

Implementation Models, Theories & Frameworks

Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR)

The Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) explores the multi-dimensional factors influencing successful implementation of evidence-based interventions in healthcare and other contexts.

Type

Determinant Framework

Purpose

The CFIR provides a comprehensive structure to systematically identify and evaluate barriers and facilitators to successful implementation, ensuring that interventions are adapted effectively to different contexts.

This model acts as a meta-theoretical framework that integrates various implementation-related constructs. It offers a standardised language and taxonomy for discussing various influences on implementation.

Elements

- Intervention Characteristics
- Outer Setting
- Inner Setting
- Characteristics of Individuals Involved
- Process of Implementation

Use with

Theoretical Domains Framework*

Behaviour Change Wheel*

CFIR-ERIC: matching tool to link barriers to evidence-based implementation strategies (note: CFIR 2.0 doesn't 'fit' as well)

EPIS model (Exploration, Preparation, Implementation, Sustainment)

Normalization Process Theory (NPT)

* Note: The TDF and Behaviour Change Wheel can be used 'within' the elements of the CFIR for tailored – and more descriptive – intervention design.

Strengths and Limitations

STRENGTHS

- Supports a comprehensive and structured assessment of implementation determinants.
- Provides clarity and depth for planning and evaluation processes.
- Can be integrated with other frameworks, such as EPIS and NPT, to enhance contextual understanding.
- Enables tailored approaches suited to complex and varied implementation settings.

LIMITATIONS

- Can be complex and challenging to apply, especially in time- or resource-limited settings.
- May be difficult to use for rapid planning and implementation.
- Lacks specificity for certain interventions or unique contexts, which can limit its applicability.

See it in practice



[Exploring the barriers and enablers to high quality clinical placements in physiotherapy at a metropolitan teaching hospital using an implementation science approach. \(Hargreaves et al., 2023\).](#)



[Applying the consolidated framework for implementation research to identify barriers affecting implementation of an online frailty tool into primary health care: a qualitative study. \(Warner et al., 2018\).](#)



[Implementation science in nutrition practice: a review of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research \(Sivakumar et al., 2025\).](#)

Find out more



[A Guide to Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research \(CFIR\), Dr Jack Bell](#)



<https://cfirguide.org/>



[CFIR-ERIC Matching Tool – Helps ‘Match’ Strategies to Barriers Identified using the CFIR](#)



[Choosing Implementation Strategies to Address Contextual Barriers: Diversity in Recommendations and Future Directions](#)



[Fostering Implementation of Health Services Research Findings into Practice: A Consolidated Framework for Advancing Implementation Science](#)



[The CFIR Card Game: A New Approach for Working with Implementation Teams to Identify Challenges and Strategies](#)

References

Abrahamson, K., DeCrane, S., Mueller, C., Davila, H., & Arling, G. (2015). Implementation of a nursing home quality improvement project to reduce resident pain. *Journal of Nursing Care Quality*, 30(3), 261-268.

<https://doi.org/10.1097/ncq.0000000000000099>

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.

Implementation Science, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-50>

Damschroder, L., Reardon, C., Widerquist, M., & Lowery, J. (2022). The updated consolidated framework for implementation research based on user feedback. *Implementation Science*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-022-01245-0>

Fontaine, G., Poitras, M., Sasseville, M., Pomey, M., Ouellet, J., Brahim, L., ... & Lambert, S. (2024). Barriers and enablers to the implementation of patient-reported outcome and experience measures (proms/prems): protocol for an umbrella review. *Systematic Reviews*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-024-02512-5>

Keith, R., Crosson, J., O'Malley, A., Crompt, D., & Taylor, E. (2017). Using the consolidated framework for implementation research (cfir) to produce actionable findings: a rapid-cycle evaluation approach to improving implementation. *Implementation Science*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0550-7>

Nilsén, P. (2015). Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. *Implementation Science*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-015-0242-0>

Norton, A. and Tappis, H. (2024). Sexual and reproductive health implementation research in humanitarian contexts: a scoping review. *Reproductive Health*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-024-01793-2>

Rangachari, P., Mushiana, S., & Herbert, K. (2022). A scoping review of applications of the consolidated framework for implementation research (cfir) to telehealth service implementation initiatives. *BMC Health Services Research*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-08871-w>

Skolarus, T., Lehmann, T., Tabak, R., Harris, J., Lecy, J., & Sales, A. (2017). Assessing citation networks for dissemination and implementation research frameworks. *Implementation Science*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0628-2>