

- 1 **Using the behaviour change wheel approach to optimise self-sampling packs for**
2 **sexually transmitted infection and blood borne viruses**
3
- 4 ***Flowers, P.** School of Psychological Sciences and Health, University of Strathclyde
5 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6239-5616>
- 6 **Vojt, G.** Glasgow Caledonian University, Department of Psychology
7 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9135-0684>
- 8 **Pothoulaki, M.** Glasgow Caledonian University, Department of Psychology
- 9 **Mapp, F.** Dept of Infection & Population Health, University College London,
10 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0733-6036>
- 11 **Woode Owusu, M.** Dept of Infection & Population Health, University College London,
12 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2102-3802>
- 13 **Cassell, J. A.** Department of Primary Care and Public Health, University of Brighton
14 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0777-0385>
- 15 **Estcourt, C.** Glasgow Caledonian University, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5523-5630>
- 16 **Saunders, J.** Dept of Infection & Population Health, University College London
17 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3020-9916>
- 18
- 19 ***Flowers, P.** is the corresponding author.

20 **Using the behaviour change wheel approach to optimise self-sampling packs for**
21 **sexually transmitted infections and blood borne viruses**

22

23 *What is already known on this subject?*

24 • The use of self-sampling packs for sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and blood borne
25 viruses (BBVs) has been widely implemented without in-depth assessment of user
26 perspectives, adequate theorisation in relation to behaviour change, or optimisation
27

28 • In a previous qualitative study we reported on our use of thematic analyses (inductive and
29 deductive) to understand the behavioural system of using self-sampling packs. We identified
30 multiple modifiable barriers, and several important facilitators to using these packs, and their
31 content, correctly
32

33 • Our thematic analyses showed that self-sampling packs offered a largely acceptable approach
34 to STI and BBV testing and that with some modification it may be possible to increase both
35 the range of people who can benefit from them and increase the return of samples
36

37 *What does this study add?*

38 • This study theorises key barriers and facilitators to each sequential step within the behavioural
39 system of using the self-sampling pack. Across the whole behavioural system of pack use we
40 identified ‘beliefs about consequences’ and ‘memory, attention and decision-making’ as being
41 particularly important theoretical domains
42

43 • To optimise self-sampling packs for STIs, our use of the behaviour change wheel suggested
44 that to modify the pack we should use intervention functions that detail *environmental*
45 *restructuring* and assist the user using pack contents through *persuasion* and *enablement* with
46 some *education* and *modelling*
47

48 • The study provides an exemplar of how to use the behaviour change wheel within the process
49 of intervention optimisation when building upon prior qualitative analyses. The results
50 informed the redesign of the pack and the development of on-line support materials to be used
51 within a large multi-site trial
52

53

54

55

56

57

58

58

59 **Using the behaviour change wheel approach to help optimise self-sampling packs for**
60 **sexually transmitted infections and blood borne viruses**

61

62

63 **Abstract (242)**

64 **Purpose:** This paper describes the process of optimising a widely offered intervention - the
65 self-sampling pack for sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and blood born viruses (BBVs).
66 We drew upon the BCW approach, incorporating the theoretical domains framework (TDF)
67 and the behaviour change technique taxonomy (BCTT) to systematically specify potential
68 intervention components that may optimise the packs.

69 **Methods:** A behaviour change wheel analysis built upon prior thematic analyses of
70 qualitative data collected through focus groups and interviews with members of the public
71 and people recruited from sexual health clinics in Glasgow and London (n=56). Salient
72 barriers and facilitators to specific sequential behavioural domains associated with wider
73 behavioural system of pack-use were subjected to further analyses, coding them in relation to
74 the TDF, the BCW's intervention functions, and finally specifying potential optimisation in
75 relation to behaviour change techniques (BCTs).

76 **Results:** Our TDF analysis suggested that across the overall behavioural system of pack use
77 the most important theoretical domains were 'beliefs about consequences' and 'memory,
78 attention and decision-making'. BCW analysis on the overall pack suggested useful
79 intervention functions should focus on 'environmental restructuring', 'persuasion',
80 'enablement', 'education' and 'modelling'. Ways of optimising the intervention were also
81 specified in relation to potentially useful behaviour change techniques (BCTs).

82 **Conclusions:** A detailed behavioural analysis building on earlier qualitative work using the
83 TDF and the BCW provided a systematic approach to optimising an existing intervention.

84 The approach enabled the specification of highly specific, evidence-based, and theoretically
85 informed recommendations for intervention optimisation.

86

87

88

89

90

91

92 **Using the behaviour change wheel approach to help optimise self-sampling packs for**
93 **sexually transmitted infections and blood borne viruses**

94
95 **Introduction**

96 Within this paper we show how, within the context of a large multi-site trial, we sought to
97 systematically optimise an existing widely offered public health intervention (self-sampling
98 packs for sexually transmitted infections (STIs)). Building on our previous qualitative
99 analyses (Flowers et al, 3a), here we report on our use of the behaviour change wheel
100 approach (Michie, van Stralen, & West, 2011)(BCW) to systematically optimise self-sampling
101 packs.

102

103 *The background to self-sampling packs*

104 Across the UK home-based self-sampling packs for STIs and BBV are widely offered (e.g.
105 Barnard et al, 2018; Ogale et al, 2019). Typically, a person requests a pack online, has it
106 delivered to their home address, takes their samples (urine, genital swab, finger prick blood
107 sample) at home, repackages up the kit and posts it back to the laboratory for testing. Results
108 are provided by SMS (text message), telephone or email by the sexual health clinic.

