

Title

Community-level Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices regarding Cardiovascular Diseases and Modifiable Risk Factors in India

Running title (50 characters)

Knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to CVD

Authors and affiliations

Kavita Singh^{1,2}, Dimple Kondal³, Deepa Mohan⁴, Mareesha Gandral¹, Sheril Rajan³, Viswanathan Mohan⁴, Mohammed K Ali^{5,6}, KM Venkat Narayan⁵, Mark D. Huffman^{7,8,9}, Dorairaj Prabhakaran^{1,3}, Nikhil Tandon¹⁰

1. Public Health Foundation of India, Gurugram, Haryana, India
2. Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Heidelberg University, Germany
3. Centre for Chronic Disease Control
4. Madras Diabetes Research Foundation, Chennai, India
5. Emory Global Diabetes Research Center of Woodruff Health Sciences Center and Emory University, Atlanta, USA
6. Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA
7. Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, USA
8. Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, USA
9. The George Institute for Global Health, University of New South Wales, Australia
10. Department of Endocrinology and Metabolism, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India

Corresponding author

Kavita Singh

Senior Research Scientist

Public Health Foundation of India, New Delhi, India

Email: kavita.singh@phfi.org

Disclosures (conflict of interest)

MDH has received travel support from the American Heart Association and World Heart Federation and consulting fees from PwC Switzerland. MDH has an appointment at The George Institute for Global Health, which has a patent, license, and has received investment funding with intent to commercialize fixed-dose combination therapy through its social enterprise business, George Medicines. MDH has pending patents for heart failure polypills.

Total word count:

Abstract: 241

Main text: 4179

Figure: 1

Tables: 5

eTables: 2

eFigures: 3

Supplementary file: 1

References: 35

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract (241 word limit)

Background

Assessment of knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) regarding cardiovascular diseases (CVD) and cardiovascular risk factors (CVRF) is critical to inform CVD prevention strategies, but limited community-level data exist from developing countries.

Methods and Results

We conducted a telephone-based survey nested in the on-going CARRS cohort in Delhi and Chennai, India between January 2021 to February 2021. We randomly selected people with CVRF, but no established CVD and those with existing CVD from the CARRS cohort and assessed their 1) knowledge of CVD symptoms and risk factors, 2) attitude towards non-physician health workers (NPHW) facilitated care and text-messages for healthy lifestyle, and 3) practices regarding monitoring of CVRF. We performed logistic regression analyses to investigate the factors associated with KAP. We interviewed 502 participants (283 with CVRF and 219 with CVD); 45.8% were female, and mean age (SD) was 48.1 (11.2) years. The knowledge of heart attack symptoms, stroke symptoms, and CVRF (>75% correct answers) were: 12.9%, 20.7%, and 17.3%, respectively. Individuals with CVRF had 2.5 times lower knowledge of CVD symptoms compared to those with existing CVD. Acceptability of NPHW-facilitated care and text-messages for healthy lifestyle was 60% and 84%, respectively.

Conclusions

The knowledge of CVD symptoms and risk factors is below optimal levels, particularly among individuals at high risk of CVD, unskilled workers, those with lower levels of education and income. Innovative use of NPHW along with mHealth tools could potentially offer solutions to reduce the burden of CVD.

Keywords: cardiovascular disease, risk factors, knowledge, practices, India

Main text (4179 words)

INTRODUCTION

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a leading cause of premature death and disability worldwide. A growing body of evidence indicates that South Asians are at a greater risk of CVD than most other ethnic groups¹. Several upstream factors (e.g., population ageing, urbanization) and downstream modifiable risk factors (e.g., smoking, unhealthy diet, physical inactivity, obesity, hypertension, diabetes, and dyslipidaemia) together fuel the rising burden of CVD among South Asians. In India, CVD affects more than 70 million people, in their most productive years, with severe socio-economic consequences². Early recognition and response to heart attack and stroke symptoms could reduce delays in hospitalization and mortality. Further, knowledge of, monitoring, and efforts to address modifiable risk factors are necessary prerequisites for CVD prevention strategies to promote behaviour change.

The strong association between behavioural risk factors and CVD onset is widely known, yet substantial potential lies in the prevention, screening, and detection of cardiovascular risk factors (CVRF). Monitoring and addressing CVRFs is critical to prevent or at least mitigate the CVD epidemic. In 2012, the Indian government adopted a national action plan to prevent and control non-communicable chronic diseases^{3,4}. This plan defined targets for 2025, including a reduction of smoking (30%), hypertension (25%), and no further increase in diabetes or obesity. India is also playing a pivotal role in terms of reaching global CVD targets as defined in the WHO's Global Action plan for the prevention and control of NCDs, given the projected future growth and aging of the population⁵. However, it is unclear how the knowledge of CVD symptoms and modifiable risk factors vary among people with existing CVD and those with CVRFs, as community-based data are not available so far for major CVRFs and heart attack and stroke symptoms.

