## **Additional File 3: Implementation Outcome Rating Scores**

**Table 5: Rating scores for Acceptability of Intervention instruments** 

| Name   | Internal<br>Consistency | Structural<br>Validity | Predictive<br>Validity | Norms | Responsiveness | Usability | Total<br>Score |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Acceptability of<br>Computerized Self-<br>Assessment[1]          | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 3     | 0              | 3         | 6              |
| Acceptability of<br>Intervention<br>Measure-<br>Posttest[2]      | 4                       | 0                      | 1                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 12             |
| Acceptability of<br>Intervention<br>Measure-Pretest[2]           | 4                       | 0                      | 1                      | 0     | 0              | 3         | 8              |
| Adapted<br>Treatment<br>Evaluation<br>Inventory-Short<br>Form[3] | 4                       | 0                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 4         | 12             |
| Assessment Rating Profile-15[4]                                  | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 7              |
| Abbreviated<br>Acceptability<br>Rating Profile[5]                | 4                       | 4                      | 0                      | 3     | 0              | 4         | 15             |
| Assessment Rating<br>Profile-Revised[6]                          | 3.5                     | 4                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 14.5           |
| Athlete Preference<br>Questionnaire[7]                           | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 2     | 0              | 4         | 6              |
| Behavior<br>Intervention Rating<br>Scale[8]                      | 3                       | 4                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 14             |
| Behavior<br>Intervention Rating<br>Scale-Revised[9]              | 4                       | 0                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 11             |
| Child Evaluation<br>Inventory[10]                                | 4                       | 3                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 14             |
| Children's<br>Intervention Rating<br>Profile[11]                 | 3.5                     | 0                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 4         | 11.5           |

| Children's Usage<br>Rating Profile[12]   | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Classroom Organization and Management Program Treatment Acceptability[13]                      | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 14 |
| Good Behavior<br>Game Treatment<br>Acceptability[13]   | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 9  |
| Geriatric<br>Treatment<br>Acceptability<br>Survey[14]  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 8  |
| Good Behavior<br>Game-Response<br>Cost/GBG-<br>Reinforcement<br>Treatment<br>Acceptability[15] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5  |
| Influences on<br>psychotherapy<br>training<br>participation<br>scale[16]                       | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3  |
| Intervention Profile<br>Rating Scale[17]   | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| Intervention Rating<br>Profile-10 (AKA<br>Teacher<br>Acceptability<br>Measure)[18]             | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 12 |
| Intervention Rating<br>Profile-15[19]  | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 13 |
| Modified<br>Treatment<br>Evaluation<br>Inventory[20]   | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 |

| Ottawa Acceptability of Decision Rules Instrument AKA Ottawa Acceptability of Decision Rules Scale[21] | 4   | 0 | 0   | 4 | 0 | 3 | 11   |
|--|-----|---|-----|---|---|---|------|
| Overall Treatment<br>Acceptability[13]   | 4   | 0 | 4   | 2 | 0 | 3 | 13   |
| Parent Evaluation<br>Inventory - Child<br>Treatment[22]  | 0.5 | 0 | 2   | 4 | 0 | 3 | 9.5  |
| Parent Evaluation<br>Inventory-Parent<br>Treatment[23]   | 0   | 0 | 0   | 4 | 0 | 3 | 7    |
| Parenting<br>Strategies<br>Questionnaire[24]   | 4   | 0 | 0   | 2 | 4 | 4 | 14   |
| Parent's<br>Acceptability of<br>Stepping Stones<br>Triple P<br>Questionnaire[24]                       | 4   | 0 | 0   | 3 | 0 | 3 | 10   |
| Self-Monitoring<br>Treatment<br>Acceptability[13]  | 4   | 0 | 1   | 2 | 0 | 3 | 10   |
| Suicide Prevention<br>Program Rating<br>Profile[25]  | 4   | 4 | 0   | 4 | 0 | 3 | 15   |
| Technology<br>Acceptance Model<br>Questionnaire[26]  | 0   | 0 | 0   | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5    |
| The Language<br>Intervention<br>Profile[27]  | 4   | 0 | 0   | 3 | 0 | 4 | 11   |
| The Pre-Referral<br>Intervention Team<br>Inventory[28]   | 4   | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 18.5 |