109

110 The provision of self-sampling packs chimes with wider cultural changes clustering around
111 the home delivery of a range of commodities, including diverse health technologies (e.g.
112 COVID-19 self-sampling packs, bowel screening packs, or home-based genetic self-sampling
113 kits). In light of recent changes to the ways people live and work wrought by COVID-19 it is
114 likely that more and more health care will be delivered remotely. In the UK context, the
115 widespread provision of self-sampling for STIs & BBV, sometimes to replace face-to-face
116 options, has taken place at a time of austerity for many public services including sexual
117 health. In some UK countries, it has also occurred at a time when the commissioning of
118 sexual health services has been de-coupled from the National Health Service and repositioned

119 within the remit of local authorities. In this paper, as part of a much larger sequential
120 programme of work, we provide an example of how we used the BCW approach to optimise
121 self-sampling packs for STIs in order to improve their use, enable their wider reach and
122 increase sample return rate.

123

124 Our previous exploratory qualitative insights (Flowers et al, 2021a) highlighted problems
125 with the existing self-sampling pack. Through thematic analyses with diverse members of the
126 public and those attending sexual health services, we showed that that use of the pack overall
127 was sometimes experienced as overwhelming, that pack-level instructions were challenging
128 to many, and that the poor overall pack-usability was likely to reduce pack use.

129

130 As an already widely available and widely used intervention, the problems with existing
131 packs do not prevent *all* people from using them effectively. Their problematic aspects may
132 affect some people more than others. We know that pack users tend to be female, of white
133 ethnicity and live in less deprived areas (Banerjee et al., 2018; Bracebridge, Bachmann and
134 Ramkhelawon and Woolnough, 2012; Manavi and Hodson, 2017). Problems with the pack
135 negate the pack's role in reducing STI transmission because people cease engaging in sexual
136 health self-care altogether, or drive them to attempt to use bricks and mortar sexual health
137 services and through struggling to attain appointments are delayed or prevented from
138 accessing timely treatment and wider care. It is also likely that the pack in its current form
139 may be amplifying long standing inequalities and lead to the social stratification of sexual
140 health screening and contribute to on-going sexual health inequalities (e.g. Wayal et al,
141 2017). Our earlier analysis suggested that those who are likely to struggle to use the pack are
142 more likely to be people who have vulnerabilities such as low literacy, low health literacy, or
143 low digital literacy (e.g. Middleton et al, 2021). Choices for sexual health care for these

144 people may be reduced to only bricks and mortar clinics – and they may not be able to access
145 them either.

146

147 Whilst these qualitative findings provided a clear, and user-led, sense of direction for
148 considering ways of optimising existing packs, in themselves they did not offer a systematic
149 way of considering how to improve the pack. Equally, the earlier qualitative work did not
150 capitalise on the prior expertise and learning embodied within health psychological, or
151 broader interdisciplinary, behaviour change theory or systematic approaches to consider ways
152 of specifying intervention content to optimise the intervention. The BCW offers just such a
153 systematic approach drawing on previous work. When the BCW is combined with the
154 theoretical domains framework (Atkins et al., 2017; TDF) it offers a means to systematically
155 borrow, and build upon, decades of previous research. As such, within this paper we focus on
156 reporting how we systematically used these tools to develop highly specific ways of
157 optimising self-sampling packs. Furthermore we draw upon the behaviour change technique
158 taxonomy (BCTT) for similar reasons. The BCTT provides a common language to specify
159 intervention content in terms of the indivisible techniques that can be harnessed to change
160 behaviour. In this case the use of the self-sampling packs.

161

162 **Methods**

163 *Participants*

164 Details of the participants that generated the initial data that the current analyse can be found
165 elsewhere (Flowers et al, 2021, paper 3a). Briefly, eleven focus groups and seven interviews
166 with young heterosexual individuals and men who have sex with men (MSM) were
167 conducted in Glasgow and London in late 2017. In total 56 participants took part in the study,
168 of whom 25 were female and 31 were male. All were cisgender. Most participants were aged
169 18-25 years (n=36), identified as ‘white British’ or ‘white other’ (n=44) and were educated to
170 University-level (n=39). Over half of the sample were heterosexual (n=40), with the
171 remaining participants self-identifying as MSM, gay or bisexual (n=14). Around one third
172 were recruited from sexual health services and had recently had a sexually transmitted
173 infection, the others were sampled from the wider community. One quarter of the sample
174 (n=9, 25%) had previously had an STI.

175

176

177 *Original Data collection*

178 The primary data were collected within the focus groups and interviews using a topic guide
179 and examples of the self-sampling pack (see Figure 1 below). As this study formed part of a
180 programme of research into accelerated partner therapy, the process of identifying, testing
181 and treating sex partners of people with STIs, lustrum.org.uk, the pack also contained
182 antibiotics. The topic guide was used to steer discussion across the full range of issues
183 detailed; where possible within the focus groups, discussion between participants was
184 encouraged rather than between facilitators and participants. The pack contained self-
185 sampling kits for vulvo-vaginal swabbing, urine collection and taking finger prick blood


186 samples. The pack included a variety of information sheets giving instructions on how to use
187 the kits, a return envelope and a series of labels to adhere to completed samples.

