

MIDOCEAN UNIVERSITY

College of Management

Master of Health Administration (MHA)

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

**Implementing Precision Medicine in Healthcare Systems:
Organizational Readiness, Governance, and Operational Challenges**

Prepared by: Almokhtar Aljarodi

Student ID: 253001640

Supervisors: Prof. Alfaisal Abdelhameed Mohamed

Prof. Fayez Ali Jrad

Academic Year: 2025-2026

1. Introduction

Precision medicine proceeds from a well-established clinical insight: patients differ from one another in genetically and biologically meaningful ways, and those differences should inform how they are diagnosed and treated. For most of medical history, this insight could not be systematically acted upon at scale. That changed when genomic sequencing became affordable, computational capacity expanded, and large-scale health data systems became capable of storing and linking molecular and clinical information. Sequencing costs fell from several billion dollars per genome at the turn of the century to under one thousand dollars by the early 2020s, and the pharmacogenomic evidence base now covers hundreds of clinically documented drug-gene interactions.

These scientific developments gave rise to a wave of national precision medicine programs from the mid-2010s onward. The United States Precision Medicine Initiative, launched in 2015, was the most prominent of these and prompted comparable commitments from the United Kingdom, Finland, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia, among others. In the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) region, precision medicine has been embedded in publicly documented national health transformation strategies. Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030 and its associated Health Sector Transformation Program identify personalized medicine and genomic capability as stated strategic priorities for a modernized, patient-centered health system.

The scientific case for this direction is well supported. The organizational case, however, has not been built with the same rigor. Bringing precision medicine into routine clinical practice requires changes that go well beyond laboratory capability: governance structures must be established or redesigned, clinical workflows rebuilt, information systems upgraded, workforces retrained, financing models adapted, and ethical frameworks developed. These are not technical problems in the first instance. They are administrative and managerial ones, and they fall directly within the domain of health systems management.

The scholarly literature has been slow to engage with these challenges as such. Most published work on precision medicine implementation approaches the subject from a clinical or biomedical angle, and the management perspective remains comparatively underdeveloped. Healthcare

administrators in the GCC who are being asked to lead implementation programs under national mandates have access to a growing body of scientific literature but relatively little in the way of management-oriented guidance. The present study responds to that gap. Through a structured scoping review of the global implementation literature, it aims to synthesize what is known about the organizational conditions that support or hinder precision medicine adoption, and to translate that synthesis into a preliminary Implementation Readiness Framework for health system leaders.

2. Problem Statement

Despite substantial and sustained global investment in precision medicine infrastructure, healthcare systems have broadly struggled to integrate genomic capabilities into routine clinical operations at scale. Manolio et al. (2019) observed that the transition from genomic research capability to routine clinical use remains incomplete in most settings, even in well-resourced health systems. The scientific tools exist. The organizational conditions to deploy them reliably do not, in most cases.

What makes this gap persistent is that implementation is organizationally complex in a specific way: it involves multiple interdependent domains simultaneously. A hospital can upgrade its genomic laboratory but see results go unused if clinicians lack the genomic literacy to act on them. It can train its clinicians but find that decision support tools are absent, leaving knowledge that cannot reach the point of care. It can install decision support tools but find that governance structures are unclear, making nobody accountable for how those tools are maintained or validated. Progress in one domain is routinely undermined by neglect in another.

The existing literature does not address this adequately from a management perspective. Clinical journals tend to treat implementation as secondary to efficacy; implementation science journals apply general adoption frameworks not originally designed for precision medicine's specific organizational demands; and health management scholarship has engaged with the topic only marginally. A synthesis through the lens of organizational readiness, one built for the administrators and executives who bear direct responsibility for making implementation work, remains limited in the published literature. Without such guidance, organizations are left to make consequential resource allocation decisions without structured support, and the result is fragmented investment and delayed benefit to patients.

In the GCC context, this problem takes on additional dimensions. National transformation programs in Saudi Arabia and neighboring states have placed precision medicine on the strategic agenda, but the organizational conditions required for delivery remain poorly understood in this setting, and relatively little published guidance addresses what readiness looks like for GCC health systems specifically. Based on publicly available documentation, the governance environments, workforce profiles, financing structures, and cultural and ethical contexts of these

systems appear to differ sufficiently from the Western settings that dominate the implementation literature to warrant deliberate attention. The study aims to produce guidance that is grounded in global evidence and interpreted with GCC organizational conditions in view, while recognizing that direct local validation would require a separate primary research phase.

3. Significance of the Study

3.1 Scientific and Academic Significance

The primary academic contribution of this study is a structured synthesis of the precision medicine implementation literature from a management and organizational perspective. Existing reviews in this area tend to be disease-specific, clinically framed, or methodologically narrow; a clearly operational, management-oriented readiness synthesis that maps organizational requirements across governance, workforce, digital infrastructure, clinical workflow, finance, and equity dimensions was not identified in the literature reviewed for this study. The present review addresses that apparent gap using a transparent, reproducible scoping review methodology following Arksey and O'Malley (2005), Levac et al. (2010), Peters et al. (2020), and PRISMA-ScR reporting guidelines (Tricco et al., 2018).