Prior studies assessing knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) in South Asia have mainly focused exclusively on hypertension and diabetes⁶⁻⁹. Findings revealed a lack of adequate knowledge about CVRFs with many respondents being unaware of the negative consequences of unhealthy diet, obesity, and physical inactivity. However, data are lacking on the community-level awareness of CVRFs, heart attack and stroke symptoms, and how awareness varies among people with CVRFs and those with existing CVD in India to design efficient CVD prevention strategies¹⁰. CVD risk reduction requires health systems that efficiently screen and stratify individuals at high risk, provide useful lifestyle modification advice, initiate preventive therapies, and mechanisms to promote lifelong adherence to prescribed drug therapies and lifestyle changes. Strategies such as patient education, task-sharing, and SMS based reminders targeted at improving health behaviours are proven effective in reducing CVD risk and improving adherence to treatment¹¹⁻¹⁴. Despite their benefits, uptake of proven strategies in India has been limited. With advances in technology, behavioural interventions can potentially be delivered to people at high CVD risk involving trained non-physician health workers (NPHW) using mobile phone (mHealth) applications and text messages, yet limited data exists on the acceptability of these strategies from patients' perspectives. Thus, understanding the community-level knowledge of CVD symptoms and CVRFs is an important first step to developing and implementing CVD prevention or care strategies for the high-risk South Asian population. This study examined the **knowledge** of heart attack and stroke symptoms, and modifiable risk

factors among people with existing CVD and those with CVRFs in India. Further, we analysed their **attitudes** towards NPHW facilitated care and text message-based reminders for clinic visit or lifestyle advice, and **practices** on monitoring of CVRFs. The study results may assist policy makers to develop and expand ongoing efforts to reduce morbidity, mortality, and associated healthcare costs associated with CVD.

METHODS

Study setting and population

Study participants were sampled from the ongoing Centre for Cardiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia (CARRS) cohort study^{15,16}. Briefly, the CARRS study used a multistage cluster random sampling technique to select households and participants from two megacities in India (Chennai and Delhi) and one in Pakistan (Karachi). When recruited, the CARRS sample populations were representative of each city. The details of the CARRS study methodology have been reported¹⁵. The baseline data collection for the CARRS cohort occurred in 2010 and thereafter five longitudinal, bi-annual follow-up surveys of the cohort participants have been conducted so far. The current telephone survey to assess knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) regarding CVD and modifiable risk factors was conducted alongside the 6th bi-annual survey (September 2020-November 2021) in Chennai and Delhi participants. From the existing cohort, we selected all eligible adults who self-reported CVD (based on a self-reported history of coronary heart disease or stroke). In addition, we selected people at high CVD risk, i.e., those without CVD but presence of at least one CVRF such as hypertension (defined as blood pressure $\geq 140/ \geq 90$ mm Hg or self-reported treatment for hypertension)¹⁷, diabetes (defined as having either HbA1c $\geq 6.5\%$, fasting blood glucose ≥ 126 mg/dL or self-reported use of glucose-lowering medications)^{18,19}, or both.

Study design

A cross-sectional, telephone-based survey was conducted in Delhi and Chennai, India from January 2021 to February 2021 to assess the knowledge, attitudes and practices towards CVD and modifiable risk factors. **Figure 1** shows the selection of study participants from the ongoing cohort and assessment tools.

Data collection

A structured pre-tested questionnaire was used to collect data on the knowledge of heart attack and stroke symptoms and modifiable CVD risk factors such as smoking, unhealthy diet, physical inactivity, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, high blood glucose, stress, and depression. Components of the study questionnaire were taken from published studies^{6,8,20}. Further, we assessed participants' attitudes or acceptability of NPHWs (nurse, community health workers, or pharmacists) delivered care and willingness to receive text messages to support heart healthy lifestyles. In addition, we collected data on the practices related to CVD management including how frequently participants monitored their blood pressure, blood cholesterol, blood glucose, and body weight.

The questionnaire was initially developed in English and then translated into Hindi. To ensure accuracy of the English to Hindi translation, the questionnaire was back translated from Hindi into English (**Supplement**). The survey questionnaire had additional questions designed to cross-check validity of participants' responses. In addition, participants' data on self-reported medical history of hyperlipidaemia, chronic kidney disease, and biomarkers such as body mass index (BMI), blood pressure, blood cholesterol and blood glucose were obtained from the latest available data of CARRS cohort conducted in the fourth follow up (2016-17). We used biomarkers data from the previous follow-up survey because in the current telephone survey conducted between 2020-2021 no blood samples were taken.

Since this study was conducted during the COVID pandemic in India (January 2021-February 2021), we followed COVID-appropriate policies and national guidelines for data collection²¹. The telephone survey was administered by trained field interviewers, and verbal consent was obtained from the study participants. Data were collected using the Commcare application installed in electronic tablets²². This study was approved by the institutional ethics committee of the Public Health Foundation of India (TRC-IE No:TRC-IEC-382.1/18) and Madras Diabetes Research Foundation in Chennai, India (Reference no. MDRF/NCT/06-01/2020).

Data analysis

The demographic and clinical characteristics for the overall study population, and participants with existing CVD and those with CVRFs, are reported as mean (standard deviations, SD) or median (25th and 75th percentiles) for continuous variables and frequencies (percentages) for categorical variables. Knowledge of CVD symptoms and modifiable risk factors are reported as mean (SD) and number (percent) for overall study population and stratified by prior CVD and CVRFs.

