Full title: Social support and ideal cardiovascular health in urban Jamaica: a cross-sectional study

Short title: Social support and ideal cardiovascular health

Authors:

Alphanso L. Blake[4], Nadia R. Bennett[1], Joette A. McKenzie[1], Marshall K. Tulloch-Reid[1], Ishtar Govia[1], Shelly R. McFarlane[1], Renee Walters[1], Damian K. Francis[2], Rainford J. Wilks[1], David R. Williams[3], Novie O. Younger-Coleman[1*], Trevor S. Ferguson[1*]

INSTITUTIONS

[1]Caribbean Institute for Health Research, The University of the West Indies, Mona, Kingston, Jamaica

[2]School of Health and Human Performance, Georgia College and State University, Milledgeville, GA, USA

[3]Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

[4]School of Clinical Medicine and Research, The Faculty of Medical Sciences, The University of the West Indies, Mona, Nassau, The Bahamas

Corresponding author:

Alphanso Blake

Email: alphanso.blake@uwimona.edu.jm

*These authors are joint senior authors on this manuscript.: TSF, NYC

Abstract

Recent studies suggest that high levels of social support can encourage better health behaviours and result in improved cardiovascular health. In this paper we evaluated the association between social support and ideal cardiovascular health among urban Jamaicans.

We conducted a cross-sectional study among urban residents in Jamaica's south-east health region. Socio-demographic data and information on cigarette smoking, physical activity, dietary practices, blood pressure, body size, cholesterol, and glucose were collected by trained personnel. The outcome variable, ideal cardiovascular health, was defined as having optimal levels of ≥5 of these characteristics (ICH-5) using the American Heart Association definitions. Social support exposure variables included number of friends (network size), number of friends willing to provide loans (instrumental support) and number of friends providing advice (informational support). Principal component analysis was used to create a social support score using these three variables. Survey-weighted logistic regression models were used to evaluate the association between ICH-5 and social support score.

Analyses included 841 participants (279 males, 562 females) with mean age of 47.6 years. ICH-5 prevalence was 26.4% (95%CI 22.2, 31.0) with no significant sex difference (male 27.5%, female 25.7%). In sex-specific, multivariable logistic regression models, social support score, was inversely associated with ICH-5 among males (OR 0.67 [95%CI 0.51, 0.89], p=0.006) but directly associated among females (OR 1.29 [95%CI 1.07, 1.55], p=0.007) after adjusting for age and community SES. Living in poorer communities was also significantly associated with higher odds of ICH-5 among males only.

In this study, having higher levels of social support was associated with better cardiovascular health among women, but poorer cardiovascular health among men in urban Jamaica. Further research should explore these associations and identify appropriate interventions to promote cardiovascular health.

INTRODUCTION

Cardiovascular Diseases

Cardiovascular disease (CVD), manifesting clinically as coronary heart disease, cerebrovascular disease, and peripheral arterial disease, remains the leading causes of morbidity and mortality globally (1, 2). The prevalence of CVDs increased two-fold from 1990 to 2019, increasing from 271 million to 523 million cases globally (3). Additionally, there was a 50% increase in deaths from 12.1 to 18.6 million over the same period (4). Social risk factors, such as socioeconomic position, poverty, social networks, access to health care services (5), continue to be one of the major contributors to cardiovascular diseases (3). Some experts projects a further increase in the prevalence of CVD cases in several world regions, including the Caribbean, where there is an expected doubling in the geriatric population over the next thirty years (6).

Several risk factors for CVDs have been recognised, including seven factors identified in the American Heart Association (AHA) "Life's Simple 7" programme: high blood pressure, high cholesterol, high blood sugar, physical inactivity, unhealthy diet, overweight/obesity and cigarette smoking (7). The AHA has also reported that preserving normal levels of these characteristics will reduce morbidity and mortality from CVD and other conditions (8, 9). In 2010, AHA introduced the concept of ideal cardiovascular health (ICH) to refer to the absence of CVD and normal levels of key risk factors, namely normal blood pressure, normal glucose, normal cholesterol, normal weight, healthy diet, physical activity of at least 150 minutes per week and current non-smoking (8). This framework for preventing cardiovascular disease and promoting cardiovascular health is largely built on the principles of primary prevention (10). The risk factors for CVD as defined were categorized into two groups, with four ideal health behaviours, consisting of non-smoking, normal weight, adequate physical activity, and healthy diet, and four ideal health factors consisting of normal blood pressure, normal cholesterol, normal glucose, and non-smoking status. AHA stated that people can improve these factors through lifestyle/behaviour changes.

In urban Jamaica, ICH prevalence is low, with only 0.5% having all 7 characteristics and 23% having 5 or more in persons 20 years and older (11). Other countries report a similarly low prevalence of ICH, ranging from 0.1% having all 7 ICH characteristics in the Republic of Serbia (12) to 3.3% having all seven ICH characteristics in Malawi (13).