The preliminary Implementation Readiness Framework produced through the synthesis will offer a conceptual model that can serve as the basis for subsequent empirical research, including quantitative validation studies, organizational assessment instruments, and comparative case analyses across health systems. The review also demonstrates how three established frameworks from organizational and implementation science can be integrated to address a problem that none of them was individually designed for.

3.2 Practical and Managerial Significance

On the practical side, the intended output is a tool that health administrators can engage with directly. The proposed framework will enable an organization to assess its current position across the identified readiness domains, identify priority investment areas, and sequence implementation activities in a way grounded in published evidence. A structured readiness assessment instrument of this kind, tailored to the organizational and administrative dimensions of precision medicine, was not identified in the literature reviewed for this study.

For the Saudi healthcare system specifically, the practical relevance is direct. Vision 2030's health priorities include personalized medicine, and administrators responsible for delivering on that agenda appear to have limited access to management-oriented implementation guidance adapted to their context. A framework that draws on global implementation evidence and interprets findings in light of GCC health system structures, governance arrangements, and

ethical contexts would offer a useful evidence-informed starting point for planning and assessment, pending empirical validation in the local setting.

4. Objectives of the Study

1. To map and synthesize the published and grey literature on organizational, governance, and operational dimensions of precision medicine implementation in healthcare delivery systems.
2. To identify and characterize the key domains of organizational readiness that the literature associates with successful integration of precision medicine into healthcare operations.
3. To examine what governance structures, policy mechanisms, and regulatory frameworks are reported as enabling or obstructing implementation across different healthcare system contexts.
4. To analyze how workforce capability, digital infrastructure, clinical workflow design, and financing arrangements function as operational enablers or barriers.
5. To assess the extent to which equity, access, and ethical considerations are addressed in the implementation literature, and to identify where gaps appear.
6. To synthesize the evidence into a preliminary Implementation Readiness Framework that health administrators can use as a starting point for assessing institutional readiness and prioritizing action.
7. To interpret findings in relation to the governance structures, workforce profiles, and policy environments characteristic of the Saudi and GCC healthcare context.

5. Study Questions

The study is guided by the following questions. Each is framed to be answerable through scoping review methodology and is directly connected to the objectives stated above.

Main Question:

What organizational, governance, and operational conditions does the published literature identify as necessary for the successful adoption and sustainable integration of precision medicine in healthcare delivery systems?

Sub-Questions:

1. What domains of organizational readiness are identified in the literature as critical for precision medicine integration, and what indicators are associated with readiness in each domain?
2. How do governance structures, policy mandates, and regulatory environments shape the pace, scope, and sustainability of precision medicine programs across different health systems?
3. What workforce-related factors, including clinical genomic literacy, role clarity, and change management approaches, appear as enablers or barriers in the implementation literature?
4. What digital infrastructure requirements and interoperability deficits are most consistently documented as bottlenecks preventing clinical translation of genomic data?
5. What financing arrangements and reimbursement strategies are associated with the long-term sustainability of precision medicine programs?
6. To what extent do equity, patient access, and ethical governance considerations appear in implementation-focused literature, and how are they addressed?
7. What components, informed by the evidence synthesis, should constitute a preliminary Implementation Readiness Framework for healthcare administrators?

6. Analytical Propositions Guiding the Review

This study uses a scoping review methodology, which is exploratory and mapping-oriented rather than hypothesis-testing. Classical inferential hypotheses with null and alternative forms are not appropriate for this design and are not advanced here. Instead, the following five analytical propositions are stated to guide the thematic coding and evidence synthesis process. They are directional claims derived from the preliminary literature and from the theoretical framework, and they will be examined critically during synthesis rather than confirmed or rejected statistically. Their purpose is to give the coding process analytical structure and to make explicit the patterns the review is specifically looking for.

1. Organizations with formalized governance structures, designated precision medicine leadership, and explicit institutional policies appear more consistently in the implementation literature as achieving meaningful adoption than those lacking such arrangements. This proposition guides attention toward governance-related evidence and shapes the first two domains of the preliminary readiness framework.
2. Organizational readiness for precision medicine appears to be a multidimensional construct. The available evidence suggests it cannot be reduced to any single enabling condition but requires concurrent progress across leadership commitment, workforce capability, digital infrastructure, clinical workflow integration, and financial sustainability. This proposition shapes the multi-domain structure of the evidence extraction matrix.
3. Workforce-related barriers, specifically gaps in clinical genomic literacy, unclear professional role boundaries, and resistance to workflow change, appear among the most frequently reported operational challenges in the preliminary literature. This proposition directs attention to workforce evidence and to differences between clinical disciplines during coding.
4. Deficits in data interoperability and digital infrastructure appear as significant bottlenecks across healthcare systems at different resource levels, suggesting a systemic rather than purely context-specific challenge. This proposition shapes coding of digital and infrastructure evidence and invites comparison across settings.

5. Equity, patient access, and ethical governance considerations appear to receive less attention in implementation-focused literature relative to technical, clinical, and economic dimensions. This proposition shapes a dedicated content analysis strand within the synthesis.

7. Previous Studies

The literature review below is organized thematically, covering six domains most relevant to this study. Within each theme, studies are considered not only for their findings but for the methodologies employed, the settings examined, and the limitations acknowledged. This approach is intended to support comparative analysis rather than descriptive summary, and to allow the research gap to emerge from the evidence rather than be asserted independently.