| Therapist Evaluation Inventory - Parent Management Training[29]  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4    |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|---|------|
| Treatment Acceptability Questionnaire[30]  | 4   | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 11   |
| Treatment<br>Acceptability<br>Questionnaire<br>(Hunsley)[31]   | 3   | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 11   |
| Treatment Acceptability Rating Form[32]  | 4   | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 9    |
| Treatment<br>Acceptability<br>Rating Form-<br>Revised[33]  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5    |
| Treatment Evaluation Inventory-Short Form (AKA Modified Treatment Evaluation Inventory-Short Form)[34] | 4   | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 15   |
| Treatment Plan Implementation Monitoring and Feedback Acceptability Survey[35]                         | 4   | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 11   |
| Usage Rating Profile - Intervention Revised[36]  | 3.5 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 13.5 |

**Table 6: Rating Scores for the Acceptability of Implementation Process Instruments** 

| Name  | Internal<br>Consistency | Structural<br>Validity | Predictive<br>Validity | Norms | Responsiveness | Usability | Total<br>Score |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Evidence-Based<br>Practice Attitude<br>Scale[37]                                  | 3                       | 2                      | 1                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 13             |
| Evidence-Based<br>Practice Attitude<br>Scale – 50[38]                             | 3                       | 3                      | 0                      | 0     | 0              | 2         | 8              |
| Journal Club<br>Acceptability<br>Questionnaire[39]                                | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 2     | 0              | 4         | 6              |
| Manual<br>Acceptability<br>Rating Scale[40]                                       | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 4         | 8              |
| Practitioner's attitudes towards treatment manuals[41]                            | 4                       | 4                      | 2                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 17             |
| Training<br>Acceptability<br>Rating Scale[42]                                     | 4                       | 0                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 11             |
| Training<br>Acceptability<br>Rating Scale-II[40]                                  | 0 0                     | 0                      | 4                      | 0     | 3              | 7         |                |
| Training/ Practice<br>Acceptability/Feasi<br>bility/Appropriaten<br>ess Scale[43] | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 0     | 0              | 3         | 3              |
| Workshop<br>Evaluation<br>Form[44]  | 3                       | 0                      | 4                      | 4     | 0              | 3         | 14             |

**Table 7: Rating Scores for Adoption Instruments** 

|   | Internal    | Structural | Predictive |       |                |           | Total |
|---|-------------|------------|------------|-------|----------------|-----------|-------|
| Name  | Consistency | Validity   | Validity   | Norms | Responsiveness | Usability | Score |
| Adoption of information technology innovation[45]   | 3           | 4          | 0          | 4     | 0              | 3         | 14    |
| Adoption of<br>Innovation Survey[46]  | 0           | 1.5        | 0          | 0     | 0              | 3         | 4.5   |
| Adoption of smoking cessation expert system[47]   | 0           | 0          | 0          | 0     | 0              | 3         | 3     |
| Adoption of the<br>Principles of<br>Effectiveness<br>Survey[48]                               | 4           | 0          | 0          | 4     | 0              | 4         | 12    |
| Interorganizational<br>Systems Standards<br>(IOS) Adoption &<br>Diffusion Model<br>Survey[49] | 0           | 0          | 0          | 4     | 0              | 3         | 7     |
| Knowledge Exchange<br>Outcomes Tool[50]   | 0           | 0          | 0          | 0     | 0              | 2         | 2     |
| Knowledge Utilization<br>Scale Among<br>Policymakers[51]                                      | 4           | 0          | 0          | 4     | 0              | 3         | 11    |
| Knowledge Utilization<br>Questionnaire<br>(English)[52]                                       | 0           | 3          | 3          | 0     | 0              | 2         | 8     |
| Learning Transfer<br>Inventory[53]  | 0           | 2          | 0          | 0     | 0              | 2         | 4     |
| Level of Use<br>Instrument[54]  | 0           | 0          | 3.5        | 0     | 0              | 3         | 6.5   |
| Perceived Attributes of<br>the Principles of<br>Effectiveness[48]                             | 0           | 0          | 0          | 0     | 0              | 3         | 3     |

