



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

A theoretically-informed process evaluation in parallel to a feasibility study of a complex oral health intervention using NICE guidelines in a care home setting

Brocklehurst, P., Langley, J., Wassell, R., Daniyal, S., Syed, S. S., Harvey, M., Goulden, N., Sherriff, A., Heilmann, A., Hoare, Z., Smith, C., Watt, R., O'Neill, C., Kee, F., McKenna, G., & Tsakos, G. (2025). A theoretically-informed process evaluation in parallel to a feasibility study of a complex oral health intervention using NICE guidelines in a care home setting. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdoe.13016>

Published in:

Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2025 the authors.

This is an open access article published under a Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy








The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Open Access

This research has been made openly available by Queen's academics and its Open Research team. We would love to hear how access to this research benefits you. – Share your feedback with us: <http://go.qub.ac.uk/oa-feedback>

ORIGINAL ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

A Theoretically Informed Process Evaluation in Parallel to a Feasibility Study of a Complex Oral Health Intervention Using NICE Guidelines in a Care Home Setting

Paul Brocklehurst¹  | Joe Langley²  | Rebecca Wassall³  | Sana Daniyal⁴ | Saif Sayeed Syed⁴  | Michelle Harvey⁵ | Nia Goulden⁶ | Andrea Sherriff⁷ | Anja Heilmann⁴ | Zoe Hoare⁶ | Craig Smith⁸  | Richard Watt⁴ | Ciaran O'Neill⁵ | Frank Kee⁵ | Peter Cairns⁹ | Nat Lievesley⁹ | Gerald McKenna⁵  | Georgios Tsakos⁴ 

¹Public Health Wales, Cardiff, UK | ²Lab4Living, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK | ³School of Dental Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK | ⁴Institute of Epidemiology & Health Care, University College London, London, UK | ⁵Centre for Public Health, Queens University Belfast, Belfast, UK | ⁶North Wales Medical School, Bangor University, Bangor, UK | ⁷School of Medicine, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK | ⁸Division of Cardiovascular Sciences, University of Manchester, UK | ⁹PPI Contributor, UK

Correspondence: Paul Brocklehurst (p.brocklehurst@bangor.ac.uk)

Received: 3 April 2024 | **Revised:** 25 September 2024 | **Accepted:** 21 October 2024

Funding: This work was supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research.

Keywords: care home | oral health | process evaluation | reflexive workshop | systems lens

ABSTRACT

Background: A theoretically informed process evaluation was undertaken in parallel to a study examining the feasibility of an oral health intervention based on an existing guideline for care homes. The objectives were to explore the factors that influenced the implementation of the intervention in order to understand the potential pathway to impact. The research team initially utilised Pfadenhauer et al.'s framework, which focuses on a number of different implementation factors: intervention characteristics, context, theory, process, strategy, agents, outcomes and setting.

Methods: Nine semi-structured interviews were undertaken with care home managers and staff, predominantly within the intervention arm of the study. Interview schedules were originally based on Pfadenhauer et al.'s framework. These were coded and analysed using thematic analysis. Given the range of themes that emerged, the research team ran a reflexive workshop to determine whether Pfadenhauer et al.'s framework was able to capture and frame the authentic voice of those interviewed.

Results: The research team found that a systems lens approach better fitted the data from the interviews, capturing the idiosyncrasy of the different settings and the importance of values and beliefs of the key stakeholders. It was clear that unlike the structure proposed by Pfadenhauer et al., many of the factors were interdependent and hierarchical in nature, that is, paradigm and goals within the care home had a direct impact on the system structure, which fed into how the care home was maintained, which led onto how the different actors behaved (care home managers and staff). The process also highlighted key factors for intervention delivery: time poverty, competing needs, staff turnover, differences between shift patterns and between permanent and agency staff. Cognitive capacity of the residents and staff attitudes were also key.

Conclusions: Adding a reflexive workshop enabled the research to critically review the Pfadenhauer et al.'s framework and change to a systems lens approach, which better explained the interdependent and hierarchical nature of the findings. It also highlighted a number of key factors that could influence the pathway to impact for the intervention.