Next, we created a composite score to assess the level of knowledge of heart attack and stroke symptoms based on responses to 8 questions. Each correct response was assigned a score of 1 with a total maximal score of 8 points each for the knowledge of heart attack symptoms and stroke symptoms. The total score for heart attack symptoms was classified into three groups: 1 (score: 0-3), 2 (score: 4-5) and 3 (score: 6-8). Likewise, the total score for stroke symptoms was classified into three strata: 1 (score: 0-1), 2 (score: 2-4) and 3 (score: 5-8). Further, knowledge of CVD risk factors was assessed based on responses to 12 questions for a total maximal score of 12 points and was classified into: 1 (score: 0-6), 2 (score: 7-9), 3 (score: 10-12). Finally, we compared the highest vs lowest levels for the knowledge of heart attack symptoms, stroke symptoms, and modifiable risk factors. The lowest level of knowledge scores (i.e., ≤75% correct responses) by people with existing CVD vs those with CVRFs were plotted using bar charts across age-group, sex, and education strata. The chi-square test was performed to investigate the difference in knowledge scores between people with existing CVD vs those with CVRFs across age-group, sex, and education strata.

Bivariate and multivariable regression analyses were performed to assess associations between socio-demographic factors with knowledge (lowest vs highest levels) of heart attack symptoms, stroke

symptoms, and modifiable risk factors. Unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals (CI) are reported. The model was adjusted for age, sex, city, and presence of existing CVD. Next, we analysed the acceptability of NPHW delivered care and willingness to receive text-messages for heart healthy lifestyle by people with CVD and CVRFs. Factors associated with acceptability of NPHW care and text-messages were analysed using bivariable and multivariable logistic regression models. Unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios with 95% CI were calculated, with adjustments for age, sex, city, and presence of existing CVD/CVRFs. Data were available for all covariates and outcomes.

Lastly, the monitoring of CVD risk factors: blood pressure, cholesterol, blood glucose and weight were classified into three groups: 1) measures checked in the past 12 months; 2) measures checked >12 months ago; 3) never checked. Bivariable and multivariable regression analyses were performed to assess the factors associated with monitoring of CVD risk factors in the past 12 months adjusting for age, sex, city, and presence of existing CVD/CVRFs. A two-sided $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant without adjustment for multiple testing. All analyses were performed using STATA version 16.0, College Station, Texas, USA.

RESULTS

Characteristics of study participants

Between January 2021 – February 2021, 560 participants were invited and 502 participants were consented (89.6% response rate) and completed the telephone survey. The overall mean (SD) age was 48.1 (11.2) years, 45.8% were female, 56.3% ($n=283$) with CVRF and 43.6% ($n=219$) with CVD. People with CVRFs were younger (mean age = 45 years vs. 52 years, $p < 0.001$), were more likely to be female (55.1% vs. 33.8%, $p < 0.001$), and less likely to have access to a mobile phone (69.6% vs. 96.3%, $p = 0.03$). Two-thirds of respondents had a high school education, nearly half (47.4%) were unemployed and 54.2% had a monthly household income less than Rs. 10,000. Two-thirds of respondents had internet access (62.3%) on mobile phones. Less than one-quarter had a family history of coronary heart disease (15.5%), with no difference among people with CVRFs and existing CVD (13.4% vs. 18.3%, $p = 0.14$). Overall, half of the study participants had a self-reported history of hypertension (51.1%) with lower rates for diabetes (43.4%) and hyperlipidaemia (38.6%). Among people with CVD, 192 (87.7%) reported coronary heart disease and 38 (17.4%) had a stroke, and 11 (5.0%) had both heart disease and stroke. Further, among people with CVD, 64.8% had hypertension, and 49.3% had diabetes. In contrast, people with CVRFs, 40.6% had hypertension and 38.9% had diabetes (**Table 1**).

Knowledge of heart attack and stroke symptoms and modifiable CVD risk factors

The overall mean (SD) knowledge score for heart attack symptoms was 3.9 (2.3), which was significantly lower among people with CVRFs than those with CVD (3.2 vs. 4.8, $p < 0.001$). Further, knowledge of heart attack symptoms (defined as >75% correct responses) was 12.9%, which was significantly lower among people with CVRFs than those with CVD (8.5% vs. 18.7%, $p < 0.01$). The mean (SD) knowledge score for stroke symptoms was lower at 2.8 (2.5), with no difference between people with

CVRFs and CVD ($p=0.70$). Further, knowledge of stroke symptoms ($>75\%$ correct response) was 20.7%, with no difference between those with risk factors or existing CVD ($p = 0.60$). The mean (SD) knowledge of modifiable risk factors was 7 (2.6) with no significant difference between people with CVRFs and CVD ($p=0.04$). Overall, the knowledge of modifiable risk factors ($>75\%$ correct responses) was 17.3%, with similar proportions among people with CVRFs and CVD ($p=0.47$). In terms of knowledge of single modifiable risk factors, most participants recognized high cholesterol (88.6%), stress (82.9%), and hypertension (81.1%) as the factors that increases the risk of having a heart attack, followed by unhealthy diet (64.5%), diabetes (63.1%), smoking (60.6%) and obesity (59.6%). Less than one-quarter of study participants reported that daily exercise (22.7%) and sleeping too much (15.1%) increased the risk of a heart attack, which was similar between people with CVRFs and CVD except for an increased awareness among people with CVD vs CVRFs for smoking (66.2% vs. 56.2%, $p=0.02$), alcohol use in excess (63.9% vs. 55.5%, $p=0.05$), and diabetes (69.4% vs. 58.3%, $p=0.01$) (**Table 2**).

The bivariate analysis comparing knowledge of heart attack symptoms, stroke symptoms and modifiable CVD risk factors between people with CVRF and CVD across age, sex, and education groups are shown in **e-Figures 1a-1c**. Overall, younger age (<35 years) and elderly (>55 years) versus middle aged participants (35-55 years), females vs. males, were more likely to have low knowledge of heart attack symptoms, stroke symptoms, and modifiable CVD risk factors ($p<0.001$).