| Perceptions of<br>Computerized Therapy<br>Questionnaire –<br>Clinician Version[55]              | 0 | 0 | 3   | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7    |
|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|------|
| Perceptions of<br>Computerized Therapy<br>Questionnaire - Patient<br>Version[55]                | 4 | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7    |
| Prevention Program<br>Assessment[56]  | 1 | 2 | 0   | 4 | 0 | 3 | 10   |
| Research Utilization<br>Questionnaire[57]   | 4 | 0 | 2.5 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 13.5 |
| Rogers Adoption<br>Questionnaire[58]  | 0 | 4 | 0   | 4 | 0 | 4 | 12   |
| The Arson Prevention<br>Program for Children<br>Adopter<br>Characteristics<br>Questionnaire[59] | 0 | 0 | 3   | 4 | 0 | 3 | 10   |
| Therapy Procedures<br>Checklist[60]   | 4 | 1 | 0   | 4 | 0 | 2 | 11   |
| Therapy Procedures<br>Checklist -<br>Revised[61]  | 4 | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6    |

**Table 8: Rating Scores for Appropriateness Instruments** 

| Name   | Internal<br>Consistency | Structural<br>Validity | Predictive<br>Validity | Norms | Responsiveness | Usability | Total<br>Score |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Information Technology<br>Appropriateness<br>Survey[62]  | 0                       | 1                      | 0                      | 3     | 0              | 3         | 7              |
| Scott Innovation<br>Scale[63]  | 3                       | 1                      | 0                      | 0     | 0              | 3         | 7              |
| The Arson Prevention<br>Program for Children<br>Innovation<br>Characteristics<br>Questionnaire[59] | 0                       | 0                      | 0.5                    | 4     | 0              | 3         | 7.5            |
| Influences on psychotherapy training participation scale[16]                                       | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 0     | 0              | 3         | 3              |
| Knowledge Exchange<br>Outcomes Tool[50]  | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 0     | 0              | 2         | 2              |
| Parenting Strategies<br>Questionnaire[24]  | 4                       | 0                      | 0                      | 2     | 4              | 4         | 14             |
| Training/ Practice<br>Acceptability/Feasibility<br>/Appropriateness<br>Scale[43]                   | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 0     | 0              | 3         | 3              |

**Table 9: Rating Scores for Cost Instruments** 

| Name                | Internal<br>Consistency | Structural<br>Validity | Predictive<br>Validity | Norms | Responsiveness | Usability | Total<br>Score |
|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Cost<br>Formula[64] | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 4     | 0              | 0         | 4              |
|                     | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 0     | 0              | 4         | 4              |

| Charge-<br>Capture<br>Tool[65]                                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Drug Abuse<br>Treatment<br>Cost Analysis<br>Program[66]          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| Direct Cost<br>Evaluation<br>Structured<br>Questionnaire<br>[67] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| SIC &<br>COINS[68]   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| Treatment<br>Cost Analysis<br>Tool[69]                           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Utilization<br>and Cost<br>Inventory[70]                         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Utilization<br>and Cost<br>Questionnaire<br>[71]                 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 8 |