188 **Figure 1: Images of the pack and its contents used within initial data collection**

189 Image 1: Visual Aid, APT Pack (Females)



Image 2: Visual Aid, APT Pack (Males)



190

191

192 *Data analysis*

193 The original thematic analysis is reported elsewhere (please see Flowers et al, 2021, paper 3a
194 for details)


195 In developing, or optimising, behaviour change interventions two key principles are
196 important; the notion of parsimony and the idea of behavioural specificity. Parsimony is
197 about offering the simplest and most elegant explanations of often complex phenomena.
198 Behavioural specificity, on the other hand, highlights that that the best insights into
199 behavioural change occur when we can harmonise the highly specific nature of our
200 understandings of antecedents to behaviours with an equally fine grained, highly specific,
201 understanding of the behaviour that we seek to change (e.g., see Preece et al., 2019).

202 For us, as a pragmatic and applied interdisciplinary team, we have sought to attain the best
203 balance of both behavioural specificity and parsimony. With regard to considering the

204 behaviours at the heart of our behaviour change endeavour, having conducted inductive,
205 participant-led thematic analysis detailing how our participants thought about the pack and
206 what constituted pack use, we conceptualised using the self-sampling packs as a behavioural
207 system structured by a series of inter-related and sequential behavioural domains (see
208 Flowers et al., 2021, paper 3a). Although we could have analysed each behavioural domain in
209 even more specific behavioural terms, we felt it was very likely that the number of shared
210 antecedents for these highly-related specific behaviours would be high and that there could be
211 a lot of effort for minimal reward. Equally we could have tried to identify a single behaviour
212 within the system- chosen because of its potential for wide ranging spill over effects. Again,
213 however, because of the sequential nature of many of the behaviours and because the pack
214 was already widely used this did not seem to be the optimal approach.

215 Figure 2 illustrates how we conceptualised pack use; conceptualising sequential elements as
216 distinct behavioural domains within an overarching behavioural system. It is worth noting
217 that effective pack use requires completion of all four behavioural domains within this
218 behavioural system. However, the specificity of intervention optimisation demands distinct
219 behavioural analyses at the level of each domain.

220 *Figure 2: Balancing parsimony and behavioural specificity to illustrate the behavioural*
221 *system of using self-sampling packs and associated behavioural domains*
222



223

224

225 For the applied and pragmatic focus of the work reported here, and for the goals of this
226 project, Figure 2 captures a useful degree of behavioural specificity to enable intervention
227 optimisation. In relation to finding a pragmatic, parsimonious approach to understanding the
228 determinants of our behavioural domains, on the one hand, the plethora of explanatory
229 frameworks that theorise behaviour change within traditional health psychology models and
230 theories are too fine grained. Yet, on the other hand, popular approaches such as the
231 Capability, Opportunity and Motivation model of behaviour change (COM-B model; Michie,
232 Atkins & West, 2011) categorises the antecedents of behaviour at too broad a level, only
233 providing explanations of behaviour change within six broad categories. As such, for this
234 project, we felt TDF offered a suitable, mid-level, explanatory framework that enables a good
235 level of specificity in relation to understanding the casual mechanisms underpinning
236 behaviour change within the sequential behavioural domains that constitute the overall
237 behavioural system of pack use.

238 In summary we believe we have found a good balance of parsimony and specificity in
239 relation to the process of behavioural diagnosis. This plays out at two levels; firstly,
240 identifying the right *pitch* of our behavioural foci for intervention optimisation; and secondly,
241 in relation to theorising the causal mechanisms that shape these behaviours at a useful level
242 (i.e. the TDF rather than COM-B).

243 *The theoretical domains framework*

244 The TDF is a meta-theoretical framework that integrates 14 key theoretical domains known
245 to be important in understanding behaviour change across a range of populations and settings
246 and health arenas (Cane et al., 2012; Atkins et al., 2017). Its domains provide a relatively
247 high-level common language to describe clusters of theoretical constructs that shape

248 behaviour. As such we refer to them as causal mechanisms (i.e., they describe the *causes* of
249 behaviour within the language of multiple theories). In other words, the TDF's domains
250 provide a coherent and structured way of organising explanations of why behaviours, such as
251 those involved in the effective use of a self- sampling packs, either *do*, or *do not* occur.

252 The TDF's domains are domains because they de-duplicate, synthesise, and summarise a
253 myriad of multiple previous theoretical constructs from formal theoretical models of health
254 psychology. In this way, the TDF provides a high-level theoretical framework to describe the
255 range of causal mechanisms implicated in understanding behaviour and behaviour change.
256 Critically, the TDF can be used as a precursor to subsequent wider intervention development
257 processes, using for example, the complementary meta-theoretical framework - The
258 Behaviour Change Wheel (BCW) (Michie, Atkins & West, 2011). Here we use it in the
259 process of intervention optimisation. Figure 3 illustrates how the 14 domains of the TDF map
260 and structure the causal mechanism shaping behaviour (the specific behaviour being changed
261 is at the centre of the circle).

262 **Figure 3 The theoretical domains framework mapping the casual mechanisms that can**
263 **moderate any specific behaviour**



264

265

266 *The behaviour change wheel approach*

267 The BCW like the TDF, is also an over-arching meta-framework representing the synthesis of
268 many other approaches to behaviour change. The BCW synthesises 19 behaviour change
269 frameworks all designed for the development and evaluation of behaviour change
270 interventions (Michie et al., 2011). The BCW details nine intervention functions that
271 represent broad categories by which interventions can change behaviour: 'Education';
272 'Persuasion'; 'Incentivisation'; 'Coercion'; 'Training'; 'Enablement'; 'Modelling';
273 'Environmental Restructuring'; and 'Restrictions'. These are prescriptively mapped to the
274 specific components of TDF, or alternatively, the COM-B. In this way, future intervention
275 functions are tailored to demonstrable intervention need (e.g., the causal mechanisms
276 specifically identified through prior TDF analysis).