In the adjusted multivariable regression model (**Table 3**), lower knowledge of heart attack symptoms were predominantly found in people with CVRF vs people with CVD (OR=2.57, 95% CI: 1.43, 4.62), and those with lower levels of education and unemployed, but the latter did not reach statistical significance. The lower knowledge of stroke symptoms was prevalent among semiskilled/unskilled workers vs trained/skilled workers (OR=3.43, 95% CI: 1.39, 8.43). Further, there were generally no significant differences in terms of the knowledge of modifiable risk factors by age, sex, income categories, except lower education was associated with low knowledge of modifiable CVD risk factors (high school vs. graduates; OR=1.76, 95% CI: 1.01-3.07).

Attitude towards involving non-physician health workers and use of text-message in CVD care

More than two-thirds of respondents (72%) faced difficulty in understanding written medical information received from the hospital, with significantly higher problems reported by people with CVD than those with CVRFs (78.5% vs. 64.6%, $p=0.002$). Further, more than half of respondents (60%) were willing to receive counselling on healthy diet, exercise, prescribed medicines, and clinic visit reminders offered through a trained non-physician health worker (NPHW) such as a nurse or community health worker, with no significant differences between people with CVD and CVRFs. Nearly half of participants were willing to have their blood pressure, blood cholesterol, and blood glucose measured by a trained NPHW, and one-third preferred receiving reminders for laboratory appointments, with significantly higher acceptance among people with CVD than those with CVRFs ($p < 0.001$). One-third of participants preferred receiving advice on smoking cessation from NPHWs, with no significant difference between groups ($p=0.08$). Lastly, most

respondents (84%) were willing to receive text-messages about heart healthy lifestyle, with significantly higher acceptance among people with CVRFs vs with CVD (88.3% vs. 80.5%, $p=0.03$) (**Table 4**).

Participants from Delhi vs Chennai reported significantly greater acceptability towards NPHW delivered care (OR=9.3, 95%CI: 4.54,19.03) and willingness to receive text-messages for healthy lifestyle (OR=6.79, 95%CI: 2.84,16.21). People with CVRFs vs those with CVD had two times greater acceptability to receive text messages for healthy lifestyle (OR=2.25, 95%CI: 1.19, 4.26) (**Table 5**).

Practices related to the monitoring of CVD risk factors

Overall, less than one-third of the participants had their blood pressure, blood glucose, body weight, and blood cholesterol checked >12 months ago and Less than 10% of the study participants had never checked any of these measures (**eTable 1**). The adjusted logistic regression model showed that people with lower levels of education (OR=2.84, 95%CI: 1.39, 5.78) and income (OR=2.02, 95%CI: 1.19, 3.41) had poor monitoring of cardiovascular risk factors (**eTable 2**).

DISCUSSION

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first community-level data documenting variation in knowledge scores for heart attack and stroke symptoms and modifiable risk factors among adults with CVD compared to those at high CVD risk in two megacities in India. In this study, knowledge of heart attack symptoms, stroke symptoms, and modifiable risk factors was low, i.e., less than 20% of the participants provided >75% correct responses to knowledge-related questions. Despite the low composite knowledge scores, most participants recognized chest pain and pain in arms or shoulder as common symptoms of heart attack. Many participants also identified numbness or weakness of the face, arm, or leg, or sudden confusion or trouble speaking or walking as symptoms of stroke. Further, this study showed that NPHW facilitated care and text messages for healthy lifestyle and risk factor monitoring to prevent or manage CVD are generally acceptable in a country with extremely limited specialist doctors and low physician-to-patient ratio.

When compared to people with existing CVD, lower level of knowledge of heart attack/stroke symptoms and risk factors was found predominantly in people with CVRFs, unskilled workers, low education, and low-income groups. Our study findings are consistent with previous reports. For example, a study of 444 adults from South Korea found the mean knowledge score of 4.3/9, 5.8/9, and 7.3/11, for heart attack symptoms, stroke symptoms, and modifiable risk factors, respectively²³. Further, the regression analyses showed that older age and lower levels of education and income were associated with lower knowledge scores. In the current study, high blood cholesterol, high blood pressure, and stress/depression were identified as the most common modifiable risk factors for heart attack, which is consistent with studies from Nepal, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Iran, and other regions²⁴. In this study, the knowledge of modifiable risk factors (>75% correct responses) was 17.3%, which is consistent with a study from Uganda involving 4,372 participants which found that a relatively small proportion of the respondents (18%) had good knowledge of

CVD prevention. Although the survey instrument used was different, this study from Uganda revealed that education levels, occupation, household income, and social-economic index were significantly associated with the CVD knowledge²⁵.

Several large epidemiological studies have shown a strong association between socio-economic position and CVD incidence and deaths. For instance, the Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiology (PURE) study analysed data of 160,299 adults aged 35-70 years old from urban and rural communities in 20 countries. After adjustment for wealth and other confounding factors, the researchers found that low levels of education vs. high level of education was significantly associated with all-cause deaths: Hazard rate (HR), 95% CIs: 1.50 (95% CI: 1.14, 1.98) for high-income countries, 1.80 (95% CI: 1.58, 2.06) in middle-income countries, and 2.76 (95% CI: 2.29, 3.31) in low-income countries²⁶. Further, O'Donnell et al. showed that sub-optimal knowledge, diagnosis, and treatment of hypertension were significantly associated with higher risk of stroke, younger age of stroke onset, and larger proportion of intracerebral haemorrhagic stroke in lower-income countries. This study underscored the potential role of population-wide strategies to improve knowledge of hypertension, and access to opportunistic screening for risk factors, to reduce the burden of premature stroke in LMICs²⁷.