7.1 Implementation Scope: From Research to Clinical Operations

The foundational challenge of scaling precision medicine from research programs into clinical operations was examined by Manolio et al. (2019) in a multi-country analysis published in *The Lancet*. Drawing on experience from genomic medicine programs in the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, and several other high-income systems, the authors identified a range of resources and strategies needed for clinical genomic implementation, noting that most documented efforts remained early-stage and institution-specific. Their analysis is valuable for its scope and cross-national coverage, but it is primarily descriptive and does not offer a structured readiness model for health administrators.

Ginsburg and Phillips (2018), writing in *Health Affairs*, advanced an argument directly relevant to this study's framing: that the principal barriers to precision medicine at scale are no longer scientific but organizational and economic. Their analysis was focused on the U.S. context and was largely policy-oriented, identifying the problem without providing operational guidance for addressing it. Together, these two accounts establish that implementation challenges are multidimensional and managerially significant, but they do not provide health administrators with a structured model for assessing or building organizational readiness.

Published perspectives from the GCC region appear limited. The available accounts, which include general assessments of early national genomic initiatives in Saudi Arabia, suggest recurring challenges in areas such as workforce preparation and clinical workflow integration that are broadly consistent with the international literature. However, these accounts tend to be narrow in scope and do not engage systematically with governance, financing, or equity dimensions. The combined implication of this body of work is that the research-to-delivery gap

is well documented internationally, but management-oriented guidance for closing it in GCC settings remains sparse.

7.2 Governance and Policy Arrangements

The governance literature converges on a reasonably consistent set of structural enabling conditions. Stark et al. (2019), in an analysis of genomic medicine programs across several high-income countries published in the *American Journal of Human Genetics*, outlined the case for coordinated global action on integrating genomics into healthcare delivery. Their paper identifies institutional features commonly associated with implementation progress, including formal policies, cross-disciplinary oversight, clear data governance protocols, and structured program evaluation. As a perspective and advocacy piece rather than an empirical validation study, it is best read as a roadmap for what governance arrangements the field considers important, rather than as direct proof of causal effectiveness. A notable limitation for this study is that its focus is on high-income Anglophone systems, and the governance mechanisms described may not translate directly to GCC institutional arrangements, where health system governance may operate under different statutory and administrative frameworks.

Maughan (2017) examined governance in the UK context and identified a structural failure mode that recurs in the international literature: responsibility for precision medicine becomes fragmented across clinical genetics, oncology, pathology, information technology, and administration, without any single body holding clear overall accountability. This fragmentation generates coordination failures that cannot be resolved by adding resources alone. Where Stark et al. outline what governance arrangements the field considers necessary, Maughan's contribution is to explain why their absence creates specific, predictable problems. Neither paper, however, offers a readiness assessment instrument that administrators in different system types could apply. The governance literature, taken together, identifies what matters but does not yet provide a practical tool for measuring where an organization currently stands.

7.3 Organizational Readiness and Change Management

The theoretical foundation for organizational readiness in this domain comes from Weiner (2009), whose widely applied framework distinguishes between change commitment (the shared motivation to pursue a change) and change efficacy (the shared belief in the organization's

collective capability to execute it). Both components are required; neither is sufficient alone. An organization whose leadership is committed to precision medicine but whose staff see no realistic path to operational delivery will not sustain implementation effort. Conversely, technical capacity in the absence of senior-level commitment will tend to remain unused. Weiner's framework was developed from broader organizational change theory and has been applied across healthcare settings, but it was not designed for precision medicine specifically. The particular capability dimensions relevant to genomic implementation, including bioinformatics infrastructure, genomic consent governance, and role design for genomic clinicians, require further specification for this context.

The emerging European implementation literature, while not yet consolidated into a single definitive source, suggests that organizational and leadership factors, such as institutional commitment, cross-disciplinary coordination, and a culture supportive of innovation, are important considerations for implementation progress. Available accounts also indicate that many hospitals may lack any formal mechanism for assessing readiness before committing to implementation, which would itself represent a significant operational gap. The broader organizational change management literature suggests that the absence of structured pre-implementation readiness assessment is a recognized predictor of implementation difficulty across sectors. Applied to precision medicine, it points to a specific type of organizational failure that a readiness framework is designed to address: the gap between institutional intention and institutional capability.

7.4 Workforce Capability

The workforce literature is characterized by notable consistency across studies and settings. Haga et al. (2019) surveyed primary care physicians in a major U.S. health system and found that fewer than twenty percent felt confident interpreting pharmacogenomic results without specialist input, despite holding generally positive attitudes toward the technology. Other surveys across different U.S. health system settings spanning medicine, pharmacy, and nursing have reported comparable findings, with a majority of clinicians reporting feeling unprepared to explain genomic test results to patients. These studies typically employ survey methodology within single health system settings, which limits their individual generalizability. Nevertheless, the

consistency of findings across different clinical disciplines and institutional contexts suggests that the training gap is systemic rather than situational.