**Table 10: Rating Scores for Feasibility Instruments** 

|      | Internal    | Structural | Predictive |       |                |           | Total |
|------|-------------|------------|------------|-------|----------------|-----------|-------|
| Name | Consistency | Validity   | Validity   | Norms | Responsiveness | Usability | Score |

| Assessment tool for potential transfers (for senior leaders, lead implementers, physician champions)[72]     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3  |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| eVital Feasibility<br>Questionnaire[73]  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3  |
| Feasibility of<br>administering The<br>Screening tool for<br>Autism in Toddlers<br>and Young<br>Children[74] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5  |
| Feasibility of the<br>Stages of Recovery<br>Instrument[75]   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6  |
| Feasibility Questionnaire for Threshold Assessment Grid[76]  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 7  |
| The Measure of Disseminability[77]   | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| Training/ Practice<br>Acceptability/Feasibili<br>ty/Appropriateness<br>Scale[43]                             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3  |
| Feasibility of a screening tool[78]  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 7  |

**Table 11: Rating Scores for Penetration Instruments** 

|      | Internal    | Structural | Predictive |       |                |           | Total |
|------|-------------|------------|------------|-------|----------------|-----------|-------|
| Name | Consistency | Validity   | Validity   | Norms | Responsiveness | Usability | Score |

| Dialectical Behavior<br>Therapy Skills Use<br>Self-Report[79]                                   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0   | 4 | 6    |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|------|
| Level of<br>Institutionalization<br>Scales for Health<br>Promotion<br>Programs[80]              | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1.5 | 3 | 19.5 |
| Level of Success<br>Instrument[58]  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0   | 4 | 7    |
| Penetrability formula<br>(# of eligible persons<br>using service/ # of<br>persons eligible)[81] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0   | 4 | 8    |

**Table 12: Rating Scores for Sustainability Instruments** 

| Name   | Internal<br>Consistency | Structural Validity | Predictive Validity | Norms | Responsiveness | Usability | Tota<br>Scor |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| Evidence Based<br>Practice Sustaining<br>Telephone<br>Survey[82]               | 0                       | 0                   | 0                   | 0     | 0              | 3         | 3            |
| General Organizational Index[83]   | 0                       | 1                   | 0                   | 0     | 0              | 3         | 4            |
| Organization<br>Checklist[84]  | 0                       | 0                   | 0                   | 0     | 0              | 4         | 4            |
| Program Sustainability Assessment Tool[85]                                     | 3                       | 2                   | 0                   | 0     | 0              | 3         | 8            |
| School-Wide<br>Universal Behavior<br>Sustainability Index-<br>School Teams[86] | 4                       | 4                   | 1                   | 4     | 0              | 3         | 1 <i>6</i>   |
| Sustainability Model<br>& Guide[87]  | 0                       | 0                   | 0                   | 4     | 0              | 3         | 7            |
| The Team Check-up Tool[88]   | 3                       | 0                   | 0                   | 0     | 1              | 3         | 7            |
| Knowledge<br>Exchange Outcomes<br>Tool[50]                                     | 0                       | 0                   | 0                   | 0     | 0              | 2         | 2            |

## References

- 1. Bendtsen P, Timpka T: Acceptability of computerized self-report of alcohol habits: a patient perspective. *Alcohol Alcohol* 1999, **34**:575–580.
- 2. Henninger K: Exploring the relationship between factors of implementation, treatment integrity and reading fluency. 2010.
- 3. Johnston C, Hommersen P, Seipp C: Acceptability of behavioral and pharmacological treatments for attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: Relations to child and parent characteristics. *Behav Ther* 2008, **39**:22–32.
- 4. Connell Jr JE: Constructing a math applications, curriculum-based assessment: An analysis of the relationship between applications problems, computation problems and criterion-referenced assessments. *Ann Arbor MI ProQuest Inf Learn* 2006.
- 5. Tarnowski KJ, Simonian SJ: **Assessing treatment acceptance: The abbreviated acceptability rating profile**. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry* 1992, **23**:101–106.
- 6. Eckert TL, Hintze JM, Shapiro ES: **Development and refinement of a measure for assessing the acceptability of assessment methods: The Assessment Rating Profile-Revised**. *Can J Sch Psychol* 1999, **15**:21–42.
- 7. Maniar SD, Curry LA, Sommers-Flanagan J, Walsh JA, others: **Student-athlete preferences** in seeking help when confronted with sport performance problems. *Sport Psychol* 2001, **15**:205–223.
- 8. Elliott SN, Treuting MVB: **The Behavior Intervention Rating Scale: Development and validation of a pretreatment acceptability and effectiveness measure**. *J Sch Psychol* 1991, **29**:43–51.
- 9. Semke CA: Examining the efficacy of Conjoint Behavioral Consultation for health behaviors of children with obesity. 2011.
- 10. Thurber S, Snow M, Thurber D: **Psychometric properties of the Child Evaluation Inventory.** *Psychol Assess J Consult Clin Psychol* 1990, **2**:206.
- 11. Elliott SN, Witt JC, Galvin GA, Moe GL: **Children's involvement in intervention** selection: Acceptability of interventions for misbehaving peers. *Prof Psychol Res Pract* 1986, **17**:235.
- 12. Briesch AM, Chafouleas SM: Exploring Student Buy-In: Initial Development of an Instrument to Measure Likelihood of Children's Intervention Usage. *J Educ Psychol Consult* 2009, **19**:321–336.
- 13. Tanol G: Treatment Fidelity: Relation to Treatment Acceptability and Change Over Time. UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA; 2010.