Recent studies suggest that having quality relationships is associated with better health outcomes, inclusive of cardiovascular disease and its risk factors (14-16). Possible mechanisms for these associations include social support systems that may act as a buffer to stressors which compound an individual's medical condition (17, 18)

Social Support and Health

Social support refers to the functions or provisions given by one's social relationships such as emotional concern, instrumental assistance, or information (17-19). Social support involves an exchange of resources between a minimum of two individuals to benefit one of the individuals (20, 21). It usually comprises the structural aspect of an individual's social life and the functions they seek to serve (22). Social support becomes important in cardiovascular events as it acts as a buffer to the debilitating effects of stress induced cardiovascular reactivity (22). Gottlieb emphasized that researchers in behavioural medicine and psychology have focused on social support for two main reasons, firstly, it plays an integral role in moderating the effects of life stress and well-being and secondly, it plays a key role in stress relief and adjustment in stressed individuals (14, 23). Given these finding, social support ought to be a fundamental principle of health promotion since it is expected to encourage healthier behaviours and potentially improve health outcomes (14).

Social support and the application of concepts related to social support can be categorized into three main areas, namely social embeddedness, perceived social support and enacted support (24). Social embeddedness relates primarily to social network size, i.e., the number of persons with whom one is socially connected. It has also been suggested that researchers develop more precise models that explore the connections between concepts that covers life stress, measures of distress and social network (24, 25). There is a growing interest among researchers regarding how social network factors interacts with cardiovascular health (26). Research has also shown that social networks can have an important effect on physical health and that among older adults, the number of friends may influence cardiovascular health, with larger number of friends being associated with better CVD risks(17, 27).

Research has shown that lack of social support is associated with an increase in cardiovascular risk, with odds ratios ranging from 2 to 3 (28). In one study Nagayoshi and colleagues found

that persons with smaller number of friends were at significantly higher risk of incident stroke; additionally, persons who reported a lack of social support also had higher risk of incident stroke, but the latter was not statistically significant (28). High social support has also been shown to be associated with reduced mortality, improvement in health and an overall greater quality of life (21). In another study, Harding and colleagues found that high levels of functional social support was associated with lower risk of incident hypertension among participants in the Jackson Heart Study (29).There is therefore evidence to support the position that certain types of social support is associated with improved outcomes in cardiovascular conditions (29).

Social support may have an important role in the risk of cardiovascular diseases, but little is known with regards to its relationship with cardiovascular health. Additionally, most of the studies have been conducted in developed countries resulting in an important knowledge gap. This study therefore aims to evaluate the relationship between social support and ideal cardiovascular health among persons living in urban Jamaica, a middle-income developing country.

METHODS

Data sources

We conducted a cross-sectional study in four parishes in Jamaica's southeast health region. The included parishes were Kingston, St Andrew, St Catherine, and St Thomas, representing almost 50% of the Jamaican population. Details concerning the research protocol and methods have been previously published (11, 30). The data were collected between June 2018 and July 2019. The study recruited participants from the 2016/2017 Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey (JHLS-III) or individuals living in one of the communities previously surveyed in JHLS-III and age 15 years or older. We included non-institutionalized Jamaicans who were resident in the selected communities and excluded persons who were unable to comprehend the questions included in the questionnaire. The study was approved by the Mona Campus Research Ethics Committee of the University of the West Indies (Ethical approval # ECP 89 16/17).

Measurements

Data on demographic characteristics, cigarette smoking, physical activity and dietary practices were collected using interviewer administered questionnaires in face-to-face interviews.

Social support items for the questionnaire were adapted from the Chicago Community Adult Health Study (CCAHS). This questionnaire is now in the public domain (31) (CCAHS at https://www.isr.umich.edu/ccahs/CCAHSQuestionnaire.pdf). Social support were measured following the methods used by Viruell-Fuentes and colleagues and assessed: i) network size based on answers to the question of "How many friends and relatives do you have?" all domains required a single numeric value; ii) instrumental support using the question "How many friends and relatives do you have to whom you can turn when you need to borrow something like a household object or a small amount of money or need help with an errand?"; iii) informational support from the question "How many friends and relatives do you have who you can ask for advice or information?"(32) .

Blood pressure was measured using an oscillometric device (Omron 5 series blood pressure monitor, Omron Healthcare, Lake Forest, IL). Three blood pressure measurements were taken using the right arm of the seated participant and followed standardized procedures developed for the International Collaborative Study of Hypertension in Blacks (33). The means of the second and third systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) measurements were used in the analyses. Weight was measured using a portable digital scale (Tanita HD-351 Digital Weight Scale, Tanita Corporation, Tokyo, Japan) and recorded to the nearest 0.1 kg. Height was measured using a portable stadiometer (Seca 213 Mobile stadiometer, Seca GmbH & Co., Hamburg, Germany) and recorded to the nearest 0.1 cm. To ensure reliable measurements, field staff were trained and certified for performing Blood Pressure (BP) and anthropometric measurement prior to starting fieldwork and at three-month intervals. Fasting glucose and total cholesterol were measured from a capillary blood sample using a point of care device (SD LipidoCare, Suwon, South Korea).