What this body of literature leaves relatively unexamined is the role clarity dimension. In most health systems, professional responsibility for ordering a genomic test, interpreting the result, and communicating it to the patient is not clearly delineated. When that ambiguity exists, clinicians tend to defer rather than act, and training investments may not produce behavioral change because the workflow conditions needed to apply new knowledge are absent. This interaction between knowledge gaps and role ambiguity is noted in the broader implementation literature but has not been systematically studied in precision medicine contexts. The workforce literature tends to treat these as separate problems when the evidence from practice suggests they require integrated solutions. This analytical gap shapes the workforce dimension of the proposed readiness framework.

7.5 Digital Infrastructure and Interoperability

Aronson and Rehm (2015), writing in *Nature*, described the informatics infrastructure required for clinical genomic medicine at scale in terms of three functional layers: a data storage and management platform for genomic information; a clinical decision support layer that surfaces actionable recommendations at the point of care; and an interoperability layer enabling data to move across institutional and regional boundaries without loss of clinical meaning or context. Their framework is largely normative, defining what is needed rather than assessing what currently exists in most health systems. Subsequent U.S.-based efforts to develop standardized interfaces between genomic data and electronic health record systems, such as the SMART on FHIR Genomics initiative, have documented both the technical feasibility of the approach and persistent institutional difficulties, including heterogeneous EHR environments, institutional resistance to data sharing, and the absence of standardized genomic data representation formats across clinical laboratories (Alterovitz et al., 2015).

Comparing these normative and operational accounts highlights a distinction important for health administrators. The normative literature identifies the infrastructure that is needed; operational accounts document what happens when organizations attempt to build it. The gap between the two is not primarily technical. It is organizational and governance-related: data sharing requires

trust between institutions, standardization requires coordinated decision-making, and clinical decision support requires ongoing maintenance and validation processes that are as much administrative as technical. In GCC healthcare settings, where public and private health IT environments may operate on different platforms and where regional interoperability standards appear to be still developing, these organizational and coordination challenges are likely compounded further. The digital infrastructure literature makes a clear case that readiness in this domain cannot be treated as a procurement problem; it is a governance and coordination problem that has a technical component.

7.6 Financing, Equity, and Ethics

Verbelen et al. (2017) reviewed economic evaluations of pharmacogenetic-guided treatment across multiple disease areas and found reasonably favorable cost-effectiveness evidence for oncology, infectious disease, and psychiatry applications. This intervention-level evidence is useful but limited for administrators. It addresses the cost-effectiveness of specific tests, not the cost of building and sustaining the institutional infrastructure that makes those tests clinically available in the first place: laboratory platforms, information systems, training programs, governance structures, and consent management processes. The organizational infrastructure cost dimension is consistently underexplored in the precision medicine economic literature, which represents a practical blind spot for implementation planning and financial governance.

On equity, Popejoy and Fullerton (2016), writing in *Nature*, documented the extent to which genomic reference databases are dominated by individuals of European ancestry, noting that European-ancestry individuals accounted for approximately eighty percent of genome-wide association study participants at the time of their analysis despite comprising less than twenty percent of the global population. For GCC populations, whose genetic profile may be shaped in part by geographic isolation and founder effects, this representational imbalance has potentially significant implications for the accuracy and clinical validity of genomic risk scores and pharmacogenomic predictions. This is not only a future concern; it may affect the reliability of tools already being deployed in clinical settings.

The ethical and consent literature applicable to GCC settings remains limited but carries specific practical significance. Standard genomic consent frameworks, developed largely in North

American and European contexts, engage with assumptions about individual autonomy, data privacy, and incidental findings that may not map cleanly onto Islamic bioethical principles, which are often understood to assign particular weight to family interests in genomic information, communal decision-making, and the disclosure of genetic risk. These differences may affect the fundamental design of consent processes and ethics governance structures, not merely their surface presentation. The available literature on genomic ethics in Islamic contexts tends to be either primarily theological rather than operationally focused, or oriented toward non-GCC settings. Health administrators in Saudi Arabia and neighboring states will likely need to address this gap in developing governance frameworks for precision medicine programs, and the current literature offers limited practical guidance for doing so.

8. Research Gap

The preceding literature review points to a gap that is specific enough to be addressed through the research design proposed in this study. Each of the six dimensions reviewed has received scholarly attention, but that attention has been distributed across disciplinary silos rather than integrated into a coherent management-oriented framework. The governance literature identifies what institutional conditions appear to matter for precision medicine adoption, but does not offer a structured readiness assessment instrument. Work on workforce capability documents training deficits in detail, but does not situate them within an organizational model that administrators can apply. The digital infrastructure literature describes what is needed technically, but largely leaves unaddressed the governance and coordination work required to make that infrastructure function. On equity and ethics, the available literature raises considerations that are practically significant, particularly for GCC contexts, but offers limited operational guidance for administrators designing programs in those settings.

Beyond this disciplinary fragmentation, the evidence base is geographically concentrated. The large majority of published precision medicine implementation research comes from high-income healthcare systems in North America and Western Europe. The GCC context appears only sparsely in the published literature, and the studies that do exist tend to be descriptive rather than analytical. This geographic imbalance matters because the organizational conditions relevant to precision medicine adoption are context-dependent. The governance arrangements, financing structures, workforce training systems, cultural and religious ethics frameworks, and population genomic characteristics of GCC health systems appear sufficiently distinct from the dominant Western literature to make direct transfer of findings unreliable without deliberate contextual interpretation.