- 14. Lundervold D, Young L, Bourland G, Jackson T: **Psychometric properties of attitudinal measures of behavioral treatment in geriatric settings**. *Behav Interv* 1991, **6**:97–106.
- 15. Tanol G, Johnson L, McComas J, Cote E: **Responding to rule violations or rule following: A comparison of two versions of the Good Behavior Game with kindergarten students**. *J Sch Psychol* 2010, **48**:337–355.
- 16. Lyon A: Influences on Psychotherapy Training Participation Scale (IPTPS). 2010.
- 17. Kutsick KA, Witt JC, Gutkin TB: **The impact of treatment development process, intervention type, and problem severity on treatment acceptability as judged by classroom teachers**. *Psychol Sch* 1991, **28**:325–331.
- 18. Power TJ, Hess LE, Bennett DS: **The acceptability of interventions for attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder among elementary and middle school teachers**. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 1995, **16**:238–243.
- 19. Kratochwill TR, Elliott SN, Busse RT: **Behavior consultation: A five-year evaluation of consultant and client outcomes.** *Sch Psychol Q* 1995, **10**:87.
- 20. Johnston C, Fine S: **Methods of evaluating methylphenidate in children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: acceptability, satisfaction, and compliance**. *J Pediatr Psychol* 1993, **18**:717–730.
- 21. Brehaut JC, Graham ID, Wood TJ, Taljaard M, Eagles D, Lott A, Clement C, Kelly A-M, Mason S, Kellermann A, others: **Measuring acceptability of clinical decision rules: validation of the Ottawa acceptability of decision rules instrument (OADRI) in four countries**. *Med Decis Making* 2009.
- 22. Kazdin AE, Bass D, Siegel T, Thomas C: Cognitive-behavioral therapy and relationship therapy in the treatment of children referred for antisocial behavior. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1989, **57**:522.
- 23. Kazdin AE, Siegel TC, Bass D: Cognitive problem-solving skills training and parent management training in the treatment of antisocial behavior in children. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1992, **60**:733.
- 24. Whittingham K, Sofronoff K, Sheffield JK: **Stepping Stones Triple P: a pilot study to evaluate acceptability of the program by parents of a child diagnosed with an Autism Spectrum Disorder**. *Res Dev Disabil* 2006, **27**:364–380.
- 25. Eckert TL, Miller DN, DuPaul GJ, Riley-Tillman TC: **Adolescent suicide prevention:** School psychologists' acceptability of school-based programs. *Sch Psychol Rev* 2003, **32**:57–76.
- 26. Van Schaik P, Bettany-Saltikov JA, Warren JG: Clinical acceptance of a low-cost portable system for postural assessment. *Behav Inf Technol* 2002, **21**:47–57.