Trial Registration: ISRCTN10276613

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2025 The Author(s). *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

1 | Background

Oral health in care homes is poor, with residents experiencing two to three times the level of dental disease when compared to their community-dwelling peers ([1]). The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines 'Oral health for adults in care homes (NG48)' were issued in 2016 with the aim to maintain and improve the oral health of care home residents [2]. However, the available literature to inform the guidelines was relatively sparse, with few empirical studies [2]. Equally, the NG48 recommendations only had a limited number of concrete actions that could be utilised by care home staff. As a result, a feasibility study entitled 'Improving the Oral Health of Older People In Care Homes (TOPIC)' was undertaken to determine whether a definitive randomised controlled trial was potentially possible [1]. TOPIC was a pragmatic cluster randomised feasibility study with a 12-month follow-up that was undertaken in 21 care homes across two sites (11 in London, 10 in Northern Ireland). Care homes randomised to the intervention arm received a complex intervention based on the NG48 guidelines, which had been subsequently refined using a 'codesign' method with care home managers and staff [3]. The intervention was composed of a training package for care home staff to promote knowledge and skills in oral health promotion, the use of an adapted Oral Health Assessment Tool to assess oral health needs of the residents, a Personal Oral Care Plan, a weekly Oral Hygiene Record and a 'support worker assisted' daily toothbrushing regime with toothpaste containing 1500 ppm fluoride. Care homes in the control arm were to continue according to their usual routine, so did not receive any of the intervention materials.

In parallel to the feasibility study, a theoretically informed process evaluation was undertaken to explore the context and the types of factors that could impact implementation. The importance of accounting for the setting has recently been advocated by the Medical Research Council, who argue that context and practice should be considered equally important components in the implementation of evidence-based interventions [4]. In this sense, organisation features, resources, the nature and quality of leadership, the prevailing culture and the communication systems within a given setting are all key [5, 6].

This paper describes an approach that started with the use of the Pfadenhauer et al. [6] framework to address the objective of the study to 'undertake a parallel process evaluation to explore how the intervention could be embedded in standard practice' [1]. However, after reviewing the data and running a reflexive workshop, our approach was adapted in light of the emerging themes to adopt a systems lens approach. Pfadenhauer et al. [6] is a framework that focuses attention on the following aspects of implementation: intervention characteristics, context, implementation theory, implementation process, implementation strategy, implementation agents, implementation outcomes and setting. Systems lens approaches hold a more reflexive and pluralistic view of knowledge mobilisation, which argues for an understanding of how this knowledge moves around systems and how it is constrained or gains legitimacy via system structures, actors, resources and the dynamics therein [5]. It also places

elements within a hierarchy, where the explicit or implicit beliefs that make a system work ('paradigm') are seen as most important and impact on the aim and purpose of the system ('goal'). This in turn acts upon the regulation and organisation of the system ('system structure') to maintain the status quo ('feedback') and the stakeholders and physical resources that form the discrete parts of the system ('system elements') [5]. The aim of this paper was to present the main findings of the process evaluation and how the research team used the reflexive workshop to restructure the approach taken.

2 | Methodology

The study received ethical approval from the London City & East Research Ethics Committee (19/LO/1107). To inform the process evaluation, the research team initially drew up a set of questions related to the key findings from the intervention refinement phase [3], which were then mapped onto the Pfadenhauer et al. [6] framework (Table 1). The process evaluation was undertaken during the active phase of the feasibility study (12 months).

The data collection for the process evaluation started with members of the research team (SD, SSS and MH) approaching care home staff in both the intervention and control groups, ahead of undertaking the interviews. In accordance with a process evaluation aimed at understanding the factors that could influence the implementation of the intervention, all participating care homes engaging in the intervention group were approached, including care home managers and staff (although the latter were often too busy to be interviewed). Residents were also approached but most declined to participate and the one interview that proceeded highlighted how levels of cognitive impairment impacted on the understanding of the intervention. A number of care homes in the control arm were also approached for interviews to identify any further factors that may be pertinent to the context of providing care. Those potentially interested in taking part were provided with a Participant Information Sheet and were given 48 h to decide whether they wished to take part. The types of stakeholders that were interviewed for the study are provided in Table 2.