This study found that two-thirds of respondents were willing to receive NPHW delivered care for lifestyle modification advice related to healthy diet, exercise, and managing medicines as well as clinic visit reminders. Further, most participants were willing to receive text-messages for healthy lifestyle and to improve medication adherence, which is consistent with prior studies²⁸. However, willingness to receive text-messages may not alone translate into adoption of healthy behaviours in long-term. Task-sharing and mHealth based strategies involving structured lifestyle modification programs to support patients have been extensively evaluated for its effectiveness in high-income countries to improve patient outcomes with some pilot studies from low- and middle-income countries²⁹. A 2019 systematic review and meta-analysis of 31 studies found that task-sharing interventions with NPHW significantly reduced systolic and diastolic blood pressures (mean difference, 95% CI): -4.85 mm Hg (95% CI: -6.12 to -3.57), and -2.92 mm Hg (95% CI: -3.75 to -2.09), respectively, in low- and middle-income countries³⁰. Another study reported that a NPHW-led educational intervention improved adherence to guideline directed medical therapy and healthy lifestyle among patients with the acute coronary syndrome³¹. Park et al. reviewed 28 studies that applied mobile phone interventions (i.e., text messaging, mobile apps, tele-monitoring via mobile phones) for CVD management and found that text messaging appears to be more effective than smartphone interventions (e.g., mobile apps and telemonitoring) in secondary prevention of CVD³². Furthermore, a 2017 systematic review of 27 randomised trials found that mobile health interventions increased medication adherence, achievement of blood pressure targets, exercise, and increased awareness of diet and exercise for the secondary prevention of CVD³³. A recent cross-sectional survey among 4,372 adults in Mukono and Buikwe districts in Uganda reported that participants who had received advice on healthy lifestyle through mobile phones had higher CVD knowledge as compared to those who had ever received healthy lifestyle advice; adjusted prevalence ratio = 1.37 (95% CI: 1.14, 1.65)²⁵. However, data from recent trials of text-messaging showed null results^{34,35}.

Implications for clinical practice and policy

Given that increasingly CVD affects people in their economically most productive ages, these results have important implications for clinical practice and CVD prevention policies to minimize the adverse consequences of inadequate knowledge such as delayed diagnosis and treatment, increased disease burden due to uncontrolled risk factors, higher healthcare costs, reduced quality of life and social and economic challenges, all exacerbating existing health inequalities. Promoting awareness and adopting healthy behaviors to prevent and manage CVD involves a multi-faceted approach that targets individuals, communities, and healthcare systems. First, this study highlights the urgent need to implement community-based health education programs that provide information about CVD risk factors and preventive measures using various channels such as schools, workplaces, community centers, and social media to reach out the target population at high risk of CVD. Second, to collaborate with media outlets to disseminate accurate and culturally appropriate information on CVD prevention, symptoms, and risk factors, as well as, engage in public service announcements to reach diverse populations. Third, train healthcare professionals to effectively communicate with patients about cardiovascular health, emphasizing the importance of early detection, risk factor control and lifestyle modifications during outpatient visits. Fourth, utilize technology to deliver health information and promote sustainable behavior change through mobile apps and interactive tools that provide personalized advice, track health metrics and offer resources for cardiovascular health. Lastly, policy advocacy that support cardiovascular health at the community and national levels through improved food labeling, urban planning that encourage physical activity, effective implementation of tobacco regulations, and regular health screenings to detect and manage CVD risk factors early.

Strengths and limitations

This study has several strengths. First, we selected participants from a well-established, large cohort from Delhi and Chennai in North and South India using multi-stage cluster random sampling, and compared knowledge, attitude, and practices among well-defined groups, i.e., participants with prior CVD vs those with CVRFs. Second, a standardized pre-tested questionnaire was administered by trained study staff. Third, we also assessed attitudes and practices around CVD management to inform design of targeted prevention strategies, i.e., acceptability of NPHW delivered care and willingness to use text-messages, which are potential, yet under-studied strategies to improve knowledge-practice gaps in CVD prevention.

This study also has some limitations. This is an observational cross-sectional study that relied on self-reported data. The self-reported measures of modifiable risk factors may have overestimated the knowledge as the participants may have responded positively to the cardiovascular risk factors knowing that this study was focused on CVD (i.e., healthy volunteer bias). However, knowledge of heart attack and stroke symptoms related questions are unlikely to be affected. We did an exploratory analysis to determine the association of knowledge of CVD symptoms, and risk factors with socio-demographic factors. The reported confidence intervals for occupation category and low-income group, were wide, which may be due to small sample size. Also, data for risk factor levels (blood pressure, glucose, cholesterol, and weight)

were obtained from 2016-17, which may not reflect participants' current values. However, these data points were not included in the multivariable regression model and the study results remain unaffected by the use of old laboratory values. Participants were selected from two urban cities in India, which limits the generalizability of this study results to India's other cities and its rural population. However, study participants had diverse representation across education and income groups. Although respondents' health-seeking behaviours (self-monitoring of CVD risk factors) were relatively high, the risk of social desirability bias might have led the respondents to provide answers expected by interviewers. Further, given the study data collection period between January-February 2021, we cannot ascertain the influence of COVID-19 pandemic on the perceived knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding CVD.