277

278 *The behaviour change techniques taxonomy*

279 As part of the wider behaviour change wheel approach, Michie et al (2013) developed an
280 extensive 93-item list of behavioural techniques, which was consensually agreed regarding
281 impact and importance, and where every technique was clearly defined and exemplified. A
282 behaviour change technique is a specific irreducible clearly defined component of an
283 intervention. It is directly related to larger ‘intervention functions’ and therefore with the
284 causal processes underlying behaviour change (i.e. TDF). For example, if the intervention
285 function was ‘modelling’, then an associated behaviour change technique that could be part
286 of the operationalisation of this function could be ‘demonstrating the behaviour’.

287 *How these tools were used within this paper*

288 Our use of the behaviour change wheel approach to intervention optimisation centred on a
289 three step approach. These three steps were initially conducted by PF, an HCPC registered
290 Health Psychologist and then audited by two other psychologists (MP and GV), all of whom
291 are expert and actively using the BCW approach, before discussing with the wider
292 interdisciplinary team (medical clinicians, public health professionals, health service
293 researchers, health economists). Throughout we aimed to do justice to these conceptual tools
294 building on their synthesis of prior expertise and learning but also to draw upon our subject-
295 specific expertise, the context of the work and the data we had collected.

296 **Step 1:** For the current paper, our previous work identifying the barriers and facilitators to
297 the range of behavioural foci within the overall system of using the self-sampling pack was
298 further analysed initially using the TDF (Cane et al., 2012). Each identified barrier or
299 facilitator could be coded against multiple TDF domains. The relative frequency of particular
300 TDF coding was assumed to be indicative of the relative importance of the causal mechanism

301 it presents at the level of each behavioural domain but also in relation to considering the
302 wider behavioural system.

303 **Step 2:** The TDF domains were further analysed using the BCW approach (Michie et al.,
304 2014). Here, TDF domains were matched prescriptively with appropriate intervention
305 functions for each barrier and/or enabler (see Table A in supplementary files).

306 **Step 3:** The relevant intervention functions were further examined, and working iteratively
307 with the previous qualitative analysis to tailor BCTs to this particular context, we specified
308 and operationalised potentially useful behaviour change techniques (BCTs) to specify useful
309 optimised intervention content.

310 *Research questions*

311 1. How can the barriers and facilitators to the range of behavioural domains within the
312 behavioural system of pack use for STI and BBV self-sampling *be theorised* using the
313 TDF?

314

315 2. What potentially useful *intervention functions* and potentially useful *behaviour*
316 *change techniques* can be specified and operationalised using the BCW to optimise
317 self-sampling packs for STI and BBV testing?

318

319 **Results**

320 **Table A** in the supplementary file shows the results of the complete BCW analysis. It can be
321 read both vertically and horizontally. Reading vertically from top to bottom illustrates the
322 various sequential behavioural domains associated with the behavioural system of effective
323 use of the pack (as shown in *Figure 1*). Reading horizontally, left to right, across the table it
324 is possible to see the target behaviour (pitched at the level of the behavioural domains) at the
325 heart of the BCW analysis that is to be changed (left hand column). Secondly, we present the
326 specific barriers and facilitators to changing that behaviour summarising insights from our
327 earlier qualitative work (Flowers et al., 2021, paper 3a). Thirdly, we show how these barriers
328 and facilitators (as causal influences on the enactment of each behavioural domain) were
329 coded in relation to theoretical domains specified by the TDF. Fourthly, we show how the
330 TDF domains, when matched with the elements from the BCW, specify broad intervention
331 functions that correspond to the underlying barrier or facilitator. Finally, at the far right we
332 show how these intervention functions can be expanded and detailed in relation to the
333 specification of particular behaviour change techniques that should optimise the intervention.
334 The optimisation process works because i) it is based on the evidence we collected through
335 our earlier qualitative work; and ii) it draws on the decades of earlier theoretical work
336 encompassed within the TDF; iii) it uses the standardising language of the intervention
337 functions from the BCW approach and iv) it uses the specific language of the BCTT. The
338 interested reader should be able to gauge the logic of each row independently and see how we
339 provide relatively granular solutions to the behaviour change problems identified by our
340 participants within our previous qualitative work.

341

342 1) **How can the barriers and facilitators to the range of sequential behavioural**
343 **domains associated with the behavioural system of pack use for STI and BBV**
344 **self-sampling be theorised using the theoretical domains framework?**

345

346 In this section the results of our TDF analysis are presented within a narrative format that
347 should be read alongside Table A within the supplementary file. Table 1 shows the relative
348 frequency of particular TDF domains for each of the four sequential behavioural steps.

349

350 Table 1 shows that for the broad behavioural domain of '*the user using the overall pack*' the
351 pack overall created a particular environmental stressor presenting significant anxiety and
352 wider challenges to users' beliefs about their capabilities in using the pack. These were
353 understood to challenge users' attention and lead to potential cognitive overload. In contrast
354 to these reported barriers, pack use was understood to be facilitated by the user's appreciation
355 of the consequences (i.e. relative ease) of using the pack (despite its complications) when
356 compared to visiting a clinic and the negative sequelae of doing so. Procedural knowledge
357 concerning how to use the overall pack and a revised compartmentalisation of the pack
358 content were also suggested as ways overall pack use could be enhanced.