The semi-structured interviews lasted between 30 and 60 min and were digitally recorded. Participants were provided with the option to have the interview conducted in person at the care home, by telephone or using a digital platform. The interviews were guided by a schedule based originally on the Pfadenhauer et al. framework, focusing on the following factors: intervention characteristics, context, theory, process, strategy, agents, outcomes and setting. Given the COVID pandemic, all the care home staff requested a remotely held interview via Teams. As such, the research team utilised the transcription function of Teams to provide MS Word documents. Interviews were then analysed and mapped into the theoretically informed framework for the process evaluation using a thematic approach.

To conduct the analysis of the interviews, three members of the research team (SD, SSS and MH) immersed themselves in the data by initially reading and re-reading the transcriptions. This process was overseen by PRB and subjectivity was reduced as far as possible through reflexivity and the use of multiple coders

TABLE 1 | Interview questions mapped onto Pfadenhauer *et al.*, [6] framework.

| Domain in Pfadenhauer et al. | Detailed question |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Intervention characteristics | How important is oral health in a care home setting? |
| | What did you think to the Oral Health Assessment Tool? |
| | Anything in the intervention that you would modify, add or remove? |
| | Any tensions between the intervention and what the residents' personal preferences were? |
| Context | Any competing needs with other care requirements? |
| | Did the staff have the time to deliver the intervention fully? |
| | Did your staff feel confident in using the materials? |
| | What do you think of the care home staff training package? Was it appropriate? Anything that you would change or modify? |
| | Did you have to change the intervention in any way to accommodate the resident's changing cognitive ability/needs? Was the intervention flexible enough? |
| | Any refusal behaviours? How did the staff manage these? |
| Implementation theory | Any dangers to staff when implementing the intervention (e.g., as a result of refusals)? |
| | Any coping strategies that the staff had to use when things didn't work? |
| | We designed the intervention with care home staff, did this help? What were your thoughts about the intervention? |
| Implementation process | Do you think the intervention met the needs of the residents? |
| | Do you think you have enough resources, such as staff or time to implement and maintain this intervention? Would you like to have more support? |
| | Did your staff feel confident in using the materials? |
| | What do you think of the care home staff training package? Was it appropriate? Anything that you would change or modify? |
| Implementation strategy | Questioned above |
| Implementation agents | What did you think to the Oral Health Assessment Tool? |
| | Anything in the intervention that you would modify, add or remove (Personal Oral Care Plan, Weekly Oral Hygiene Record, Tips and Tricks, Oral Health Poster)? |
| | Any tensions between the intervention and what the residents' personal preferences were? |
| | Did the staff have the time to deliver the intervention fully? |
| | Any competing needs with other care requirements? |
| | Did you have to change the intervention in any way to accommodate the resident's changing cognitive ability/needs? Was the intervention flexible enough? |
| Implementation outcomes | Did involvement in TOPIC cause any difficulties or problems in the general day-to-day running of your home? |
| | Thinking about your home's involvement in the TOPIC study was the experience positive? Can you give me an example? |
| | Anything negative? |
| | How did the staff cope with the form filling? Any difficulties completing the weekly checklists and OIDsPs? |
| Setting | Questioned above |

(SD, SSH, MH and PRB). Quotes were then compared with the theoretical framework and recorded in an Excel document, that acted as a master file. It was determined in advance that the interviews would continue until saturation had been reached [7].

This was assessed by PRB, when no new information was generated from the interviews deductively and when no further additional themes/codes were elicited inductively that were not initially within the Pfaednhauer et al. framework.