Conclusion

This study shows substantial variation and sub-optimal knowledge of heart attack and stroke symptoms and CV risk factors in India. The use of task-sharing approaches, including trained NPHWs, and use of SMS-based reminders for healthy lifestyle were acceptable to most participants across major subgroups, which may improve the uptake of preventive CVD care. However, to engage and empower people at high CVD risk, culturally appropriate, and targeted educational programs leveraging digital technologies customized for elderly, low socio-economic groups would be desirable.

References

1. Roth GA, Mensah GA, Johnson CO, et al. Global Burden of Cardiovascular Diseases and Risk Factors, 1990-2019: Update From the GBD 2019 Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Dec 22 2020;76(25):2982-3021. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2020.11.010
2. Karan A, Engelgau M, Mahal A. The household-level economic burden of heart disease in India. *Trop Med Int Health*. May 2014;19(5):581-91. doi:10.1111/tmi.12281
3. Mondal S, Van Belle S. India's NCD strategy in the SDG era: are there early signs of a paradigm shift? *Global Health*. Apr 25 2018;14(1):39. doi:10.1186/s12992-018-0357-6
4. Global Non-Communicable Disease (NCD) Action Plan. Accessed 10 Dec 2023. <https://ncdalliance.org/global-ncd-action-plan>.
5. World Health Organization (WHO) Global Action Plan 2019. Accessed on 10 Dec 2023. <https://www.who.int/initiatives/sdg3-global-action-plan>.
6. Vaidya A, Aryal UR, Krettek A. Cardiovascular health knowledge, attitude and practice/behaviour in an urbanising community of Nepal: a population-based cross-sectional study from Jhaukhel-Duwakot Health Demographic Surveillance Site. *BMJ Open*. Oct 24 2013;3(10):e002976. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002976
7. Amarasekara P, de Silva A, Swarnamali H, Senarath U, Katulanda P. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices on Lifestyle and Cardiovascular Risk Factors Among Metabolic Syndrome Patients in an Urban Tertiary Care Institute in Sri Lanka. *Asia Pac J Public Health*. Jan 2016;28(1 Suppl):32S-40S. doi:10.1177/1010539515612123
8. Khan MS, Jafary FH, Jafar TH, et al. Knowledge of modifiable risk factors of heart disease among patients with acute myocardial infarction in Karachi, Pakistan: a cross sectional study. *BMC Cardiovasc Disord*. Apr 27 2006;6:18. doi:10.1186/1471-2261-6-18
9. Islam FM, Chakrabarti R, Islam MT, et al. Prediabetes, diagnosed and undiagnosed diabetes, their risk factors and association with knowledge of diabetes in rural Bangladesh: The Bangladesh Population-based Diabetes and Eye Study. *J Diabetes*. Mar 2016;8(2):260-8. doi:10.1111/1753-0407.12294
10. Labarthe D, Lloyd-Jones DM. 50x50x50: Cardiovascular Health and the Cardiovascular Disease Endgame. *Circulation*. Sep 4 2018;138(10):968-970. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.118.035985
11. Anand SS, Samaan Z, Middleton C, et al. A Digital Health Intervention to Lower Cardiovascular Risk: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Cardiol*. Aug 1 2016;1(5):601-6. doi:10.1001/jamacardio.2016.1035
12. Liu G, Li Y, Hu Y, et al. Influence of Lifestyle on Incident Cardiovascular Disease and Mortality in Patients With Diabetes Mellitus. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. Jun 26 2018;71(25):2867-2876. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2018.04.027
13. Palmer MJ, Barnard S, Perel P, Free C. Mobile phone-based interventions for improving adherence to medication prescribed for the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Jun 22 2018;6:CD012675. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD012675.pub2
14. Ali MK, Singh K, Kondal D, et al. Effectiveness of a Multicomponent Quality Improvement Strategy to Improve Achievement of Diabetes Care Goals: A Randomized, Controlled Trial. *Ann Intern Med*. Sep 20 2016;165(6):399-408. doi:10.7326/M15-2807
15. Nair M, Ali MK, Ajay VS, et al. CARRS Surveillance study: design and methods to assess burdens from multiple perspectives. *BMC Public Health*. Aug 28 2012;12:701. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-701
16. Kondal D, Patel SA, Ali MK, et al. Cohort Profile: The Center for cardiometabolic Risk Reduction in South Asia (CARRS). *Int J Epidemiol*. Feb 9 2022;doi:10.1093/ije/dyab014
17. Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, et al. The Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure: the JNC 7 report. *JAMA*. May 21 2003;289(19):2560-72. doi:10.1001/jama.289.19.2560
18. *Use of Glycated Haemoglobin (HbA1c) in the Diagnosis of Diabetes Mellitus: Abbreviated Report of a WHO Consultation*. 2011. *WHO Guidelines Approved by the Guidelines Review Committee*.
19. Genuth S, Alberti KG, Bennett P, et al. Follow-up report on the diagnosis of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care*. Nov 2003;26(11):3160-7. doi:10.2337/diacare.26.11.3160
20. Saeed O, Gupta V, Dhawan N, et al. Knowledge of modifiable risk factors of Coronary Atherosclerotic Heart Disease (CASHD) among a sample in India. *BMC Int Health Hum Rights*. Feb 4 2009;9:2. doi:10.1186/1472-698X-9-2
21. Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) guidelines on health research during COVID-19 Pandemic in India. Accessed on 20 Mar 2022. https://www.icmr.gov.in/pdf/covid/techdoc/EC_Guidance_COVID19_06052020.pdf.
22. Commcare Data Collection App. Accessed on 20 March 2022. <https://www.dimaqi.com/commcare/>.