ICH variables

The seven ICH categories were defined using the standards of the American Heart Association (7). Normal blood pressure was defined as SBP less than 120 mm Hg and DBP less than 80 mm Hg among persons who are not being treated for hypertension. Normal body mass index (BMI) was defined as BMI less than 25.0 kg/m^2. Normal glucose was defined using a fasting glucose

level of less than 5.6 mmol/L among persons not being treated for diabetes. Normal cholesterol was less than 5.2 mmol/L among persons not being treated for hypercholesterolaemia. Current non-smokers were defined as persons who reported never smoking or have quit smoking for more than 12 months. Engaging in 150 minutes of moderate physical activity or 75 minutes of vigorous physical activity per week was defined as adequate physical activity. Participants were classified as having healthy diet if they had three or more of the dietary characteristics below:

- Low salt defined as no salt added at the table and rarely or never eating processed food.
- Low sugar-sweetened beverage (SSB) consumption defined as having SSB less than twice per week.
- Adequate fruit and vegetable consumption defined as having fruits or vegetables three or more times per day.
- Adequate fish consumption as having fish two or more times per week.

Baseline socioeconomic status (SES) characteristics included participants' educational attainment; this was captured categorically as:

- "Less than high school" for persons with no formal education or up to grade 8
- "High school" for persons who would have attained formal education up to grades 9 – 13.
- "More than high school" for persons with post-secondary education at college, university or vocational training institutions.

This was used as an individual level socioeconomic status (11)

Unimproved land value for each property for the communities selected for the survey were obtained from Jamaica's National Land Agency (NLA). Community property values were classified using the median property value for each community as a summary measure of the socioeconomic status for that community. The median property values were ordered and distinguished into rural and urban categories and then divided into categories, namely, lower, middle and upper categories. Details on the use of this metric in the Jamaican context has been previously published (11).

Poverty was defined using the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) Poverty Maps data base (34). Levels of poverty were estimated based on household consumption patterns quoted in Jamaican

dollars per adult across 14 parishes and 767 communities of the country. This approach provided a Poverty headcount, estimated using a measure of consumption which compared the values of the food poverty line with the value of the total poverty line (34). The food poverty line represents the cost of the food basket which consists of a minimum nutritional requirement of kilocalories per family. The total poverty line consists of the food basket which is added to non-food items such as transport cost, clothing, health, educational and personal expenses (34). For this analysis communities were ranked according to total poverty and categorized into lower, middle, and upper tertiles, such that those in the upper tertile have the highest level of poverty.

Sample size and power

Sample size and power calculations were performed using Stata 16.1. We estimated the power based on an available sample of 841 study participants. To account for the complex survey design and the fact that the analyses will use survey analytic methods, we estimated a design effect factor and used this to estimate an effective sample size for each phase of the study. The design effect was estimated as the ratio of the variance for the proportion of participants with five ICH components in JHLS-II with and without adjustment for survey design. This was found to be 2.6; a similar estimate of the design effect was found when other outcomes were used. Based on this design effect, our effective sample size was estimated to 324 (i.e., 841/2.6) for this study. We did not have estimates of the variation of ICH by social support groups, but we estimated power based on possible odds ratios of 1.5 to 2.5 per unit increase in social support score (which is assumed to follow the Normal distribution while prevalence of ICH at mean support score is assumed to be 0.23). A sample of 324 has power ranging from 81% to estimate a odds ratio (OR) of 1.5 using logistic regression ($\alpha = 0.05$ two-sided; $\beta=0$ vs $\beta = 0.405$) and 99% to detect a OR of 2.5.

Statistical approaches

Statistical analyses were done using Stata version 16.1. Community-specific data inclusive of land value and poverty data were identified from the National Land Agency (NLA) and the Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN) respectively, these were merged into the primary study dataset. Given that social support was assessed using three correlated variables (network size, instrumental support, informational support), we used Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to

derive a score combining the three variables. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was used to determine the suitability of the variables for use in PCA, with KMO greater than 0.5 seen as significant (35). KMO for the three variables included was 0.739, thus adequate for use in PCA. Horn's parallel analysis method was then used to select the PCA components for use in the analysis (36, 37). This yielded a single PCA component with Eigenvalue of 2.37 explaining 81% of the variance in the three variables.

Outcome and exposure variables

We estimated the proportion of persons having all seven ideal cardiovascular health components, however, given that this proportion was very small, we used having five or more ICH components as the main outcome variable in evaluating associations. The main exposure variable was social support score as defined above. Covariates and potential confounders assessed included age, sex, and measures of SES variables (education level, median community property value and community poverty).

T-tests were used to identify differences in means and Chi-squared and Fisher's exact used to identify differences in proportions. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant for analyses. Logistic regression models were used to assess bivariate and multivariable associations. Analyses were weighted to account for survey design.

Missing data

Missing data were handled using multiple imputation. The total dataset included 849 participants. Analyses were limited to 841 participants who had data on age, sex, and survey weights. Missing data for other variables were filled in using multiple imputation by chained equations using Stata suite of multiple imputation commands (38). For the variables included in the analyses for this paper 727 participants had full data and 114 participants has data for at least one variable missing. The total fraction of missing data was 13.5% the largest proportion of missing for a single variable being 6.4%. We therefore chose to do 20 imputations based on recommendations from Graham et al. (39).