TABLE 2 | Participants that were interviewed for the process evaluation.

| # | Stakeholder role | Geographic location |
|---|--|---------------------|
| 1 | Care home manager (intervention group) | London |
| 2 | Care home manager (intervention group) | London |
| 3 | Care home manager (intervention group) | London |
| 4 | Care home manager (control group) | London |
| 5 | Care home staff (intervention group) | London |
| 6 | Care home staff (control group) | London |
| 7 | Care home resident (control group) | London |
| 8 | Care home manager (intervention group) | Northern Ireland |
| 9 | Care home manager (intervention group) | Northern Ireland |

Towards the end of the process evaluation, members of the research team (GT, PRB, JL, RRRW, SSS, SA and MH) undertook a reflexive workshop to review the findings and the applicability of the Pfadenhauer et al. [6] framework for a care home setting. Data were collected to understand the experience of the researchers in undertaking the interviews. At the workshop, the following factors were explored:

1. Appropriateness of the questions and whether the collected data reflected what they were sensing and experiencing from working in the care homes; and
2. Identification of any key aspects of the findings that were not easily mapped into the Pfadenhauer et al. [6] framework

The findings from the interviews and the workshop led the research team to reconsider the usefulness of the Pfadenhauer et al. [6] framework. As such, the interviews and workshop findings were combined and analysed using a hierarchical system lens approach to produce a 'meta' and more reflexive view of the narrative [5].

3 | Results

Care home managers and care home staff from six different care homes in the intervention arm were interviewed, along with three of the 11 care homes that were allocated to the control arm. Time pressures during the study period (which coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic) meant that no other care homes were able to participate in the interviews.

As highlighted above, the coding of the transcripts initially followed the framework from Pfadenhauer et al. [6], however, what

became apparent when reviewing the data was that the framework was not describing the key phenomena that were emerging. Focusing on the intervention characteristics, context, implementation theories, processes, strategies, agents, outcomes and settings, did not account for how these were often interdependent in care homes and how they acted upon another in a hierarchical manner. For example, key stakeholders were able to influence the delivery of the intervention in substantive ways. In many homes, this was the care home manager, but it could also be a member of staff who had a real interest in oral health. Following the reflexive workshop, where these issues were surfaced we changed our framework to a system lens approach and recoded accordingly.

The findings are presented according to the key leverage points in the hierarchical system lens approach, which formed the new framework for the elicited codes (Table 3). Interview and workshop quotes are prefaced with 'I' and 'W' respectively. Further detail is available in the [Supporting File](#).

3.1 | Paradigm and Goals

All the care home managers interviewed expressed a strong desire to participate in the study, particularly as access to local dental services was difficult.

There's more coming in with their own teeth [AND] their own teeth are in such a state. Sometimes it's only plaque that's holding the teeth together I:8.14

Equally, participation in the study appeared to have a marked impact on the reported daily routines for care home staff.

We knew that they weren't really brushing their teeth as often as they said. So now they're really on board and they point out to you after breakfast, I'm away to brush my teeth now I:8.40

(care home manager)

3.2 | System Structure

The manner of adoption of the study appeared to be relatively idiosyncratic and the organisation and the efficiency of processes within each home were very different.

They're so different in their structure. The context impacts whether the intervention works and how they respond to it W:2,887

(researcher 3)

Equally, certain features of the care home were seen to be more important than others. One key element here was the position and personality of the person in charge of dealing with the TOPIC study at the home.

It's just really the personality of the manager. If you have a really good, enthusiastic manager, that's it W:720

(researcher 3)

TABLE 3 | System lens applied to interviews and workshop data.