Table 1 Causal mechanisms relevant for each behavioural domain within pack use

TDF Domain	Reported Barrier	Reported Facilitator
Using the overall pack		
Environmental context and resources	xx	xxx
Beliefs about Consequences		xxx
Memory, attention and decision Processes	xx	x

Beliefs about Capabilities	xx	x 359
		360
Emotion	xx	361
		362
Knowledge		x 363
		364
Skills		x 365
		366
User reading the information leaflets		
Memory, attention and decision Processes	xxxx	xxx 367
		368
Beliefs about Consequences	x	xx 369
Correct use of self-sampling kits; swabs, urine and blood samples		
Beliefs about Consequences	xx	371
		372
Knowledge	xx	373
		374
Skills	x	375
		376
Beliefs about Capabilities	x	377
		378
Emotion	x	379
		380
Returning the sample		
Beliefs about Consequences	xxxx	381
		382
Knowledge	xx	383
		384
Emotion	xx	385
		386
Social Influences	xx	387
		388
Behavioural regulation		x 389
		390
Memory, attention and decision processes		x 391
		392

388

389

390 **x** =Indicative of the frequency of particular TDF occurring in relation to the inductively derived barriers and
 391 facilitators.

392

393 For the step of '*reading the information leaflets*' the key casual mechanisms implicated were
394 the user's reduced attention and associated ability to follow the specific instructions related to
395 the formatting of leaflets. However, our participants also suggested the inclusion of
396 information about the consequences of untreated infections at the start of the leaflets might
397 increase attention whilst reading the leaflets. In turn this might enable the user to read the
398 somewhat challenging level of information contained within the leaflets. Equally, modifying
399 the leaflets to be clearer was thought to enhance attention and decision-making. Moreover,
400 the inclusion of information about how long it might take to complete the task was also
401 suggested as a means to enhancing reading the full leaflets.

402 In relation to important causal mechanisms implicated in the *correct use of self-sampling*
403 *kits*, these included knowledge and skills deficits and low perceived ability to use the kits
404 themselves. Knowledge deficits included both erroneous beliefs about the potential for
405 samples to degrade in the post, an outdated and spurious understanding of HIV and the
406 implications of a positive diagnosis. Beliefs about capabilities related to poor perceived self-
407 efficacy in relation to collecting samples. No corresponding facilitators were recorded.

408 In relation to the behavioural domain of the pack, user *posting their sample back to the labs*
409 *for processing* Table 2 shows an overview of the key causal domains that are important in
410 explaining this behaviour. There were key concerns about the return envelope being
411 recognised by others as being related to sexual health screening or a diagnosis of an STI and
412 in this way STI-related stigma may prohibit return of the samples. Furthermore, there were
413 concerns that the postal system may be inadequate (on a number of levels) in ensuring the
414 safe return of samples and in turn this may decrease the likelihood of people returning the
415 samples within the prepaid envelope. Participants believed that return of the samples could be
416 enhanced with the provision of multiple ways of returning packs (e.g. drop off in a

417 pharmacy), ensuring decision-making processes could tailor user choice of the way to return
418 the samples that felt safe for them. Moreover, it was also suggested that processes which
419 notified the user of safe receipt of their sample may also be useful.

420

421 **2. What potentially useful intervention functions and potentially useful behaviour**
422 **change techniques can be specified using the behaviour change wheel (BCW) to**
423 **optimise self-sampling packs for STIs and BBVs?**

424

425 Again, we draw the reader's attention to Table A within the supplementary file which shows
426 the full matrix of our initial findings concerning the barriers and facilitators to completing
427 each behavioural domain within the overall behavioural system of pack use, the relevant TDF
428 domains identified in the step above, and the corresponding intervention functions in addition
429 to examples of how they could be operationalised as individual behaviour change techniques
430 (BCTs). In this way, each row within Table A provides an auditable account of our use of
431 these tools for the whole process of intervention optimisation. Within each row there is a
432 sense of how we have 'reverse engineered' potential intervention content in ways that are
433 precisely tailored to the findings from our earlier qualitative work and the causal mechanisms
434 identified through the use of the TDF. Within this section however, to address the research
435 questions directly, we present a narrative account of our findings concerning intervention
436 functions and then tabularise our suggestions for potentially useful BCTs.

437

438 To address the behavioural domain of 'using the overall pack' our analysis suggested
439 intervention functions should focus on *environmental restructuring* through modifying the
440 pack and providing on-line materials to *enable* pack use. On-line materials should also *model*
441 ideal pack use (for example, depicting pack use in a quiet location within online materials)

442 and *persuade* the potential user that using the pack is a better way of testing than trying to get
443 an appointment within a clinic and that they can overcome perceived barriers to pack use.

444 For the behavioural domain of ‘reading the information leaflets’ our analysis suggested that
445 useful intervention functions should focus on *environmental restructuring* through changing
446 the leaflets to improve accessibility and making sure the user is reading the leaflets within a
447 quiet place. The leaflets should also be modified to *persuade* and *educate* the reader around
448 the importance of reading the leaflet and following its instructions.

449

450 For the behavioural domain of ‘Correct use of self-sampling kits; swabs, urine and blood
451 samples’ intervention functions are required that focus on *environmental restructuring* that
452 provide additional on-line support that *educates, models, trains* and *persuades* the viewer to
453 use the sampling kits correctly. Barriers to Kit-users can be overcome through persuasion
454 concerning the consequences of kit use and benchmarking others normative behaviour around
455 kit use.