RESULTS

Unweighted summary statistics for participants characteristics by sex were presented in Table 1. The analysed sample included 841 participants with an overall mean age of 47.6±18.4 years; this included 562 females and 279 males. The mean height was 165.5 cm, and the mean weight was 78.5 kg; females weighed significantly more than males (79.7 kg vs. 76.0 kg; p=0.029. The mean overall BMI was 28.7 kg/m^2; females (30.4 kg/m^2) had significantly higher BMI than males (25.4 kg/m^2), p≤0.001. Mean systolic blood pressure (SBP) was 130.9 mmHg (males = 132.9 mmHg vs 129.9 mmHg for females, p=0.067). For the diastolic blood pressure (DBP), the overall mean was 84.4 mmHg with no significant variation by sex (p=0.787). Mean fasting blood glucose level was 5.9 mmol/l overall; sex specific values were: 5.8 mmol/l for males vs. 6.0 mmol/l for females (p=0.191). Overall total cholesterol level was 4.4 mmol/l; females (4.5 mmol/l) had significantly higher total cholesterol levels than males (4.2 mmol/l), p=0.002.

Table 1 – Unweighted mean values for participant characteristics by sex

Characteristics	**n (Male/Female)**	**Male n= 279**	**Female n= 562**	**Total n= 841**	**P-values males vs females**
Mean for Continuous Variables		Mean ±SD	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD	
Age (years)	841 (279/562)	46.56 ±19.17	48.16 ± 18.07	47.63 ± 18.42	0.246
Height (cm)	811 (268/543)	173.04 ± 8.31	161.74 ± 7.97	165.47 ± 9.67	<0.001
Weight (kg)	817 (269/548)	76.05 ± 21.69	79.68 ± 23.50	78.48 ±22.97	0.029
BMI (kg/m2)	808 (267/541)	25.42 ±7.21	30.35 ± 8.51	28.73 ± 8.43	<0.001
SBP (mmHg)	822 (270/552)	132.86 ± 21.09	129.89 ±23.06	130.86 ± 22.46	0.067
DBP (mmHg)	822 (270/552)	84.19 ±14.07	84.47 ±13.23	84.38 ±13.50	0.787
Fasting Glucose (mmol/l)	799 (261/538)	5.80 ±1.98	6.01 ± 2.45	5.94 ±2.31	0.191
Total Cholesterol (mmol/l)	798 (262/536)	4.21 ± 1.16	4.48 ± 1.19	4.39 ± 1.19	0.002

There were no significant sex differences sex differences in SES characteristics: For education categories, 51.9% of persons had high school level, while 25.8% of respondents had more than high school education and 22.4% had less than high school education (p-value for male vs. female = 0.962). The mean median land value was 1.63 million JMD overall (females, 1.64 M vs males, 1.62M) (p-value for male vs. female = 0.890). The highest percentage (54%) of persons were in the lower land value category, 27% were in the middle category and 17% in the upper category (p-value for male vs. female = 0.598). The highest proportion of persons were in the upper category of total poverty (44.9%), the middle category had 19.4% and the lower category had 35.7% (p-value for male vs. female = 0.252).

Figures 1- 3 show the median distribution of social support/network characteristics for study participants. The median friend number size was 4, males had a median value of 5 and females had a median of 4 friends (Figure 1). For instrumental support, the median number was 3 persons, males had a median of 4 while females had a median of 3 persons (Figure 2). Median value for informational support was 4 overall; males had a median score of 5 and females had 4 persons.

Prevalence of the individual ICH components are shown in Table 2. The highest prevalence was seen for current non-smokers at 81% and lowest prevalence for healthy diet at 19 %. Prevalence of the other components were physical activity ≥150 minutes, 41%; normal blood pressure, 34%; normal BMI, 36%; normal blood glucose level, 68%; and normal cholesterol level, 79%. The distribution of number of ICH variables is shown in Figure 4. Median number of ICH variables was 3 and mean number was 3.6. None of the participants had all seven ICH characteristics. Prevalence of 5 or more components was 26.7% (95% CI 22.3 – 31.0); males 25.7%, females 27.5%. There was no significant difference in the prevalence of ICH by sex.

Table 2 Mean ICH score and prevalence estimates of ICH characteristics by Sex

Characteristics	Total N = 841	Males (n=279)	Females (n = 562)
Total ICH score (Mean, 95% CI)	3.57, (3.46 – 3.69)	3.60, (3.47 – 3.72)	3.55, (3.39 – 3.70)
BMI normal ICH (%, 95% CI)	36, (32 – 40)	45, (38 – 51)	28, (23 – 32)
Non-smoker ICH (%, 95% CI)	81, (77 – 85)	72, (66 – 78)	89, (86 – 92)
Glucose Normal ICH (%, 95% CI)	68, (62 – 74)	67, (59 – 74)	68, (62 – 75)
Normal BP ICH (%, 95% CI)	34, (29 – 40)	29, (24 – 35)	39, (33 – 46)
Physical activity ICH (%, 95% CI)	41, (36 – 45)	52, (46 – 57)	30, (24 – 37)
Healthy diet ICH (%, 95% CI)	19, (16 – 22)	16, (12 – 20)	22, (18 – 26)
Cholesterol Normal ICH (%, 95% CI)	79, (75 – 82)	79, (73 – 85)	78, (74 – 82)

Table 3 displays bivariate analyses stratified by sex and reported as odds ratios (95%) CI of having ICH-5. We report sex-specific estimates as there was significant sex-interaction in the association between ICH and social support score (p=0.003). Age was significantly associated with ICH-5 for both males and females with odds ratio of 0.97 (0.94 – 0.99) for males and 0.95 (0.92 – 0.97) for females. Among males, social support score was inversely associated with ICH-5, with odds ratio of 0.69 (0.52 – 0.91) while among females, social support score was directly associated with ICH-5, with odds ratio of 1.10 (0.30 – 1.29).