23. Han CH, Kim H, Lee S, Chung JH. Knowledge and Poor Understanding Factors of Stroke and Heart Attack Symptoms. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Sep 29 2019;16(19)doi:10.3390/ijerph16193665
24. Koochi F, Khalili D. Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice Regarding Cardiovascular Diseases in Adults Attending Health Care Centers in Tehran, Iran. *Int J Endocrinol Metab*. Jul 2020;18(3):e101612. doi:10.5812/ijem.101612
25. Ndejjo R, Nuwaha F, Bastiaens H, Wanyenze RK, Musinguzi G. Cardiovascular disease prevention knowledge and associated factors among adults in Mukono and Buikwe districts in Uganda. *BMC Public Health*. Jul 22 2020;20(1):1151. doi:10.1186/s12889-020-09264-6
26. Rosengren A, Smyth A, Rangarajan S, et al. Socioeconomic status and risk of cardiovascular disease in 20 low-income, middle-income, and high-income countries: the Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiologic (PURE) study. *Lancet Glob Health*. Jun 2019;7(6):e748-e760. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30045-2
27. M OD, Hankey GJ, Rangarajan S, et al. Variations in knowledge, awareness and treatment of hypertension and stroke risk by country income level. *Heart*. Dec 14 2020;doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2019-316515
28. DeSouza SI, Rashmi MR, Vasanthi AP, Joseph SM, Rodrigues R. Mobile phones: the next step towards healthcare delivery in rural India? *PLoS One*. 2014;9(8):e104895. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0104895
29. Singh K, Bawa VS, Venkateshmurthy NS, et al. Assessment of Studies of Quality Improvement Strategies to Enhance Outcomes in Patients With Cardiovascular Disease. *JAMA Netw Open*. Jun 1 2021;4(6):e2113375. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.13375
30. Anand TN, Joseph LM, Geetha AV, Prabhakaran D, Jeemon P. Task sharing with non-physician health-care workers for management of blood pressure in low-income and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Glob Health*. Jun 2019;7(6):e761-e771. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30077-4
31. Sharma KK, Gupta R, Mathur M, et al. Non-physician health workers for improving adherence to medications and healthy lifestyle following acute coronary syndrome: 24-month follow-up study. *Indian Heart J*. Nov - Dec 2016;68(6):832-840. doi:10.1016/j.ihj.2016.03.027
32. Park LG, Beatty A, Stafford Z, Whooley MA. Mobile Phone Interventions for the Secondary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis*. May-Jun 2016;58(6):639-50. doi:10.1016/j.pcad.2016.03.002
33. Gandhi S, Chen S, Hong L, et al. Effect of Mobile Health Interventions on the Secondary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Can J Cardiol*. Feb 2017;33(2):219-231. doi:10.1016/j.cjca.2016.08.017
34. Klimis H, Thiagalingam A, McIntyre D, Marschner S, Von Huben A, Chow CK. Text messages for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease: The TextMe2 randomized clinical trial. *Am Heart J*. Dec 2021;242:33-44. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2021.08.009
35. Chow CK, Klimis H, Thiagalingam A, et al. Text Messages to Improve Medication Adherence and Secondary Prevention After Acute Coronary Syndrome: The TEXTMEDS Randomized Clinical Trial. *Circulation*. May 10 2022;145(19):1443-1455. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.121.056161

List of Figures / Tables

Figure 1. Study flowchart to demonstrate selection of study participants

Table 1. Characteristics of study participants

Table 2. Knowledge of heart attack symptoms, stroke symptoms and cardiovascular risk factors

Table 3. Factors associated with the knowledge of heart attack and stroke symptoms, and risk factors

Table 4. Attitudes towards the non-physician health workers and text messages for cardiovascular disease management

Table 5. Factors associated with acceptability of non-physician health worker and text messages for cardiovascular disease management

eTable 1. Practices related to monitoring of cardiovascular risk factors.

eTable 2. Factors associated with low monitoring of CVD risk factors.

eFigure 1a. Lower level knowledge of heart attack symptoms among people with existing CVD vs people with CVRF by socio-demographic categories.

eFigure 1b. Lower level knowledge of stroke symptoms among people with existing CVD vs people with CVRF by socio-demographic categories.

eFigure 1c. Lower level knowledge of modifiable risk factors among people with existing CVD vs people with CVRF by socio-demographic categories.