456

457 Finally, for the behavioural domain of the user returning the samples useful intervention
458 functions could use *environmental restructuring* through modifying the pack and specifically
459 the return envelope to *enable* users to overcome perceived barriers. Furthermore, users can be
460 *educated* and *persuaded* about the efficacy of the postal system and the labs in processing
461 accurate results from samples through the modification of pack level content. Finally,
462 intervention functions that *educate* and *enable* those returning samples about the receipt and
463 results of their sampling may be useful modifications.

464

465 Overall, across the whole behavioural system, our analysis of potentially useful intervention
466 functions shows that environmental restructuring (n=16), persuasion (n=14), enablement

467 (n=14), modelling (n=9), education (n=9) and training (n=1) could all be important in
 468 optimising the pack.

469

470 Table 2 illustrates the end product of our analyses and details the way behaviour change
 471 techniques could be operationalised which reflect intervention functions and specify
 472 evidence-based and theoretically informed ways of optimising the intervention. We would
 473 recommend all the suggested changes to optimise the self-sampling packs.

Table 2 Suggested intervention functions and behaviour change techniques to optimising behaviour change in relation to each behavioural domain within pack use

Behaviour Change Technique (numbers refer to the BCT numbers detail within the BCT taxonomy v1)	Operationalisation
Using the overall pack	
12.5 Adding objects to the environment	The pack design must facilitate pack use rather than reduce it- it should include the compartmentalisation of pack components into bespoke packaging? , pack level instructions as well as component level (i.e. Kit-level) instructions
15.4 Self-talk	Pack-level instructions, or on-line support, can prompt the user to articulate their prior successful experiences with using self-managed packs (e.g. Have you ever built Ikea TM furniture? -Just keep telling yourself that)
12.1 Restructuring the physical environment	On-line pack access, or pack -level instructions should recommend the choice of a location in which to use the pack contents (e.g., in a quiet space at home)
9.2 Pros and Cons	On-line pack access, or pack -level instructions can encourage the user to identify and compare the pros and cons of using the pack vs visiting the clinic (e.g. waiting times, felt stigma)
5.3 Information about social and environmental consequences	On-line pack access, or pack -level instructions, can stress the positive benefits of using the pack as opposed to visiting the clinic (e.g., time, resource, queues, potential feelings of exposure in the waiting room)
4.1 Instructions on how to perform a behaviour	On-line support and links within the pack-level instructions should enable the user to access detailed real time on-line support
User reading the information leaflets	
12.1 Restructure the physical environment	The leaflet, inserted within the pack, must be designed to be simple and engaging; it should include some visuals and have no large blocks of text

11.3 Conserving mental resources	The leaflet can suggest that the user ensures a quiet environment to facilitate reading the leaflet (e.g. 'choose a time when you can focus on taking the samples undisturbed')
12.1 Restructure the physical environment	The leaflet should be translated into a number of other languages
5.1 Information about health consequences	The leaflet should provide information very early within its content that highlights the health consequences of testing for and effectively treating or not treating chlamydia
5.2 Salience of consequences	Early on within the leaflet the information about the consequences of infection? should be designed in such a way as to ensure that it is particularly memorable
5.3 Information about social and environmental consequences	Provide information within the leaflet about the time needed for completion of the task.
Correct use of self-sampling kits; swabs, urine and blood samples	
5.3 Information about social and environmental consequences	On-line pack access, or pack -level instructions must explain the efficacy of the samples for diagnosis when they are distributed through the post
15.1 Verbal persuasion about capability	On-line pack access, and pack -level instructions can boost user self-efficacy telling users they can do the self-sampling tests; stating that they <i>will</i> succeed
6.1 Demonstration of the behaviour	Within the on-line materials there should be a clear observable example of how to perform the self-samples, including the blood samples
6.2 Social Comparison	On-line pack access, or pack -level instructions should draw attention to other user use of all the pack (e.g., around 90% of users successfully return all the self-samples)
5.1 Information about health consequences	On-line materials or pack -level instructions, must explain the rationale for the HIV self-sampling kits and provide a clear articulation of the health consequences of not using it
5.3 Information about social and environmental consequences	On-line materials or pack -level instructions must explain the rationale for all the HIV self-sampling kits and a clear articulation of the wider consequences of not using it (e.g. the impact of undiagnosed HIV on others) On-line materials or pack -level instructions should provide a sense of choice and partial uptake of the self-samples (HIV or Chlamydia)
Returning the sample	
12.5 Adding objects to the environment	The return envelope should look bland and not distinctive and the lab address should be easy to cover with one's hand
12.5 Adding objects to the environment	Make sure there is a larger envelope available to mask the return envelope with the lab address
5.1 Information about	Pack-level instructions and the site where packs can be accessed on-line should provide clear information concerning the viability of samples which are self-

health consequences	collected, and the viability of samples delivered to labs through the postal system
6.2 Social Comparison	Pack-level instructions and the site where packs can be accessed on-line should draw the user's attention to the fact that other people return the samples and get accurate results all the time (e.g, 'this is routine care within London clinics')
6.2 Social Comparison	Pack-level instructions and the site where packs can be accessed on-line should draw the user's attention to the fact that other people return the samples and get accurate results all the time (e.g, 'this is routine care within London clinics')
12.5 Adding objects to the environment	Pack-level instructions and the site where packs can be accessed on-line should ensure that the user knows that there are safe and secure drop off boxes within sexual health clinics or pharmacies that represent alternatives to postal delivery
2.2 Feedback on behaviour	Systems should be in place that acknowledge receipt of the pack to the user.
2.7 Feedback on outcomes of behaviour	Systems should be in place that provide feedback on the outcomes of the use of the self-sampling kits by giving results. Quickly and efficiently - including negative results

474

475 Our analysis shows that different sequential behavioural domains that make up the overall
 476 behavioural system of pack use warrant distinct behaviour change techniques. However, in
 477 relation to describing the overall frequencies of recommended BCTs across the whole
 478 behavioural system, these related to the BCT grouping 'natural consequences' (n=10),
 479 'antecedents' (n=9), 'comparison of behaviour' (n=4), 'feedback and monitoring' (n=2),
 480 'comparison of outcomes' (n=2), 'self-belief' (n=2), 'shaping knowledge' (n=1), and
 481 'regulation' (n=1).