To the best of the researcher's knowledge, the available literature does not yet contain an integrated, management-oriented readiness framework built from a systematic synthesis of the implementation evidence and designed specifically for healthcare administrators managing precision medicine programs. The literature as reviewed provides the constituent parts of such a framework, distributed across disciplines and settings, but has not assembled them into a coherent, practically applicable model. The present study addresses that gap by conducting a structured scoping review, synthesizing the evidence across the six dimensions reviewed, and

developing a preliminary Implementation Readiness Framework that can serve as both an analytical tool for future research and a practical starting point for healthcare administrators.

9. Theoretical Foundations

Three established frameworks from implementation science and organizational change theory underpin this study. Each contributes a distinct analytical lens. Together they support a multi-domain model of readiness that is better suited to the organizational complexity of precision medicine implementation than any single framework would be alone.

9.1 Weiner's Theory of Organizational Readiness for Change (2009)

Weiner argues that organizational readiness is a shared psychological state with two interacting components: change commitment (the collective motivation to pursue a particular change) and change efficacy (the collective belief in the organization's capacity to execute it). Both are required for genuine readiness. An organization whose leadership is committed to precision medicine but whose staff see no realistic path to operational delivery will not sustain implementation effort. Conversely, technical capacity in the absence of senior-level commitment will tend to remain underutilized. This framework directs attention to both motivational and capability dimensions of readiness, which helps explain why organizations with comparable resources can achieve markedly different implementation outcomes. In the present study, this framework is applied to frame the evidence extraction questions relating to leadership, culture, and workforce dimensions of readiness.

9.2 Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR; Damschroder et al., 2009)

CFIR organizes the factors that influence implementation outcomes into five domains: the characteristics of the intervention being implemented; the outer setting, which includes the policy environment, patient population, and external pressures; the inner setting, encompassing organizational structure, culture, and readiness for change; the characteristics of individuals involved in implementation; and the implementation process itself. For this study, the inner setting and outer setting domains are most directly relevant. The inner setting domain encompasses the organizational structure, leadership, and readiness characteristics that health administrators manage; the outer setting captures the policy, regulatory, and financing environment in which implementation occurs. CFIR is used here as an organizing lens for

evidence extraction rather than as a rigid analytical schema; its primary value is that it directs attention to the full organizational ecology of implementation rather than to isolated variables.

9.3 Leavitt's Diamond Model of Organizational Change

Leavitt's (1965) model describes organizations as systems composed of four interdependent elements: structure, technology, people, and tasks. The central proposition is that significant changes to any one element create adjustment pressures across the others, and that implementation efforts that address only one or two elements while leaving others unchanged are unlikely to achieve durable results. Precision medicine implementation touches all four elements simultaneously, which contributes to its organizational complexity. An institution that installs new genomic technology without adjusting clinical task structures, retraining its workforce, or modifying its governance and accountability arrangements will find that the investment does not deliver intended value. The Diamond Model reinforces the case for a multi-domain readiness framework and provides a theoretical rationale for the framework's structure.

9.4 Preliminary Seven-Domain Implementation Readiness Framework

Drawing on these three theoretical frameworks, the study proposes to organize its evidence synthesis around seven preliminary domains of organizational readiness. These domains are not independent; they interact, and underdevelopment in one tends to create pressures in others. They are presented here as an initial organizing structure for evidence extraction and coding. They are explicitly provisional and will be refined through the scoping review process; the final framework configuration will reflect what the evidence actually shows rather than the initial theoretical expectation.

1. **Strategic Leadership and Vision:** A formally endorsed organizational strategy for precision medicine, with senior leadership accountability, defined performance goals, and committed resource allocation.
2. **Governance and Policy:** Data governance policies, patient consent frameworks, regulatory compliance mechanisms, and a designated oversight body with cross-functional representation.

3. **Workforce Capability and Change Management:** Genomic literacy across relevant clinical disciplines, clear professional role definitions for precision medicine delivery, accessible training programs, and structured approaches to managing resistance and role evolution.
4. **Digital Infrastructure and Data Interoperability:** Electronic health record compatibility with genomic data formats, functional genomically informed clinical decision support, and compliance with applicable interoperability standards.
5. **Clinical Workflow Integration:** Precision medicine processes embedded within routine care pathways, from test ordering through result communication and treatment decision support.
6. **Finance and Sustainability:** Multi-year financial planning for program development, reimbursement strategy for genomic testing, cost-effectiveness evidence for selected applications, and identified sustainable funding sources.
7. **Patient Access, Equity, and Ethics:** Equity consideration in program design and patient access, consent frameworks adapted to local cultural and religious contexts (including Islamic bioethical principles relevant to GCC settings), privacy protections, and formal ethics governance.

These seven domains will serve as the primary deductive categories for thematic coding in the scoping review. Domain boundaries and sub-domain content will be adjusted if the evidence consistently points to a different configuration.

