

Additional File 2. Data input, tasks performed, and analysis output for MMCS Steps 5 through 9.

<i>MMCS step</i>	<i>Data input</i>	<i>Tasks performed</i>	<i>Analysis output</i>
5. Assessed sustainability per site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCM-coded interview data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generated CCM code summaries per site • Reached consensus on whether each site exhibited high, medium, or low sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment of high/medium/low sustainability level to each of the 9 sites: 3 high, 3 medium, and 3 low
6. Identified influencing factors per site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i-PARIHS-coded interview data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generated i-PARIHS code summaries per site, including descriptions of factors deemed relevant to each summary • Reached consensus on identified factors per site and a consolidated list of identified factors across all the sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of relevant factors for each of the 9 sites • List of 25 factors under the i-PARIHS domains of Innovation (6), Recipients (6), Context (8), and Facilitation (5)
7. Organized the assessed sustainability and identified factors per site into a sortable matrix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCM sustainability assessed per site • i-PARIHS-aligned factors identified per site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arranged the data into a matrix using Microsoft Excel: factors on rows, sustainability on columns, and sites on sheets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matrix of 25 rows (factors), 3 columns (sustainability), and 9 sheets (sites) that is sortable and filterable
8. Conducted within-site analysis of the matrixed data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each site-specific sheet of the matrix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examined the data on each factor per site • Reached consensus on whether the factor was present, somewhat present, or minimally present at the site • Reached consensus on whether the factor had an enabling, hindering, or neutral/unclear influence on sustainability at the site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation (and insertion into the matrix) of the presence and influence of each of the 25 factors for each of the 9 sites

<p>9. Conducted cross-site analysis of the matrixed data</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Matrix with presence and influence specification for each factor per site, with the sheets (sites) ordered by sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessed whether factors and their combinations were (i) present across multiple sites, (ii) consistently associated with higher or lower sustainability, and (iii) emphasized at some sites more than others Regarded a factor or a combination of factors as being associated with high/medium/low sustainability if it was identified at a majority (i.e., even if not all) of the sites designated as high/medium/low sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11 factors (and no combinations of factors' presence and influence) identified for at least 2 sites within a group of high/medium/low sustainability sites, under the i-PARIHS domains of Innovation (1), Recipients (4), Context (4), and Facilitation (2)
---	--	---	---

CCM: Collaborative Chronic Care Model

i-PARIHS: Integrated Promoting Action on Research Implementation in Health Services

MMCS: Matrixed Multiple Case Study