482 **Discussion**

483 This paper presents the results of a behaviour change wheel analysis of a prior thematic
484 analysis of qualitative data collected through focus groups and interviews. It presents the
485 granular specification for changes that should optimise an existing intervention using
486 concepts and language from the BCW; theoretical domains specified by the TDF,
487 intervention functions, and the behaviour change technique taxonomy. Our analysis focused
488 upon ways to optimise an existing individual-level intervention. The existing intervention
489 itself can be conceptualised as relatively simple when compared to interactional or longer
490 term continuous interventions. It includes the effective use of a pack that contained several
491 self-sampling kits, instructions and materials to enable the return of samples to lead to
492 diagnosis.

493

494 Recent studies however, show that return rate of samples is highly variable and socially
495 patterned. The use of self-sampling packs is likely to be of increasing importance remote and
496 self-managed care becomes more and more normative. Self-testing / sampling for COVID-19
497 is also a central tool to returning to the work or educational setting. Insights into how to
498 optimise the use of such packs are likely to be increasingly useful. To our knowledge this
499 paper is the first internationally to focus on the optimisation of such self-managed packs
500 using tools from health psychology and the wider behavioural sciences.

501

502 Our use of the behaviour change wheel may be interesting to other health psychologists in the
503 way we sought to balance behavioural specificity with parsimony. The effectiveness of the
504 BCW approach relies on rigorous examination and selection of the appropriate specific
505 behaviour(s). In our experience, this first step in the process of a 'behavioural diagnosis', in
506 other words selecting the key behaviour(s) to be changed within given behavioural domains

507 and their wider systems, is far more complex than published guidance and papers would
508 suggest, yet it is central and indeed fundamental to the usefulness of the whole BCW
509 approach. Michie et al (2014) for example highlight the importance of considering likely
510 impact, ease of implementation, likely spill-over and ease of measurement. However, for an
511 intervention already existing and known to be less than optimal this approach with its
512 singular focus was deemed insufficient to enable the overall optimisation that would lead to
513 wider population reach and effective use. As such we cast our behavioural lens across the
514 whole behavioural system of pack-use.

515

516 Equally of interest to health psychologists and other behavioural scientists we spent a lot of
517 time considering how to conceptualise the diverse behaviours involved within effective pack
518 use. We believe it is important to stress to others the centrality of this step in relation to using
519 tools like the BCW approach effectively. Within this study we sought to conceptualise the
520 overall use of the pack as a behavioural system; for us a behavioural system is a series of
521 interdependent behavioural domains, each domain in turn is constituted from a number of
522 discrete behaviours. We made the decision to pitch our analysis at the level of the behavioural
523 domain and not the overall behavioural system or indeed at the level of highly specific
524 behaviours. Our findings show that there are important differences in the causal mechanisms
525 (i.e., TDF domains) associated with the each of the different behavioural domains and this
526 resulted in us specify different intervention content for each sequential step. We believe that
527 there is a need for more conceptual and methodological work in this area as many papers
528 using these tools fail to provide clarity about this essential first step in behavioural diagnosis.

529

530 Accordingly, having established a pragmatic way of conceptualising the behaviours we
531 wished to optimise, using the BCW, we were able to make distinct and quite granular

532 recommendations for ways to intervene in each behavioural domain. By quantifying the
533 overall frequency of the TDF domains we coded as indicative of their relative importance, we
534 were able to evidence that optimisation should focus overall on changes to the user's '*beliefs*
535 *about consequences*' when using the pack, and additional information to facilitate the user's
536 '*memory attention and decision processes*'. We also provided particular detail of ways to
537 optimise each of the behavioural domains involved in this wider behavioural system.
538 Subsequently, we drew upon the wider team's clinical, practical and inter-disciplinary
539 expertise and conducted an APEASE analysis of the recommendations developed here.
540 APEASE addresses affordability, practicability, effectiveness/cost-effectiveness,
541 acceptability, side-effects/safety and equity.

542

543 Our final analysis and the agreed BCTs and intervention content were eventually used to
544 develop a series of on-line support videos for people using the packs. Our analysis was also
545 used to redesign the packs that were used within a multi-site cluster randomised control trial
546 of APT.

547

548 **Strengths and limitations**

549 *Limitations* of the current study included the potential for recruitment bias. Although we
550 recruited participants from both clinical and community settings and in Scotland and England
551 the participants that agreed to take part were largely well educated, health literate and
552 confident and/or comfortable enough to share their views and opinions on self-sampling
553 packs for sexually transmitted infections. In this way our insights into optimising self-
554 sampling packs are based on the perspectives of participants who may not represent the
555 people for whom optimisation may well be most important. In light of this we also conducted
556 similar research amongst people with mild learning difficulties to try to provide insights from

557 more diverse populations (Middleton et al., 2021). Overall we found similar barriers and
558 facilitators to those reported in Flowers et al., 3a).

