, F., Luitel, N. P., Marx, M., Medhin, G., Murhar, V., Ndyanabangi, S., Patel, V., Petersen, I., Prince, M., Raja, S., Rathod, S. D., Shidaye, R., Ssebunya, J., Thornicroft, G., Tomlinson, M., Wolde-Giorgis, T., & Lund, C. (2018). Partnerships in a Global Mental Health Research Programme—the Example of PRIME [journal article]. *Global Social Welfare*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40609-018-0128-6>

Breuer, E., Lee, L., De Silva, M., & Lund, C. (2016). Using theory of change to design and evaluate public health interventions: a systematic review [journal article]. *Implementation Science*, 11(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-016-0422-6>

Breuer, E., Morris, A., Blanke, L., Pearsall, M., Rodriguez, R., Miller, B. F., Naslund, J. A., Saxena, S., Balsari, S., & Patel, V. (2023). A theory of change for community-initiated mental health care in the United States. *Cambridge Prisms: Global Mental Health*, 10, e56.

Breuer, E., Subba, P., Luitel, N., Jordans, M., De Silva, M., Marchal, B., & Lund, C. (2018). Using qualitative comparative analysis and theory of change to unravel the effects of a mental health intervention on service utilisation in Nepal. *BMJ Global Health*, 3(6), e001023. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001023>

Brownson, R. C., Kumanyika, S. K., Kreuter, M. W., & Haire-Joshu, D. (2021). Implementation science should give higher priority to health equity. *Implementation Science*, 16(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-021-01097-0>

Bulthuis, S. E., Kok, M. C., Raven, J., & Dieleman, M. A. (2020). Factors influencing the scale-up of public health interventions in low- and middle-income countries: a qualitative systematic literature review. *Health Policy And Planning*, 35(2), 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czz140>

Chibanda, D., Verhey, R., Munetsi, E., Cowan, F. M., & Lund, C. (2016). Using a theory driven approach to develop and evaluate a complex mental health intervention: the friendship bench project in Zimbabwe. *Int J Ment Health Syst*, 10, 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-016-0050-1>

Damschroder, L., Aron, D., Keith, R., Kirsh, S., Alexander, J., & Lowery, J. (2009). Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implement Sci*, 4, 50.

De Silva, M. J., Breuer, E., Lee, L., Asher, L., Chowdhary, N., Lund, C., & Patel, V. (2014). Theory of change: a theory-driven approach to enhance the Medical Research Council's framework for complex interventions. *Trials*, 15(1), 1–13.

Eccles, M., & Mittman, B. (2006). Welcome to implementation science. *Implement Sci*, 1, 1.

Hawe, P. (2015). Minimal, negligible and negligent interventions. *Social Science & Medicine*, 138, 265–268.

Jordans, M. J. D., Luitel, N. P., Pokhrel, P., & Patel, V. (2016). Development and pilot testing of a mental healthcare plan in Nepal. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 208(s56), s21–s28. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bj.p.114.153718>

Kokota, D., Breuer, E., Manda-Taylor, L., & On Behalf of the PROMISE Project. (2023). *PROMISE Theory of Change workshop guidance*.

Lawrie, S., Hanlon, C., Manda-Taylor, L., Knapp, M., Pickersgill, M., Stewart, R. C., Ahrens, J., Allardyne, J., Amos, A., & Bauer, A. (2023). Psychosis Recovery Orientation in Malawi by Improving Services and Engagement (PROMISE) protocol. *Plos ONE*, 18(11), e0293370.

McKay, M. M., Sensoy Bahar, O., & Ssewamala, F. M. (2020). Implementation science in global health settings: Collaborating with governmental & community partners in Uganda. *Psychiatry Res*, 283, 112585. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2019.112585>

Mental Health Innovation Network. (2014). *Theory of Change Toolkit*. Retrieved 11th June 2024 from <https://www.mhinnovation.net/resources/theory-change-toolkit>

Meyers, D. C., Durlak, J. A., & Wandersman, A. (2012). The quality implementation framework: a synthesis of critical steps in the implementation process. *Am J Community Psychol*, 50, 462–480.

Moore, G. F., & Evans, R. E. (2017). What theory, for whom and in which context? Reflections on the application of theory in the development and evaluation of complex population health interventions. *SSM-population health*, 3, 132–135.

Mugisha, J., Abdulmalik, J., Hanlon, C., Petersen, I., Lund, C., Upadhyaya, N., Ahuja, S., Shidhaye, R., Mntambo, N., Alem, A., Gureje, O., & Kigozi, F. (2017). Health systems context(s) for integrating mental health into primary health care in six Emerald countries: a situation analysis. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-016-0114-2>

Myers, B., Regenauer, K. S., Rose, A., Johnson, K., Ndamase, S., Ciya, N., Brown, I., Joska, J., Bassett, I. V., Belus, J. M., Ma, T. C., Sibeko, G., & Magidson, J. F. (2024). Community health worker training to reduce mental health and substance use stigma towards patients who have disengaged from HIV/TB care in South Africa: protocol for a stepped wedge hybrid type II pilot implementation trial. *Implement Sci Commun*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43058-023-00537-w>

Patel, V., & Prince, M. (2010). Global Mental Health: a new global health field comes of age. *JAMA*, 303, 1976–1977.