Males with high school education had a 2.48 (1.48 – 4.15) higher odds of ICH-5 compared to those with less than high school education, while those with more than high school level education had a non-significant 1.3 times higher odds of ICH-5; on the other hand females with more than high school education had a borderline significant 2.50 (0.98 – 6.31) higher odds of ICH-5 while those with high school education had a non-significant 1.88 (0.59 – 5.97) higher odds of ICH-5.

For land value, the lower category was used as the referent category. Males in the middle category had a non-significant 0.46 (0.25 – 0.83), lower odds of having 5 or more ICH characteristics; those in the upper category were also non-significant with odds of 0.92 (0.42 – 2.03) of ICH-5. On the other hand, females in the middle land value category had a non-significant 0.64 (0.39 – 1.05) odds of having ICH-5, those in the upper category had a non-significant 0.98 odds (0.46 – 2.06).

Poverty was classified into three categories and the lower category was used as the referent for both males and females. Males in the middle category had a non-significant 1.18 (0.56 – 2.51) odds of having ICH-5, while those in the upper category had a significantly 2 times higher odds of having ICH-5 (1.06 – 3.78). For females all values were non-significant; those in the middle category had a 0.93 (0.48 – 1.80) odds of ICH-5; and those in the upper category had 1.65 (0.85 – 3.20) odds.

Table 3 – Sex-specific Bivariate model showing the odds of ICH-5

Outcome: ICH-5	**Males**		**Females**	
Predictors	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Pvalue	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Pvalue
Age	0.97 (0.94 – 0.99)	0.003	0.95 (0.92 – 0.97)	<0.001
Social Support Score	0.69 (0.52 – 0.91)	0.010	1.10 (0.30 – 1.29)	0.272
Education Categories				
Less than High School	Ref		Ref	
High School	2.48 (1.48 – 4.15)	0.001	1.88 (0.59 – 5.97)	0.277

More than High School	1.30 (0.61 – 2.76)	0.480	2.50 (0.98 – 6.31)	0.054
Land Value Categories				
Lower Category	Ref		Ref	
Middle Category	0.46 (0.25 – 0.83)	0.012	0.64 (0.39 – 1.05)	0.075
Upper Category	0.92 (0.42 – 2.03)	0.832	0.98 (0.46 – 2.06)	0.951
Community Poverty Categories				
Lower Category	Ref		Ref	
Middle Category	1.18 (0.56 – 2.51)	0.653	0.93 (0.48 – 1.80)	0.823
Upper Category	2.00 (1.06 – 3.78)	0.033	1.65 (0.85 – 3.20)	0.132

Table 4 shows the final multivariable models looking at the relationship between ICH-5 and social support score. Again, we present sex-specific models as there was evidence for sex interaction in the relationship between ICH-5 and social support score. The models also included age, land value and community poverty. Among females, social support score was directly associated with ICH-5, with odds ratio of 1.26 (95%CI 1.04 – 1.53). Age was significantly associated with ICH-5, odds ratio 0.94 (95% CI 0.91 – 0.97). Females in the upper category of land value had a significantly higher odds of ICH-5 (2.52; 95% CI 1.06 – 6.03).

Among males, social support score was inversely associated with ICH-5, with odds ratio of 0.69 (95%CI 0.54 – 0.88). Age was significantly associated with ICH-5 odds ratio 0.96 (95% CI 0.93 – 0.99). Community poverty was directly associated with ICH-5 among men, middle category odds ratio 3.87 (95% CI 1.10 – 13.57); upper category, odds ratio 2.04 (95% CI 1.04 – 3.98). There were no significant associations between education category and social support score among men.

Table 4a: Survey weighted Multivariable Model showing the odds of ICH-5 for males and females with their corresponding 95% CI and pvalue. (ICH-5 Odds)

Variables	**Females** **Odds ratio (95% CI)**	**P-value**	**Males** **Odds ratio (95% CI)**	**P-value**
Social Support Score	1.26 (1.04 – 1.53)	0.020	0.69 (0.54 – 0.88)	0.005
Age	0.94 (0.91 – 0.97)	<0.001	0.96 (0.93 – 0.99)	0.010
Education Category				
Less than High School	1.0		1.0	
High School	0.53 (0.11 – 2.61)	0.422	1.20 (0.45 – 3.2)	0.710
More Than High School	0.89 (0.25 – 3.24)	0.861	0.64 (0.18 – 2.27)	0.477
Land Value Category				
Lower Category	1.0		1.0	
Middle category	1.48 (0.68 – 3.21)	0.305	0.46 (0.16 – 1.33)	0.148
Upper Category	2.52 (1.06 – 6.03)	0.038	2.49 (0.76 – 8.22)	0.129
Community Poverty Category				
Lower Category	1.0		1.0	
Middle Category	1.07 (0.45 – 2.53)	0.873	3.87 (1.10 – 13.57)	0.035
Upper Category	2.46 (0.93 – 6.50)	0.069	2.04 (1.04 – 3.98)	0.038

DISCUSSION

Main Findings

In this study we found that higher levels of social support are inversely associated with ICH among males, but directly associated among women. Men tends to have larger networks than women, however there is no significant difference in the prevalence of ICH by sex. We also found that age was significantly associated with ICH-5 and community poverty was directly associated with ICH-5 among men, indicating that men in poorer communities were more likely to have ICH-5.