- 27. Turan Y: Acceptability ratings of language interventions and reasoning as described by early childhood special education teachers. *Early Child Dev Care* 2012, **182**:1371–1382.
- 28. Yetter G: Assessing the Acceptability of Problem-Solving Procedures by School Teams: Preliminary Development of the Pre-Referral Intervention Team Inventory. *J Educ Psychol Consult* 2010, **20**:139–168.
- 29. Myers SJ: Relationship Between the Consultant-Parent Working Alliance and Ratings of the Consultation Process with Parents of Children Having Autism Spectrum Disorder. ProQuest; 2008.
- 30. Krain AL, Kendall PC, Power TJ: **The role of treatment acceptability in the initiation of treatment for ADHD**. *J Atten Disord* 2005, **9**:425–434.
- 31. Hunsley J: **Development of the treatment acceptability questionnaire**. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess* 1992, **14**:55–64.
- 32. Reimers TM, Wacker DP: Parents' ratings of the acceptability of behavioral treatment recommendations made in an outpatient clinic: A preliminary analysis of the influence of treatment effectiveness. *Behav Disord* 1988.
- 33. Keleher KL: Parental acceptance of behavioural treatments for children with autism. 1999.
- 34. Kelley ML, Heffer RW, Gresham FM, Elliott SN: **Development of a modified treatment evaluation inventory**. *J Psychopathol Behav Assess* 1989, **11**:235–247.
- 35. Easton JE: **Teacher Acceptability of Treatment Plan Implementation Monitoring and Feedback Methods**. 2009.
- 36. Briesch AM, Chafouleas SM, Neugebauer SR, Riley-Tillman TC: **Assessing influences on intervention implementation: Revision of the usage rating profile-intervention**. *J Sch Psychol* 2013, **51**:81–96.
- 37. Aarons GA: Mental health provider attitudes toward adoption of evidence-based practice: The Evidence-Based Practice Attitude Scale (EBPAS). Ment Health Serv Res 2004, 6:61–74.
- 38. Aarons GA, Cafri G, Lugo L, Sawitzky A: **Expanding the domains of attitudes towards evidence-based practice: The Evidence Based Practice Attitude Scale-50**. *Adm Policy Ment Health Ment Health Serv Res* 2010, **39**:331–340.
- 39. Mazuryk M, Daeninck P, Neumann CM, Bruera E: **Daily journal club: an education tool in palliative care**. *Palliat Med* 2002, **16**:57–61.
- 40. Milne D: Can we enhance the training of clinical supervisors? A national pilot study of an evidence-based approach. Clin Psychol Psychother 2010, 17:321–328.

- 41. Addis ME, Krasnow AD: A national survey of practicing psychologists' attitudes toward psychotherapy treatment manuals. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2000, **68**:331.
- 42. Davis JR, Rawana EP, Capponi DR: **Acceptability of behavioral staff management techniques**. *Behav Interv* 1989, **4**:23–44.
- 43. Lyon A: Training/Practice Acceptability/Feasibility/Appropriateness Scale. 2011.
- 44. Bartholomew NG, Joe GW, Rowan-Szal GA, Simpson DD: **Counselor assessments of training and adoption barriers**. *J Subst Abuse Treat* 2007, **33**:193–199.
- 45. Moore GC, Benbasat I: **Development of an instrument to measure the perceptions of adopting an information technology innovation**. *Inf Syst Res* 1991, **2**:192–222.
- 46. Unsworth KL, Sawang S, Murray J, Sorbello T: **DEVELOPING AN INTEGRATIVE MODEL FOR UNDERSTANDING INNOVATION ADOPTION.** In *Academy of Management Proceedings. Volume 2009*. Academy of Management; 2009:1–6.
- 47. Hoving C, Mudde AN, de Vries H: **Intention to adopt a smoking cessation expert system within a self-selected sample of Dutch general practitioners**. *Eur J Cancer Prev* 2006, **15**:82–86.
- 48. Pankratz M, Hallfors D, Cho H: **Measuring perceptions of innovation adoption: the diffusion of a federal drug prevention policy**. *Health Educ Res* 2002, **17**:315–326.
- 49. Nelson ML, Shaw MJ: The adoption and diffusion of interorganizational system standards and process innovations. *Urbana* 2003, **51**:61801.
- 50. Skinner K: **Developing a tool to measure knowledge exchange outcomes**. *Can J Program Eval* 2007, **22**:49.
- 51. Landry R, Lamari M, Amara N: **The extent and determinants of the utilization of university research in government agencies**. *Public Adm Rev* 2003, **63**:192–205.
- 52. Chagnon F, Pouliot L, Malo C, Gervais M-J, Pigeon M-È: **Research article Comparison of determinants of research knowledge utilization by practitioners and administrators in the field of child and family social services**. *practice* 2010, **9**:19.
- 53. Chen H-C: Cross-cultural construct validation of the learning transfer system inventory in Taiwan. Marshall University; 2003.
- 54. McCormick LK, Steckler AB, McLeroy KR: **Diffusion of innovations in schools: a study of adoption and implementation of school-based tobacco prevention curricula**. *Am J Health Promot AJHP* 1995, **9**:210–219.
- 55. Carper MM, McHugh RK, Barlow DH: **The dissemination of computer-based psychological treatment: A preliminary analysis of patient and clinician perceptions**. *Adm Policy Ment Health Ment Health Serv Res* 2013, **40**:87–95.