| Leverage points | Description | Codes from interviews and workshops | Explanation of codes |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Paradigm and goals | Values and explicit/implicit beliefs that makes the system work and aims to deliver to this system mindset | Desire to improve oral health and participate in an oral health intervention | Importance of oral health and oral health routine |
| System structure | Elements that make up the system (subsystems, actors, elements and their interconnections) | Idiosyncrasy of care homes | Care homes are highly variable (e.g., values, beliefs and structures) |
| | | Position and personality of the person running TOPIC | Authority, personality and drive of the person responsible for delivering the intervention in the care home |
| | | Time poverty | Lack of time of care home staff to deliver the intervention |
| | | Competing needs | The additional burden of providing an oral health routine in a busy care home |
| | | Different shift patterns | Influence of different shift patterns on the culture and preparedness to provide an oral health routine |
| | | Staff turnover | The impact of regular staff turnover on maintaining continuity of an oral health routine |
| | | Permanent and agency staff | The impact of using agency staff and the loss of knowledge from the system |
| Feedback | System regulation and organisation to maintain stability and status quo (e.g., through power and roles) | Excessive paperwork | Documenting activity and the additional burden of recording the details of an oral health routine |
| | | Rhythm and processes | Importance of aligning any new oral health regime with the existing rhythm and processes of the care home |
| | | Challenge of training | The importance of training in establishing a minimum level of knowledge to support an oral health routine |
| Structural elements | Stakeholders and physical resources that form the discrete parts of the system | Intervention acceptability | How well the intervention was received by the resident |
| | | Cognitive capacity of the resident | The influence of cognitive capacity on the oral health routine |
| | | Staff attitudes and confidence | Attitudes towards the oral health routine and confidence in determining the difference between oral health and disease |
| | | Intervention components | Details of the different components of the oral health routine |

Junior care home staff would struggle to make it happen because they're not high enough in the hierarchy in that particular care home.... W:2,936

(researcher 1)

These people are so over worked. They are very well motivated. They want to do the study. It's just they don't have the time to do that W:320

(researcher 1)

Time poverty was raised as a significant issue in the workshop and in the interviews.

Competing needs was another factor raised in the interviews, with care home staff prioritising one task over another due to

time poverty and the fluctuating care needs of the residents. The new oral health routine was an additional task in an already busy schedule, and this was exacerbated further in homes with a higher proportion of residents requiring nursing care.

So, they are more happy to give someone a shower and give them breakfast and forget about those other bits, yeah I:1.862

(care home manager)

Differences between shift patterns, shaped by the routines within the care home was also raised in the interviews and the workshop.

It's done in the morning. They wake them up, take them to the bathroom, change them, wash them....
....at night it's not the same W:1,860

(researcher 1)

Staff turnover was an important factor raised in both the interviews and the workshop.

Every week we have new team members I:5.292

(care home manager)

Equally, there appeared to be a difference in how permanent and agency staff responded to the study in a number of homes.

Staff wise....it really affected us greatly because when we started most of the team members that we have were agency I:5.292

(care home manager)

3.3 | Feedback

One key element that arose at this level was the issue of excessive paperwork and some of those interviewed felt that this should have been integrated more with the residents' Care Plans.

It's just the paperwork. Because in their mind. The last thing they're thinking of is to fill up to do paperwork I:6.651

(care home staff)

Equally, many of those interviewed expressed the importance of integrating anything new, like an oral health routine, into the existing rhythm and processes of the care home.

But if I was doing it today, I would actually make sure the forms were in their bedroom, because that's where everything takes [place] I:9.176

(care home manager)

Care home managers often cited the challenge of training in a care home environment, which was exacerbated by the level of staff turnover.

I've managed services before. It is quite difficult. Because you've got to have the knowledge yourself to share that knowledge I:1.106

(care home manager)

3.4 | Structural Elements

Most residents appeared to receive the intervention well, but the relationship with the care staff appeared key.

It's about getting to know your resident, what works, what doesn't work I:1.1,512

(care home manager)

The cognitive capacity of the resident was also viewed as important.

And as much as I want to be able to communicate....
....every senior is challenging I:5.470

(care home manager)

In the reflexive workshop, cognitive capacity was also reported to fluctuate over the course of the study, which could impact on communication and make it very difficult at times to collect the research data.

The cognitive impairment had got worse. And then we're asking questions. It's so difficult for them to understand and answer W:1,972

(researcher 1)

Staff attitudes also varied and not all wanted to participate in an intervention to improve oral health.