Comparison to previous studies

Studies have been done to review the relationship between social support and disease morbidity and as such predict pathways in which social support may influence health outcomes and contribute to better mental health and also act as a buffer to stressful chronic conditions (22, 40). In a Swiss study, the prevalence of ICH was found to be 54% (3 or more ICH variables), compared to our study with 26.7% of persons having five or more ICH variables (41) Another study in Peru had only 12.7% having 5 or more ICH characteristics and no one had all 7 ICH characteristics (42). Similarly, persons in the lower SES regions had higher percentage of ICH prevalence. A study by Bostean and colleagues highlighted the protective effectives of social support from family and friends coupled with neighbourhood characteristics influences mental health by acting as a buffer to stressful life events (32). Research has also revealed that social support possesses the ability to encourage positive reframing, thus reducing the stress (43). Such stress may lead to high blood pressure which increases the risk of heart attack and stroke (44).

Gender Differences

Males had a higher number of friends than females, however social support scores were inversely associated with ICH-5 for males and directly associated for females. One study showed that their larger networks can act as a source of burden and won't necessarily be a source of support (45). The same study, however documented the lack of approaches to improve social support among social networks (45).

Possible Mechanisms

Our results may be due to the promotion of unhealthy behaviours among men with larger friend numbers while social networks encourage positive health behaviours among women. Poverty and ICH may be influenced by physical activity and BMI. Essentially, women in the upper category of land value may be more health conscious and as such make a more deliberate effort to factor in healthy lifestyle behaviours. Men however in poorer communities may do more physically strenuous tasks which keeps them active and unconsciously maintaining an ideal health status.

The perceived accessibility to the social support that can be available may contribute to a positive sense of self and the accomplishment of personal task as encouragements can influence behaviours (40). These support systems may play an integral role in guiding individuals towards a level of optimum social performance since social support may manifest as ensuring one eats properly, exercise, avoid smoking among other important factors which are listed as an ICH criterion.

Implications

Our review did not identify any other study exploring the relationship between social support, ICH and neighbourhood characteristics. Additionally, it forms the platform for the development of sex specific approaches to achieving ICH characteristics. This is possible because the socioeconomic background is taken into consideration and the impact that peers may have on the realization of the intended outcome stipulated by the ICH goal.

The concept of ICH was developed to factor in the behavioural and clinical risk factors that can be used in research and clinical practice as a practical tool to motivate and enable patients to reduce their own cardiovascular risk (46). The findings of this study can stimulate the implementation of targeted approaches that factors in socioeconomic conditions of people.

Strengths and limitations

The study sample is representative of the most populous areas of the country, which provides a mix of rural and urban experiences and a good estimate for local experiences. The study had a small sample size and as such the statistical approaches employed accounted for the population-level estimates.

Conclusion

The association between social support score and ICH characteristics varies by sex, with an inverse association among men and positive association among women. Women living in communities with high property value were more likely to have ICH, while men living in poorer communities were more likely to have ICH. These findings suggest that gender specific approaches may be needed when designing social interventions to improve cardiovascular health.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Harvard T H Chan School of Public Health Lown Scholars Program for the grant and general support. The authors also thank the National Land Agency (NLA) for providing the property value data and the Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN) for providing the shapefile. The authors would also like to thank the Ministry of Health and Wellness and the National Health Fund Jamaica, which provided funding for the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey III in 2016/2017. They also would like to thank the Geoinformation Unit from both STATIN and NLA. Thanks to the JHLS III field staff, JHLS III participants and the CAIHR/ERU administrative staff and the unit driver for their support.