- 56. Stamatakis KA, McQueen A, Filler C, Boland E, Dreisinger M, Brownson RC, Luke DA: Measurement properties of a novel survey to assess stages of organizational readiness for evidence-based interventions in community chronic disease prevention settings. *Implement Sci IS* 2012, **7**:65.
- 57. Champion VL, Leach A: Variables related to research utilization in nursing: An empirical investigation. *J Adv Nurs* 1989, **14**:705–710.
- 58. Steckler A, Goodman RM, McLeroy KR, Davis S, Koch G: **Measuring the diffusion of innovative health promotion programs**. *Am J Health Promot AJHP* 1992, **6**:214–224.
- 59. Henderson JL, MacKay S, Peterson-Badali M: Closing the research-practice gap: Factors affecting adoption and implementation of a children's mental health program. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol* 2006, **35**:2–12.
- 60. Weersing VR, Weisz JR, Donenberg GR: **Development of the therapy procedures checklist: A therapist-report measure of technique use in child and adolescent treatment**. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol* 2002, **31**:168–180.
- 61. Baumann BL, Kolko DJ, Collins K, Herschell AD: **Understanding practitioners'** characteristics and perspectives prior to the dissemination of an evidence-based intervention. *Child Abuse Negl* 2006, **30**:771–787.
- 62. Khazanchi D: Information technology (IT) appropriateness: the contingency theory of "fit" and IT implementation in small and medium enterprises. *J Comput Inf Syst* 2005, **45**:88–95.
- 63. Scott SD, Plotnikoff RC, Karunamuni N, Bize R, Rodgers W: Factors influencing the adoption of an innovation: An examination of the uptake of the Canadian Heart Health Kit (HHK). *Implement Sci* 2008, **3**:41.
- 64. Bloomquist ML, August GJ, Horowitz JL, Lee SS, Jensen C: **Moving from science to service: Transposing and sustaining the early risers prevention program in a community service system**. *J Prim Prev* 2008, **29**:307–321.
- 65. Nicoletti B: Chart audit: is your practice billing what it should? Fam Pract Manag 2009, **16**:15–19.
- 66. French MT, Bradley CJ, Calingaert B, Dennis ML, Karuntzos GT: **Cost analysis of training and employment services in methadone treatment**. *Evol Program Plan* 1994, **17**:107–120.
- 67. Allegri RF, Butman J, Arizaga RL, Machnicki G, Serrano C, Taragano FE, Sarasola D, Lon L: **Economic impact of dementia in developing countries: an evaluation of costs of Alzheimer-type dementia in Argentina**. *Int Psychogeriatr* 2007, **19**:705–718.
- 68. Saldana L, Chamberlain P, Bradford WD, Campbell M, Landsverk J: **The Cost of Implementing New Strategies (COINS): A method for mapping implementation resources using the Stages of Implementation Completion**. *Child Youth Serv Rev* 2014, **39**:177–182.