10. Methodology and Research Methods

10.1 Research Design

This study uses a scoping review methodology following the framework of Arksey and O'Malley (2005), as subsequently developed by Levac et al. (2010) and Peters et al. (2020). Reporting will follow the PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) as described by Tricco et al. (2018). A scoping review is appropriate here for several reasons. The research questions are exploratory and mapping-oriented rather than confirmatory; the aim is to characterize the breadth and distribution of available evidence on precision medicine implementation from a management perspective, identify gaps in that evidence, and generate a conceptual framework. The relevant literature spans clinical, implementation science, health policy, and management disciplines and is heterogeneous in study design and methodology, which makes the inclusive approach of a scoping review more appropriate than the narrower eligibility criteria of a systematic review. No primary data collection from human subjects is required, making the design feasible within a master's-level project timeline.

10.2 Databases and Search Period

Five databases will be searched: PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, CINAHL, and Google Scholar. PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, and Web of Science provide core coverage across clinical, implementation science, and health management literature. CINAHL adds coverage of nursing and allied health professional perspectives relevant to the workforce domain. Google Scholar will be used as a supplementary source to extend coverage to grey literature including policy reports, government documents, and institutional case studies that may not appear in the peer-reviewed databases listed above. The reference lists of all included studies will be hand-searched to identify additional eligible sources not captured through database searching.

The search will cover publications from January 2015 through the date of search execution, anticipated in 2026; the exact end date will be documented in the final report. The 2015 start date marks the launch of the U.S. Precision Medicine Initiative and the beginning of the current wave of national implementation programs globally. Earlier theoretical sources will be cited as conceptual foundations but will not form part of the systematic search.

10.3 Search Strategy

The search strategy combines terms from three concept groups, linked by Boolean AND operators:

- **Concept Group 1 (Precision Medicine):** "precision medicine" OR "personalized medicine" OR "genomic medicine" OR "pharmacogenomics" OR "precision health"
- **Concept Group 2 (Implementation):** "implementation" OR "adoption" OR "integration" OR "organizational readiness" OR "change management" OR "healthcare delivery" OR "clinical workflow"
- **Concept Group 3 (Management and Governance):** "governance" OR "policy" OR "leadership" OR "workforce" OR "digital infrastructure" OR "interoperability" OR "financing" OR "equity" OR "ethics"

The combined string takes the form (Group 1) AND (Group 2) AND (Group 3). It will be adapted to each database's syntax, and MeSH or equivalent controlled vocabulary terms will be incorporated where applicable. The complete search strings for each database will be documented and made available as a supplementary appendix to the final report.

10.4 Screening Process

Screening follows a two-stage process consistent with PRISMA-ScR guidance. In Stage 1, all retrieved records will be de-duplicated and assessed on title and abstract against the eligibility criteria. Records that cannot be confidently excluded on title and abstract alone will be advanced to Stage 2. In Stage 2, full texts of all remaining records will be retrieved and assessed against the complete eligibility criteria. The reason for exclusion of each Stage 2 record that does not meet criteria will be documented. A PRISMA-ScR flow diagram will track the number of records at each stage from identification through final inclusion.

10.5 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria:

- Published in English between January 2015 and the date of search execution (anticipated 2026).

- Addresses implementation, adoption, or integration of precision medicine in a healthcare delivery setting.
- Engages with at least one organizational, governance, or operational dimension relevant to healthcare administrators or health system management.
- Study type includes peer-reviewed journal articles, scoping or systematic reviews, policy reports, and institutional case studies from any healthcare system context.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Studies focused exclusively on molecular biology, genomic discovery, or clinical therapeutic efficacy with no implementation or organizational content.
- Laboratory studies, clinical trial protocols, or pharmacological efficacy studies.
- Editorials, letters, or opinion pieces without empirical or analytical substance.
- Conference abstracts without accessible full text.
- Direct-to-consumer genetic testing studies without a healthcare system implementation context.

10.6 Data Extraction

Data will be extracted from all included studies using a standardized charting form. Fields will include: author(s) and year; country and health system context; study design and methodology; study objective; precision medicine application focus; implementation domains addressed, mapped to the preliminary seven-domain framework; barriers identified; enablers identified; and key findings with their relevance to the readiness framework. The charting form will be piloted on five included studies before full-scale application to verify completeness and internal consistency.

10.7 Evidence Synthesis

Synthesis proceeds in three stages. First, a descriptive mapping will characterize the evidence base by year, geographic region, study design, and implementation domain, revealing where evidence is concentrated and where it is sparse. Second, thematic coding will be applied: findings from all included studies will be coded deductively against the seven preliminary

domains, with inductive codes added for themes that emerge from the data but were not anticipated by the initial framework. Third, framework synthesis will integrate the coded evidence into the refined Implementation Readiness Framework. The initial domain structure will be adjusted where the evidence consistently supports a different configuration.

A dedicated interpretive step will follow to assess the relevance and potential applicability of findings to GCC health system conditions, drawing on documented characteristics of Saudi and GCC health governance, workforce, financing, and ethics frameworks. This interpretive step is not a separate systematic search; it is a post-synthesis analytical process grounded in the main evidence and in the publicly documented features of GCC health systems. It does not constitute local empirical validation; rather, it offers a contextually informed reading of the global evidence with GCC organizational conditions in view.

11. Population and Sample of the Study

Because this is a scoping review of published and grey literature rather than a study involving human research subjects, the concepts of population and sample apply in a methodological rather than demographic sense.