Funding

Funding for this study was provided by the Bernard Lown Scholar program, (grant number: BLSCHP-1604). Sponsor's Website: https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/lownscholars/. The grant was awarded to TSF. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Heidenreich PA, Trogdon JG, Khavjou OA, Butler J, Dracup K, Ezekowitz MD, et al. Forecasting the future of cardiovascular disease in the United States: a policy statement from the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2011;123(8):933-44.
2. Alam MT, Echeverria SE, DuPont-Reyes MJ, Vasquez E, Murillo R, Gonzalez T, et al. Educational Attainment and Prevalence of Cardiovascular Health (Life's Simple 7) in Asian Americans. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021;18(4).
3. Roth GA, Mensah GA, Johnson CO, Addolorato G, Ammirati E, Baddour LM, et al. Global Burden of Cardiovascular Diseases and Risk Factors, 1990-2019: Update From the GBD 2019 Study. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2020;76(25):2982-3021.
4. Cardiovascular Diseases 2022 [updated September 29 2022. Available from: https://ncdalliance.org/why-ncds/ncds/cardiovascular-diseases#:~:text=Cases%20of%20cardiovascular%20disease%20nearly,cardiovascular%20diseases%20can%20be%20prevented.
5. Madavanakadu Devassy S, Webber M, Scaria L, Amuthavalli Thiyagarajan J, Fendt-Newlin M, Joubert J, et al. Social and behavioural risk factors in the prevention and management of cardiovascular disease in Kerala, India: a catchment area population survey. BMC Cardiovascular Disorders. 2020;20(1):327.
6. Aranco N. Panorama of Aging and Long-term Care: Latin America and the Caribbean is Aging | Publications Publications.iadb.org2019 [Available from: https://publications.iadb.org/publications/english/document/Panorama_of_Aging_and_Long-term_Care_Latin_America_and_the_Caribbean_is_Aging_en_en.pdf.
7. Life's Simple 7 Mlc.heart.org2022 [Available from: https://mlc.heart.org/assessment/health-factors.
8. Lloyd-Jones DM, Hong Y, Labarthe D, Mozaffarian D, Appel LJ, Van Horn L, et al. Defining and setting national goals for cardiovascular health promotion and disease reduction: the American Heart Association's strategic Impact Goal through 2020 and beyond. Circulation. 2010;121(4):586-613.
9. Ford ES, Greenlund KJ, Hong Y. Ideal cardiovascular health and mortality from all causes and diseases of the circulatory system among adults in the United States. Circulation. 2012;125(8):987-95.
10. Ford ES. Ideal Cardiovascular Health. Circulation. 2012;125(16):1955-7.
11. McKenzie JA, Younger NO, Tulloch-Reid MK, Govia I, Bennett NR, McFarlane S, et al. Ideal cardiovascular health in urban Jamaica: prevalence estimates and relationship to community property value, household assets and educational attainment: a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2020;10(12):e040664.
12. Janković J, Davidović M, Bjegović-Mikanović V, Janković S. Status of cardiovascular health in the Republic of Serbia: Results from the National Health Survey. PLoS One. 2019;14(3):e0214505.
13. Pengpid S, Peltzer K. Ideal Cardiovascular Health in a Nationally Representative Population-Based Sample of Adults in Malawi. Glob Heart. 2021;16(1):24.
14. Gottlieb BH, Bergen AE. Social support concepts and measures. J Psychosom Res. 2010;69(5):511-20.
15. Ochoa CY, Haardörfer R, Escoffery C, Stein K, Alcaraz KI. Examining the role of social support and spirituality on the general health perceptions of Hispanic cancer survivors. Psychooncology. 2018;27(9):2189-97.
16. Uchino BN, Cronan S, Scott E, Landvatter J, Papadakis M. Chapter 9 - Social support and stress, depression, and cardiovascular disease. In: Chantler PD, Larkin KT, editors. Cardiovascular Implications of Stress and Depression: Academic Press; 2020. p. 211-23.
17. Goldman AW. All in the family: The link between kin network bridging and cardiovascular risk among older adults. Social science & medicine (1982). 2016;166:137-49.

18. Strom JL, Egede LE. The impact of social support on outcomes in adult patients with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review. Curr Diab Rep. 2012;12(6):769-81.
19. Harvey IS, Story CR, Knutson D, Whitt-Glover MC. Exploring the Relationship of Religiosity, Religious Support, and Social Support Among African American Women in a Physical Activity Intervention Program. J Relig Health. 2016;55(2):495-509.
20. Arthur HM. Depression, isolation, social support, and cardiovascular disease in older adults. The Journal of cardiovascular nursing. 2006;21(5 Suppl 1):S2-7; quiz S8-9.
21. Tengku Mohd TAM, Yunus RM, Hairi F, Hairi NN, Choo WY. Social support and depression among community dwelling older adults in Asia: a systematic review. BMJ Open. 2019;9(7):e026667-e.
22. Uchino B. Social Support and Health: A Review of Physiological Processes Potentially Underlying Links to Disease Outcomes. Journal of behavioral medicine. 2006;29:377-87.
23. Bobdey S, Pawar AA, Sarkar R. An assessment of perceived social support among naval personnel. Medical journal, Armed Forces India. 2020;76(2):213-6.
24. Barrera Jr. M. Distinctions between social support concepts, measures, and models. American Journal of Community Psychology. 1986;14(4):413-45.
25. Smyth N, Siriwardhana C, Hotopf M, Hatch SL. Social networks, social support and psychiatric symptoms: social determinants and associations within a multicultural community population. Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology. 2015;50(7):1111-20.
26. Singh R, Javed Z, Yahya T, Valero-Elizondo J, Acquah I, Hyder AA, et al. Community and Social Context: An Important Social Determinant of Cardiovascular Disease. Methodist Debakey Cardiovasc J. 2021;17(4):15-27.
27. Uchino BN, Ruiz JM, Smith TW, Smyth JM, Taylor DJ, Allison M, et al. The Strength of Family Ties: Perceptions of Network Relationship Quality and Levels of C-Reactive Proteins in the North Texas Heart Study. Annals of behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine. 2015;49(5):776-81.
28. Nagayoshi M, Everson-Rose SA, Iso H, Mosley TH, Jr., Rose KM, Lutsey PL. Social network, social support, and risk of incident stroke: Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities study. Stroke. 2014;45(10):2868-73.
29. Harding BN, Hawley CN, Kalinowski J, Sims M, Muntner P, Young Mielcarek BA, et al. Relationship between social support and incident hypertension in the Jackson Heart Study: a cohort study. BMJ open. 2022;12(3):e054812-e.
30. Ferguson T, Tulloch-Reid M, Younger N, Govia I, Wilks R, Williams D. Cardiovascular health in urban poor and middle income communities in Jamaica: impact of psychosocial stress, social networks, and social support2017.
31. House JS, Kaplan GA, Morenoff J, Raudenbush SW, Williams DR, Young EA. Chicago Community Adult Health Study, 2001-2003. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]; 2012.
32. Bostean G, Andrade FCD, Viruell-Fuentes EA. Neighborhood stressors and psychological distress among U.S. Latinos: Measuring the protective effects of social support from family and friends. Stress Health. 2019;35(2):115-26.
33. Ataman SL, Cooper R, Rotimi C, McGee D, Osotimehin B, Kadiri S, et al. Standardization of blood pressure measurement in an international comparative study. J Clin Epidemiol. 1996;49(8):869-77.
34. STATIN Pa. Mapping Poverty Indicators: Consumption Based Poverty In Jamaica. In: Jamaica PIoJaSIo, editor. The Planning Institute of Jamaica 16 Oxford Road, Kingston 5,Jamaica, West Indies: Planning institute of Jamaica; 2019.
35. Hair J BB, Babin B, Anderson R, Tatham R. Multivariate Data Analysis. 6th edition Upper Saddle River N.J.: Pearson; 2006.
36. Dinno A. Implementing Horn's Parallel Analysis for Principal Component Analysis and Factor Analysis. The Stata Journal. 2009;9(2):291-8.