559

560 *Strengths* of the current study are that the optimisations are all based on empirical qualitative
561 work and have benefited from the use of behaviour change theory. We have presented a clear
562 account and auditable summary of our decision-making and the interpretation of results
563 (Table A in appendix). Other strengths include the fact that our results have been translated
564 into a range of resources that have been available to optimise self-sampling packs for STIs. In
565 addition, we have provided a transparent account of using behavioural theory to optimise an
566 existing intervention.

567

568 **Conclusion**

569 Using tools from behavioural science and health psychology we have shown how it is
570 possible to systematically optimise STI & BBV self-sampling packs to increase their reach
571 and effective use. Whilst our analysis here focused upon optimising self-sampling packs for
572 use within a wider trial of a particular form of partner notification we believe our analysis
573 offers several transferable insights into self-sampling packs more generally and for self-
574 sampling packs for COVID -19 in particular.

575

576 **References**

- 577 Atkins, L., Francis, J., Islam, R., O'Connor, D., Patey, A., Ivers, N., Foy, R., Duncan, E.M.,
578 Colquhoun, H., Grimshaw, J.M. & Lawton, R. (2017). A guide to using the Theoretical
579 Domains Framework of behaviour change to investigate implementation problems.
580 *Implementation Science*, 12(1), 77.
- 581 Banerjee, P., Thorley, N. & Radcliffe, K. Banerjee P, Thorley N, Radcliffe K. A service
582 evaluation comparing home-based testing to clinic-based testing for Chlamydia and
583 gonorrhoea in Birmingham and Solihull. *International journal of STD & AIDS*. 2018
584 Sep;29(10):974-9. Int. J. STD AIDS 29, 974–979 (2018).
- 585 Barker, F., Atkins, L. & de Lusignan, S. (2016). Applying the COMB behaviour model and
586 behaviour change wheel to develop an intervention to improve hearing aid use in adult
587 auditory rehabilitation. *International Journal of Audiology*, 55:sup3, S90-S98. doi:
588 10.3109/14992027.2015.1120894
- 589 Barnard, S., Free, C., Bakolis, I., Turner, K.M.E., Looker, K.J. & Baraitser, P. (2018).
590 Comparing the characteristics of users of an online service for STI self-sampling with clinic
591 service users: a cross-sectional analysis. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, 94, 377–383.
592 doi:10.1136/sextrans-2017-053302
- 593 Bracebridge, S., Bachmann, M. O., Ramkhalawon, K. & Woolnough, A. Evaluation of a systematic
594 postal screening and treatment service for genital Chlamydia trachomatis, with remote clinic access
595 via the internet: a cross-sectional study, East of England. *Sex Transm Infect*. 88, 375–381 (2012).
- 596 Cane, J., O'Connor, D. & Michie, S. (2012). Validation of the theoretical domains framework
597 for use in behaviour change and implementation research. *Implementation Science*, 7, 37.
- 598 Flowers, P., Pothoulaki, M., Vojt, G., Mapp, F., Woode Owusu, M., Estcourt, C., Cassell, J.
599 & Saunders, J. (2021). Understanding the barriers and facilitators to using self-sampling
600 packs for sexually transmitted infections and blood borne viruses: thematic analyses
601 supporting intervention optimisation. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.22.20230359>
602
- 603 Manavi, K. & Hodson, J. Observational study of factors associated with return of home
604 sampling kits for sexually transmitted infections requested online in the UK. *BMJ Open*, 7,
605 e017978 (2017)
- 606 Michie, S., Atkins, L. & West, R. (2014). *The behaviour Change Wheel: A Guide to*
607 *Designing Interventions*. London: Silverback (1st edition).
- 608 Michie, S., Richardson, M., Johnston, M., Abraham, C., Francis, J., Hardeman, W., Eccles,
609 M.P., Cane, J. & Wood, C.E. (2013). The Behavior Change Technique Taxonomy (v1) of 93
610 hierarchically clustered techniques: building an international consensus for the reporting of
611 behavior change interventions. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 46 (1), 81-95. doi:
612 10.1007/s12160-013-9486-6
- 613 Middleton, A., Pothoulaki, M., Woode Owusu, M., Flowers, P., Mapp, F., Vojt, G., Laidlaw,
614 R. & Estcourt, C. (2020). How can we make self-sampling packs for sexually transmitted
615 infections and blood borne viruses more inclusive? A qualitative study with people with mild
616 learning disabilities and low health literacy.
617 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.06.20217612>
618

619 Ogale, Y., Yeh, P.T., Kennedy, C.E., Toskin, I. & Narasimhan, M. (2019). Self-collection of
620 samples as an additional approach to deliver testing services for sexually transmitted
621 infections: a systematic review and meta analysis. *British Medical Journal Glob Health*, 4,
622 e001349. doi:10.1136/ bmjgh-2018-001349

623 Presseau J, McCleary N, Lorencatto F, Patey AM, Grimshaw JM, Francis JJ. Action, actor,
624 context, target, time (AACTT): a framework for specifying behaviour. *Implementation*
625 *Science*. 2019 Dec;14(1):1-3.
626

627 Wayal, S., Hughes, G., Sonnenberg, P., Mohammed, H., Copas, A.J., Gerressu, M., Tanton,
628 C., Furegato, M. & Mercer, C.H. (2017). Ethnic variations in sexual behaviours and sexual
629 health markers: findings from the third British National Survey of sexual attitudes and
630 lifestyles -3). *Lancet Public Health*, 2 (10), e458–e72