RAMESES II

Section	Pages in report
Title In the title, identify the document as a realist evaluation	Identified as implementation science (title page) (no page numbers, per NIHR reporting guidelines)
Abstract Journal articles will usually require an abstract, while reports and other forms of publication will usually benefit from a short summary. The abstract or summary should include brief details on: the policy, programme or initiative under evaluation; programme setting; purpose of the evaluation; evaluation question(s) and/or objective(s); evaluation strategy; data collection, documentation and analysis methods; key findings and conclusions Where journals require it and the nature of the study is appropriate, brief details of respondents to the evaluation and recruitment and sampling processes may also be included Sufficient detail should be provided to identify that a realist approach was used and that realist programme theory was developed and/or refined	Abstract (no page numbers, per NIHR reporting guidelines)
INTRODUCTION	
Rationale for evaluation Explain the purpose of the evaluation and the implications for its focus and design	Section 1.1.5, page 22
Programme theory Describe the initial programme theory (or theories) that underpin the programme, policy or initiative	No initial programme theory.
Evaluation questions, objectives and focus State the evaluation question(s) and specify the objectives for the evaluation. Describe whether and how the programme theory was used to define the scope and focus of the evaluation	Section 1.3, page 25.
Ethical approval State whether the realist evaluation required and has gained ethical approval from the relevant authorities, providing details as appropriate. If ethical approval was deemed unnecessary, explain why	Section 2.8, page 45.
METHODS Rationale for using realist evaluation Explain why a realist evaluation approach was chosen and (if relevant) adapted	Implementation science provided as rational. Section 2.1, page 26.
Environment surrounding the evaluation	Section 1.1,

Describe the environment in which the evaluation took place	pages 19-22. Section 1.2.3. page 23, Section 2.4.1, page 29.
Describe the programme policy, initiative or product evaluated. Provide relevant details on the programme, policy or initiative evaluated	Section 1.2, pages 22-23
Describe and justify the evaluation design A description and justification of the evaluation design (i.e. the account of what was planned, done and why) should be included, at least in summary form or as an appendix, in the document which presents the main findings. If this is not done, the omission should be justified and a reference or link to the evaluation design given. It may also be useful to publish or make freely available (e.g. online on a website) any original evaluation design document or protocol, where they exist	Chapter 2. pages 26-45.
Data collection methods Describe and justify the data collection methods – which ones were used, why and how they fed into developing, supporting, refuting or refining programme theory. Provide details of the steps taken to enhance the trustworthiness of data collection and documentation	Chapter 2. pages 26-45.
Recruitment process and sampling strategy Describe how respondents to the evaluation were recruited or engaged and how the sample contributed to the development, support, refutation or refinement of programme theory	Section 2.4.1, pages 28-29.
Data analysis Describe in detail how data were analysed. This section should include information on the constructs that were identified, the process of analysis, how the programme theory was further developed, supported, refuted and refined, and (where relevant) how analysis changed as the evaluation unfolded	Section 2.5.1, pages 36-37.