37. Hayton JC, Allen DG, Scarpello V. Factor Retention Decisions in Exploratory Factor Analysis: a Tutorial on Parallel Analysis. Organizational Research Methods. 2004;7(2):191-205.
38. StataCorp. Stata Glossary and Index: Release 16. College Station, Texas: StataCorp LLC; 2019.
39. Graham JW, Olchowski AE, Gilreath TD. How many imputations are really needed? Some practical clarifications of multiple imputation theory. Prev Sci. 2007;8(3):206-13.
40. Kim S, Thomas PA. Direct and Indirect Pathways From Social Support to Health? J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci. 2019;74(6):1072-80.
41. Schoenenberger AW, Radovanovic D, Muggli F, Suter PM, Schoenenberger-Berzins R, Parati G, et al. Prevalence of ideal cardiovascular health in a community-based population - results from the Swiss Longitudinal Cohort Study (SWICOS). Swiss Med Wkly. 2021;151:w30040.
42. Benziger CP, Zavala-Loayza JA, Bernabe-Ortiz A, Gilman RH, Checkley W, Smeeth L, et al. Low prevalence of ideal cardiovascular health in Peru. Heart. 2018;104(15):1251-6.
43. Campos B, Ullman JB, Aguilera A, Dunkel Schetter C. Familism and psychological health: the intervening role of closeness and social support. Cultur Divers Ethnic Minor Psychol. 2014;20(2):191-201.
44. News AHA. Chronic stress can cause heart trouble American Heart Association2020 [Available from: https://www.heart.org/en/news/2020/02/04/chronic-stress-can-cause-heart-trouble#:~:text=Stress%20may%20lead%20to%20high,cardiovascular%20events%2C%22%20Schiffrin%20said.
45. Child ST, Albert MA. Social Networks and Health Outcomes: Importance for racial and socioeconomic disparities in cardiovascular outcomes. Curr Cardiovasc Risk Rep. 2018;12(12).
46. Burroughs Peña MS, Mbassa RS, Slopen NB, Williams DR, Buring JE, Albert MA. Cumulative Psychosocial Stress and Ideal Cardiovascular Health in Older Women. Circulation. 2019;139(17):2012-21.



Figure 1 – median friend number for males and females



Figure 2 – median number of persons males and females can turn to when they need a loan.



Figure 3 – median number of friends males and females have who are willing to provide advice.



Figure 4 - # of ICH components

Appendices

Table 1: Weighted estimates (no imputation)

Characteristic	Male n= 279	Female n= 562	95% CI
Mean for Continuous Variables	Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE	
Age (years)	38.46 ± 0.09	38.09 ± 0.94	38.28 – 38.65
Height (cm)	173.40 ± 0.60	162.77 ± 0.57	165.47 ± 9.67
Weight (kg)	78.83 ± 1.15	77.40 ± 1.11	78.48 ± 22.97
BMI (kg/m2)	25.64 ±0.43	29.60 ± 0.43	28.73 ± 8.43
Mean of 2nd & 3rd SBP readings (mmHg)	127.59 ±0.78	121.73 ±1.43	130.86 ± 22.46
Mean of 2nd & 3rd DBP readings	81.62 ±0.61	80.77 ±0.90	84.38 ± 13.50
Fasting Glucose	5.84 ± 0.42	5.48 ±0.12	5.94 ±2.31
Total Cholesterol	44.24 ± 0.09	4.22 ± 0.05	4.39 ± 1.19