- 69. PAGES DE: Treatment Cost Analysis Tool (TCAT) Data Entry and Review Guide. .
- 70. Kashner TM, Stensland MD, Lind L, Wicker A, Rush AJ, Golden RM, Henley SS: Measuring use and cost of care for patients with mood disorders: the utilization and cost inventory. *Med Care* 2009, **47**:184–190.
- 71. Kashner TM, Rush AJ, Altshuler KZ: **Measuring costs of guideline-driven mental health care: the Texas Medication Algorithm Project**. *J Ment Health Policy Econ* 1999, **2**:111–121.
- 72. King H, Tallman K, Huberman: Assessment Tool for Potential Transfer. 2004.
- 73. Alonso F, Walsh CO, Salvador-Carulla L, others: **Methodology for the development of a taxonomy and toolkit to evaluate health-related habits and lifestyle (eVITAL)**. *BMC Res Notes* 2010, **3**:83.
- 74. Kobak KA, Stone WL, Ousley OY, Swanson A: **Web-based training in early autism screening: Results from a pilot study**. *Telemed E-Health* 2011, **17**:640–644.
- 75. Weeks G, Slade M, Hayward M: **A UK validation of the Stages of Recovery Instrument**. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 2010.
- 76. Slade M, Cahill S, Kelsey W, Powell R, Strathdee G, Valiakalayil A: Threshold 3: the feasibility of the Threshold Assessment Grid (TAG) for routine assessment of the severity of mental health problems. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol 2001, 36:516–521.
- 77. Trent LR: **Development of a Measure of Disseminability (MOD)**. University of Mississippi; 2010.
- 78. Hides L, Hides L, Lubman DI, Hides L, Lubman DI, Elkins K, Hides L, Lubman DI, Elkins K, Catania LS, others: **Feasibility and acceptability of a mental health screening tool and training programme in the youth alcohol and other drug (AOD) sector**. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2007, **26**:509–515.
- 79. Dimeff LA, Woodcock EA, Harned MS, Beadnell B: Can dialectical behavior therapy be learned in highly structured learning environments? Results from a randomized controlled dissemination trial. *Behav Ther* 2011, **42**:263–275.
- 80. Goodman RM, McLeroy KR, Steckler AB, Hoyle RH: **Development of level of institutionalization scales for health promotion programs**. *Health Educ Behav* 1993, **20**:161–178.
- 81. Stiles PG, Boothroyd RA, Snyder K, Zong X: **Service penetration by persons with severe mental illness: How should it be measured?** *J Behav Health Serv Res* 2002, **29**:198–207.
- 82. Aarons G: **EBP Sustaining Telephone Survey**. 2007.

- 83. Bond GR, Drake RE, Rapp CA, McHugo GJ, Xie H: **Individualization and quality improvement: two new scales to complement measurement of program fidelity**. *Adm Policy Ment Health Ment Health Serv Res* 2009, **36**:349–357.
- 84. Berliner L: Organization Checklist. .
- 85. Luke DA: The Program Sustainability Assessment Tool: a new instrument for public health programs. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2014, 11.
- 86. McIntosh K, MacKay LD, Hume AE, Doolittle J, Vincent CG, Horner RH, Ervin RA: **Development and initial validation of a measure to assess factors related to sustainability of school-wide positive behavior support**. *J Posit Behav Interv* 2011:1098300710385348.
- 87. Maher L, Gustafson, D., Evans, A: Sustainability and model guide. .
- 88. Chan KS, Hsu Y-J, Lubomski LH, Marsteller JA: Validity and usefulness of members reports of implementation progress in a quality improvement initiative: findings from the Team Check-up Tool (TCT). *Implement Sci* 2011, **6**:115.