The study population is the body of peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, systematic or scoping reviews, and institutional case studies published in English between January 2015 and the date of search execution that address organizational, governance, or operational dimensions of precision medicine implementation in healthcare delivery. Preliminary scoping searches suggest this population may comprise in the approximate range of 800 to 1,200 records across the five databases before de-duplication and eligibility screening. This figure is a rough working estimate derived from initial exploratory searches and should not be treated as a projection; the actual number will only be established when the full systematic search is executed.

The study sample is the subset of those records that meet all inclusion criteria and none of the exclusion criteria following two-stage screening. Comparable scoping reviews in adjacent areas of implementation research provide a rough sense of likely scale, suggesting a final included sample that might fall in the range of 60 to 120 eligible sources, though the actual number could be higher or lower depending on the breadth and relevance of the retrieved literature. A sample within this approximate range would be sufficient to support the thematic synthesis and framework development that are the primary outputs of this study.

If this research is extended at a later stage to include primary data collection from healthcare administrators in Saudi Arabia or the GCC, a separate research design involving structured survey or interview methodology would be required. In that case, a random stratified sample covering geographic regions, facility types, and organizational sectors would need to be drawn, with sample size determined by power calculations appropriate to the intended analysis methods.

12. Study Tools

As a scoping review, this study does not employ primary data collection instruments such as questionnaires or interview guides. The study tools are the structured methodological instruments that govern how evidence is identified, screened, extracted, and synthesized. Each is designed to ensure consistency, transparency, and reproducibility across the review process.

Database Search Strategy Protocol.

A fully documented search protocol for each of the five databases, specifying exact search strings, Boolean operators, controlled vocabulary terms (MeSH or equivalent), date filters, and language restrictions. The protocol will be piloted on a subset of records before full execution to test sensitivity and coverage. The complete protocols will be documented in a supplementary appendix to ensure the review is replicable.

Eligibility Screening Form.

A structured checklist based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria defined in Section 10.5, applied consistently at both screening stages. The form includes a decision field for each criterion and a free-text field for recording the specific reason for exclusion at Stage 2. It will be piloted on approximately 20 records before full application.

Data Extraction Charting Form.

A standardized spreadsheet capturing all defined extraction fields for each included study: author(s), year, country and health system context, study design, objective, precision medicine focus, implementation domains addressed, barriers identified, enablers identified, and key findings with their relevance to the preliminary readiness framework. The form will be piloted on five studies before full-scale application.

Thematic Coding Framework.

A coding scheme organized around the seven preliminary readiness domains defined in Section 9.4, supplemented by an inductive code category for themes that emerge from the data but are not captured by the initial framework. Each code includes an operational

definition and at least two reference examples to support consistent application across the included studies.

Evidence Synthesis Matrix.

A cross-tabulation mapping all included studies against the seven preliminary framework domains. The matrix supports identification of domains where evidence converges across multiple studies and contexts, domains where evidence is limited or contradictory, and gaps that the final framework design must acknowledge.

PRISMA-ScR Flow Diagram.

A PRISMA-ScR flow diagram will be completed to document the number of records identified, screened at Stage 1, assessed at Stage 2, and finally included, in accordance with PRISMA-ScR reporting requirements (Tricco et al., 2018).

13. Analytical Methods

Because this is a scoping review, the analysis does not involve inferential statistics. The following analytical methods will be applied in sequence, corresponding to the three evidence synthesis stages described in Section 10.7.

Descriptive Bibliometric Mapping.

All included studies will be characterized quantitatively by year of publication, geographic region, study design, precision medicine application domain, and implementation domain addressed. This mapping will be presented in tabular and graphical form. Its purpose is to characterize the shape of the evidence base: where it is concentrated, how it has evolved over time, and which readiness domains are relatively well or poorly studied. Frequency counts for barriers and enablers identified across included studies will be produced as a heuristic indicator of which implementation challenges appear most consistently across different contexts, without implying statistical significance.

Thematic Analysis and Framework Synthesis.

The primary analytical method for the synthesis phase is thematic analysis using a framework synthesis approach. Findings from all included studies will be extracted, coded deductively against the seven preliminary readiness domains, and analyzed for convergent patterns (findings that appear consistently across multiple studies and settings), divergent findings (contradictory evidence requiring interpretation), and emergent themes (patterns not anticipated by the initial framework). Inductive codes will be added as needed. The framework itself will be revised through this process, with domain boundaries and sub-domain content adjusted to reflect the actual distribution and weight of evidence.

Content Analysis for Equity and Ethics Dimensions.

A structured content analysis protocol will assess the degree of attention each included study gives to equity, patient access, and ethical governance considerations, and in what terms. This strand of analysis directly examines the fifth analytical proposition, which

anticipates that these dimensions may be underrepresented relative to technical and clinical content. Findings will be reported both quantitatively (frequency of equity-related content across studies) and thematically (which aspects of equity and ethics receive attention and which appear absent).

GCC Contextual Interpretation.

Following the main synthesis, a dedicated interpretive step will assess the relevance and potential applicability of identified evidence clusters to GCC health system conditions. This step will consider which findings relate most directly to GCC governance structures, workforce profiles, financing arrangements, cultural and religious ethics frameworks, and population genomic characteristics. This is an interpretive analytical process grounded in the systematic evidence and in the documented features of Saudi and GCC health systems; it is not a primary research activity or a claim of local validation.