Powell, B. J., Waltz, T. J., Chinman, M. J., Damschroder, L. J., Smith, J. L., Matthieu, M. M., Proctor, E. K., & Kirchner, J. E. (2015). A refined compilation of implementation strategies: results from the Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC) project. *Implementation Science*, 10, 21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-015-0209-1>

Proctor, E. K., Landsverk, J., Aarons, G., Chambers, D., Glisson, C., & Mittman, B. (2009). Implementation Research in Mental Health Services: An Emerging Science with Conceptual, Methodological, and Training challenges. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 36(1), 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-008-0197-4>

Rose, A. L., Belus, J. M., Hines, A. C., Barrie, I., Regenauer, K. S., Andersen, L. S., Joska, J. A., Ciya, N., Ndamase, S., Myers, B., Safren, S. A., & Magidson, J. F. (2022). Patient and provider perceptions of a peer-delivered intervention ('Khanya') to improve anti-retroviral adherence and substance use in South Africa: a mixed methods analysis. *Glob Ment Health (Camb)*, 9, 439–447. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gmh.2022.47>

Saraceno, B., Van Ommeren, M., Batniji, R., Cohen, A., Gureje, O., Mahoney, J., Sridhar, D., & Underhill, C. (2007). Barriers to improvement of mental health services in low-income and middle-income countries. *The Lancet*, 370(9593), 1164–1174. (NOT IN FILE)

Sarkies, M. N., Francis-Auton, E., Long, J. C., Pomare, C., Hardwick, R., & Braithwaite, J. (2022). Making implementation science more real. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-022-01661-2>

Selamu, M., Asher, L., Hanlon, C., Medhin, G., Hailemariam, M., Patel, V., Thornicroft, G., & Fekadu, A. (2015). Beyond the Biomedical: Community Resources for Mental Health Care in Rural Ethiopia. *Plos ONE*, 10(5), e0126666. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0126666>

Seward, N., Hanlon, C., Hinrichs-Kraples, S., Lund, C., Murdoch, J., Taylor Salisbury, T., Verhey, R., Shidhaye, R., Thornicroft, G., Araya, R., & Sevdalis, N. (2021). A guide to systems-level, participatory, theory-informed implementation research in global health. *BMJ Global Health*, 6(12), e005365. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmigh-2021-005365>

Singla, D. R., Lawson, A., Kohrt, B. A., Jung, J. W., Meng, Z., Ratjen, C., Zahedi, N., Dennis, C. L., & Patel, V. (2021). Implementation and Effectiveness of Nonspecialist-Delivered Interventions for Perinatal Mental Health in High-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 78(5), 498–509. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.4556>

Smith, J. D., Li, D. H., & Rafferty, M. R. (2020). The Implementation Research Logic Model: a method for planning, executing, reporting, and synthesizing implementation projects. *Implementation Science*, 15(1), 84. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-020-01041-8>

Taylor, N., McKay, S., Long, J. C., Gaff, C., North, K., Braithwaite, J., Francis, J. J., & Best, S. (2023). Aligning intuition and theory: a novel approach to identifying the determinants of behaviours necessary to support implementation of evidence into practice. *Implementation Science*, 18(1), 29.

Waltz, T. J., Powell, B. J., Matthieu, M. M., Damschroder, L. J., Chinman, M. J., Smith, J. L., Proctor, E. K., & Kirchner, J. E. (2015). Use of concept mapping to characterize relationships among implementation strategies and assess their feasibility and importance: results from the Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC) study. *Implement Sci*, 10, 109. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-015-0295-0>

Wolfenden, L., Foy, R., Presseau, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Ivers, N. M., Powell, B. J., Taljaard, M., Wiggers, J., Sutherland, R., & Nathan, N. (2021). Designing and undertaking randomised implementation trials: guide for researchers. *BMJ*, 372.

EDITORIAL BOARD**Editor-in-chief**

Alexandre Luiz de Oliveira Serpa

Associated editors

Alessandra Gotuzzo Seabra
Ana Alexandra Caldas Osório
Cristiane Silvestre de Paula
Luiz Renato Rodrigues Carreiro
Maria Cristina Triguero Veloz Teixeira

Section editors

"Psychological Assessment"
André Luiz de Carvalho Braule Pinto
Danielle de Souza Costa
Natália Becker
Lisandra Borges Vieira Lima
Luiz Renato Rodrigues Carreiro
Thatiana Helena de Lima

"Psychology and Education"
Alessandra Gotuzzo Seabra
Carlo Schmidt
Kátia Carvalho Amaral Faro

"Social Psychology and Population's Health"

Fernanda Maria Munhoz Salgado
Gabriel Gaudencio do Rêgo
João Gabriel Maracci Cardoso
Marina Xavier Carpêna

"Clinical Psychology"

Cândida Helena Lopes Alves
Julia Garcia Durand
Vínius Pereira de Sousa

"Human Development"

Ana Alexandra Caldas Osório
Cristiane Silvestre de Paula
João Rodrigo Maciel Portes

Review Articles

Jessica Mayumi Maruyama

EDITORIAL PRODUCTION**Publishing coordination**

Surane Chiliani Vellenich

Editorial intern

Sofia Lustosa de Oliveira da Silva

Language editor

Daniel Leão

Layout designer

Studio Acqua