There are quite a few [staff] that don't wanna take part. I'll be honest with you. I'm the only one I:2.1162

(care home staff)

Staff felt that the Oral Health Assessment Tool was helpful as it raised the awareness of oral health within the care home.

I'm getting to understand who actually brushes their own teeth. Who's having a challenge with it? 1.138

(care home manager)

4 | Discussion

The findings of the process evaluation highlighted the complexity of introducing an oral health intervention in a care home setting. The organisation and the efficiency of processes within each home were very different. Time poverty was a significant issue and competing needs were another factor that was seen as important. Staff turnover and the differences between different shift patterns were seen as influential, as was the difference in how permanent and agency staff responded to the intervention. Finally, the cognitive capacity of the

3. J. Langley, R. Wassall, A. Geddis-Regan, et al., "Putting Guidelines Into Practice: Using Co-Design to Develop a Complex Intervention Based on NG48 to Enable Care Staff to Provide Daily Oral Care to Older People Living in Care Homes," *Gerodontology* 40, no. 1 (2023): 112–126.
4. K. Skivington, L. Matthews, S. A. Simpson, et al., "Framework for the Development and Evaluation of Complex Interventions: Gap Analysis, Workshop and Consultation-Informed Update," *Health Technology Assessment* 25, no. 57 (2021): 1–132, <https://doi.org/10.3310/hta25570>.
5. A. Haynes, L. Rychetnik, D. Finegood, M. Irving, L. Freebairn, and P. Hawe, "Applying Systems Thinking to Knowledge Mobilisation in Public Health," *Health Research Policy and Systems* 18, no. 1 (2020): 1–9.
6. L. Pfadenhauer, A. Gerhardus, K. Mozygemba, et al., "Making Sense of Complexity in Context and Implementation: The Context and Implementation of Complex Interventions (CICI) Framework," *Implementation Science* 12 (2017): 21.
7. V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3 (2006): 77–101.
8. E. McGill, D. Marks, V. Er, T. Penney, M. Petticrew, and M. Egan, "Qualitative Process Evaluation From a Complex Systems Perspective: A Systematic Review and Framework for Public Health Evaluators," *PLoS Medicine* 17, no. 11 (2020): e1003368, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003368>.
9. I. G. Johnson, M. Z. Morgan, and R. J. Jones, "Oral Care, Loss of Personal Identity and Dignity in Residential Care Homes," *Gerodontology* 40 (2022): 200–206.
10. R. Patel, C. Robertson, and J. E. Gallagher, "Collaborating for Oral Health in Support of Vulnerable Older People: Co-Production of Oral Health Training in Care Homes," *Journal of Public Health* 41, no. 1 (2019): 164–169.
11. R. Patel, R. Fitzgerald, F. Warburton, C. Robertson, N. B. Pitts, and J. E. Gallagher, "Refocusing Dental Care: A Risk-Based Preventative Oral Health Programme for Dentate Older People in UK Care Homes," *Gerodontology* 39, no. 2 (2022): 131–138.
12. K. Paddock, C. Brown Wilson, C. Walshe, and C. Todd, "Care Home Life and Identity: A Qualitative Case Study," *Gerontologist* 59, no. 4 (2019): 655–664.
13. L. Warren, J. E. Kettle, B. J. Gibson, A. Walls, and P. G. Robinson, "I've Got Lots of Gaps, but I Want to Hang on to the Ones That I Have': The Age-Ing Body, Oral Health and Stories of the Mouth," *Ageing and Society* 40, no. 6 (2020): 1244–1266.
14. S. Allan and F. Vadean, "The Association Between Staff Retention and English Care Home Quality," *Journal of Aging & Social Policy* 33, no. 6 (2021): 708–724.
15. M. Calvo and M. Sclater, "Creating Spaces for Collaboration in Community Co-Design," *International Journal of art & Design Education* 40, no. 1 (2021): 232–250.
16. J. Gabbay and A. le May, "Mindlines: Making Sense of Evidence in Practice," *British Journal of General Practice* 66, no. 649 (2016): 402–403.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section.