If the study is later extended to include primary data collection from health administrators, standard quantitative methods would apply at that stage, including descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis for framework validation, and regression or structural equation modeling for examining relationships between readiness domain scores and implementation outcomes.

14. Study Limitations

Acknowledging the limitations of a study's design is a condition of intellectual credibility, not an admission of weakness. The limitations below are inherent to the methodology chosen and to the scope of the available literature. They are stated here to inform appropriate interpretation of the study's findings and to identify directions for follow-on research.

English-language restriction.

The search is limited to publications in English. This will exclude potentially relevant work published in Arabic from Saudi and GCC institutions, and in German, French, Japanese, and other languages from precision medicine programs in those countries. The exclusion is particularly significant given the study's aim to inform practice in the GCC, where a body of Arabic-language policy documentation and program reports exists that will not be captured through the systematic search.

Dominance of Western literature.

The evidence base is expected to be drawn predominantly from high-income healthcare systems in North America and Western Europe, reflecting where most precision medicine implementation research has been conducted and published. Applying those findings to GCC contexts requires deliberate interpretive care. The framework produced by this study should be understood as globally informed but not GCC-validated. Its applicability in GCC settings would need to be tested through primary empirical research.

Underrepresentation of unpublished GCC experience.

Operational implementation experience in Saudi Arabia and neighboring states is not fully captured in peer-reviewed literature. Much of what has been learned at the program level in GCC health systems exists in internal reports, consultancy documents, and institutional knowledge rather than published form. This limits the extent to which the framework can claim to reflect actual GCC implementation practice rather than GCC policy aspiration.

Dependence on quality and reporting of included studies.

Scoping reviews do not include formal quality appraisal of individual studies, which is a recognized characteristic of the methodology. This means that findings from methodologically stronger and weaker studies receive equal weight in the synthesis. Where conclusions depend on a small number of studies or on studies with notable methodological limitations, this will be acknowledged in the discussion of findings.

Absence of primary field validation.

The preliminary Implementation Readiness Framework produced by this study will be derived from published literature rather than validated through direct engagement with healthcare administrators. Its practical utility and contextual fit for Saudi or GCC settings cannot be fully established without a follow-on validation phase involving empirical data collection from relevant practitioners. The study positions itself as a necessary and evidence-grounded first step toward that validation.

Publication bias.

Positive implementation experiences are more likely to be written up and accepted for publication than failures or stalled programs. The evidence base may therefore present a somewhat optimistic picture of what has been achieved and what is achievable. Where the synthesis finds convergent positive findings, this possibility should be kept in mind during interpretation.

15. References

- Alterovitz, G., Warner, J., Zhang, P., Chen, Y., Ullman-Cullere, M., Kreda, D. A., & Kohane, I. S. (2015). SMART on FHIR Genomics: Facilitating standardized clinico-genomic apps. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 22(6), 1173–1178.
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32.
- Aronson, S. J., & Rehm, H. L. (2015). Building the foundation for genomics in precision medicine. *Nature*, 526(7573), 336–342.
- Damschroder, L. J., Aron, D. C., Keith, R. E., Kirsh, S. R., Alexander, J. A., & Lowery, J. C. (2009). Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: A consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation Science*, 4(1), 50.
- Ginsburg, G. S., & Phillips, K. A. (2018). Precision medicine: From science to value. *Health Affairs*, 37(5), 694–701.
- Haga, S. B., Kim, E., Myers, R. A., & Ginsburg, G. S. (2019). Primary care physicians' knowledge, attitudes, and experience with personal genetic testing. *Journal of Personalized Medicine*, 9(2), 29.
- Leavitt, H. J. (1965). Applied organizational change in industry: Structural, technological, and humanistic approaches. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizations* (pp. 1144–1170). Rand McNally.
- Levac, D., Colquhoun, H., & O'Brien, K. K. (2010). Scoping studies: Advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science*, 5(1), 69.
- Manolio, T. A., Rowley, R., Williams, M. S., Roden, D., Ginsburg, G. S., Bult, C., & Green, E. D. (2019). Opportunities, resources, and techniques for implementing genomics in clinical care. *The Lancet*, 394(10197), 511–520.
- Maughan, T. (2017). The Promise and the Hype of 'Personalised Medicine'. *The New Bioethics*, 23(1), 13–20.

- Peters, M. D. J., Godfrey, C., McInerney, P., Munn, Z., Tricco, A. C., & Khalil, H. (2020). Chapter 11: Scoping reviews (2020 version). In E. Aromataris & Z. Munn (Eds.), *JBIM Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. JBI. <https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-12>
- Popejoy, A. B., & Fullerton, S. M. (2016). Genomics is failing on diversity. *Nature*, 538(7624), 161–164.
- Stark, Z., Dolman, L., Manolio, T. A., Ozenberger, B., Hill, S. L., Caulfield, M. J., & Rehm, H. L. (2019). Integrating genomics into healthcare: A global responsibility. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 104(1), 13–20.
- Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., ... Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), 467–473. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
- Verbelen, M., Weale, M. E., & Lewis, C. M. (2017). Cost-effectiveness of pharmacogenetic-guided treatment: Are we there yet? *The Pharmacogenomics Journal*, 17(5), 395–402.
- Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science*, 4(1), 67.