Clinician perspectives on the implementation of a very-brief physical activity intervention into cardiac rehabilitation settings – a mixed methods process evaluation of the 'Measure It!' Trial

<u>Jess Seymour</u>¹, Heather Chadwick², Zephanie Tyack³, Sarah Bowen⁴, Clare Calo⁵, Penelope Simmonds⁶, Rachel Davey¹, Kacie Patterson¹, Wendan Shi⁷, Steven McPhail^{3,8}, Robyn Gallgher⁷, Christian Verdicchio⁷, Breanne Kunstler⁹, Walter Abhayaratna¹⁰, Theophile Niyonsenga¹, Richard Keegan¹¹, Nicole Freene^{1,12}

¹Health Research Institute, University of Canberra, Canberra, Australia. ²North Canberra Hospital, Canberra Health Services, Canberra, Australia. ³Australian Centre for Health Services Innovation and Centre for Healthcare Transformation, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. ⁴National Capital Private Hospital, Canberra, Australia. ⁵Queanbeyan Hospital and Health Service, Queanbeyan, Australia. ⁶Delmar Private Hospital, Dee Why, Australia. ⁷Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney,, Sydney, Australia. ⁸Digital Health and Informatics, Metro South Health Service District, Brisbane, Australia. ⁹Behaviour Works Australia, Monash Sustainable Development Institute, Monash University, Clayton, Australia. ¹⁰Canberra Hospital and Health Services, Canberra, Australia. ¹¹Faculty of Health, University of Canberra, Canberra, Australia. ¹²Physiotherapy, Faculty of Health, University of Canberra, Canberra, Australia.

Abstract

Background: Cardiac rehabilitation (CR) attendees with coronary heart disease (CHD) are unlikely to meet recommended physical activity (PA) levels. Time-efficient and easy-to-implement PA interventions are therefore needed.

Methods: The 'Measure It!' Trial, a multi-centre randomised controlled trial evaluated the implementation of a very-brief PA intervention (<5-minutes) to improve CR attendees' PA over 6-months. Process evaluation outcomes included appropriateness, acceptability, and fidelity of the intervention (Measure It!). Quantitative and qualitative data were collected from CR clinicians who implemented and delivered 'Measure It!'. Data included interviews, the Acceptability of Intervention Measure (AIM) survey, and observations of intervention delivery. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics and a hybrid inductive deductive approach and triangulated for interpretation.

Outcomes: Fourteen CR clinicians (40.4± 12.7 years old, 72% female) were interviewed. Clinicians viewed the intervention as appropriate for use in CR, describing it as a 'low key' approach to prompt physical activity without burdening CR attendees. Clinicians liked the overall structure of the intervention and reported use of PA guidelines added to credibility. The AIM score for clinicians (5/5, IQR 3.5-5) supporting acceptability. On average, 72% of attendees received all interventions and median delivery time was 5-minutes (IQR 5), indicating fidelity.

Implications for practice: Measure It!' may offer a time-efficient PA intervention that can be implemented into CR programs to improve PA levels of attendees.

Conclusions: The 'Measure It!' intervention was delivered with fidelity and perceived as acceptable and appropriate by CR clinicians, indicating suitability for use in CR settings.