Figure 1. Study flowchart to demonstrate selection of study participants




Table 1. Characteristics of study participants

	OVERALL N=502 (%)	People with CVRF N=283 (%)	People with existing CVD N=219 (%)	P-value
Age , in years, mean (SD)	48.1 (11.2)	45.0 (10.8)	52.0 (10.5)	<0.001
Sex				<0.001
Male	272 (54.2%)	127 (44.9%)	145 (66.2%)	
Female	230 (45.8%)	156 (55.1%)	74 (33.8%)	
Marital status				0.240
Married	472 (94.0%)	263 (92.9%)	209 (95.4%)	
Non-Married	30 (6.0%)	20 (7.1%)	10 (4.6%)	
Education				0.110
Up to primary schooling	61 (12.2%)	28 (9.9%)	33 (15.1%)	
High school to Secondary	322 (64.1%)	181 (64.0%)	141 (64.4%)	
Graduation and above	119 (23.7%)	74 (26.1%)	45 (20.5%)	
Occupation				0.210
Unemployed	238 (47.4%)	134 (47.3%)	104 (47.5%)	
Semiskilled/Unskilled	88 (17.5%)	43 (15.2%)	45 (20.5%)	
Trained/skilled	176 (35.1%)	106 (37.5%)	70 (32.0%)	
Household Income (monthly), Indian rupees (US\$)				0.530
<10000 (<125)	272 (54.2%)	160 (56.5%)	112 (51.1%)	
10000-20000 (125-250)	102 (20.3%)	56 (19.8%)	46 (21.0%)	
>20000 (>250)	126 (25.1%)	67 (23.7%)	59 (26.9%)	
Missing	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)	
Religion				<0.001
Hindu	425 (84.7%)	252 (89.0%)	173 (79.0%)	
Muslim	32 (6.4%)	12 (4.2%)	20 (9.1%)	
Sikh	11 (2.2%)	1 (0.4%)	10 (4.6%)	
Christian	32 (6.4%)	18 (6.4%)	14 (6.4%)	
Jain	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.9%)	
City				<0.001
Chennai	284 (56.6%)	183 (64.7%)	101 (46.1%)	
Delhi	218 (43.4%)	100 (35.3%)	118 (53.9%)	
Having access to mobile phone	408 (81.3%)	197 (69.6%)	211 (96.3%)	0.027
Basic Phone	156 (38.2%)	66 (33.5%)	90 (42.7%)	
Smart Phone	252 (61.8%)	131 (66.5%)	121 (57.3%)	
Having internet access in mobile phone	254 (62.3%)	131 (66.5%)	123 (58.3%)	0.160
Family history of coronary heart disease	78 (15.5%)	38 (13.4%)	40 (18.3%)	0.140
Self-reported previous heart disease	192 (38.2%)	0	192 (87.7%)	<0.001
If yes, taking medications for heart disease (n=192)	174 (90.6%)	-	174 (90.6%)	
Self-reported previous stroke	38 (7.6%)	0	38 (17.4%)	<0.001
If yes, taking medications for stroke (n=38)	15 (39%)	-	15 (39%)	
Hypertension	257 (51.2%)	115 (40.6%)	142 (64.8%)	<0.001
If yes, taking medications for hypertension (n=257)	235 (91.4%)	102 (88.7%)	133 (93.7%)	0.160
Diabetes mellitus	218 (43.4%)	110 (38.9%)	108 (49.3%)	0.019
If yes, taking medications for diabetes (n=218)	210 (96.3%)	106 (96.4%)	104 (96.3%)	0.980
Hyperlipidemia	194 (38.6%)	67 (23.7%)	127 (58.0%)	<0.001
If yes, taking medications for hyperlipidemia (n=194)	156 (80.4%)	45 (67.2%)	111 (87.4%)	<0.001
Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD)	15 (3.0%)	3 (1.1%)	12 (5.5%)	0.004
If yes, taking medications for CKD (n=15)	10 (67%)	3 (100%)	7 (58%)	0.170

	OVERALL N=502 (%)	People with CVRF N=283 (%)	People with existing CVD N=219 (%)	P-value
Body mass index*, Kg/m ² mean (SD) (N=423)	26.5 (4.6)	26.3 (4.6)	26.7 (4.6)	0.440
Systolic blood pressure*, mmHg (N=469)	130.4 (18.5)	130.4 (18.4)	130.5 (18.7)	0.960
Diastolic blood pressure*, mmHg (N=469)	81.8 (11.4)	81.7 (11.2)	82.0 (11.7)	0.76
Total cholesterol*, mean (SD) (N=460)	176.9 (42.2)	183.3 (37.8)	168.7 (46.1)	<0.001
Fasting blood glucose*, mean (SD) (N=461)	127.6 (54.8)	124.8 (53.8)	131.4 (56.1)	0.200

*BMI, blood pressure, cholesterol and blood glucose data obtained from the fourth follow-up of CARRS cohort conducted in 2016-17.

Marital status, Religion and Family history of coronary heart disease data obtained from CARRS baseline survey conducted in 2010-11

CVRF=Cardiovascular Risk Factors, CVD=Cardiovascular Disease, INR=Indian rupees; SD=Standard Deviation

P-value reports the difference between people with CVRF vs people with CVD.

Table 2. Knowledge of heart attack symptoms, stroke symptoms and cardiovascular risk factors

	OVERALL N=502 (%)	People with CVRF N=283 (%)	People with existing CVD N=219 (%)	P-value
Knowledge of heart attack symptoms				
Chest pain or discomfort	403 (80.3%)	209 (73.9%)	194 (88.6%)	<0.001
Pain or discomfort in arms or shoulder	343 (68.3%)	174 (61.5%)	169 (77.2%)	<0.001
Difficulty in breathing or shortness of breath	303 (60.4%)	158 (55.8%)	145 (66.2%)	0.018
Feeling weak, light-headed, or faint	198 (39.4%)	103 (36.4%)	95 (43.4%)	0.11
Pain or discomfort in the jaw, neck or back	190 (37.8%)	97 (34.3%)	93 (42.5%)	0.061
Tingling in the fingers or toes*	92 (18.3%)	50 (17.7%)	42 (19.2%)	<0.001
Swelling of the feet and legs*	64 (12.7%)	33 (11.7%)	31 (14.2%)	<0.001
Trouble seeing in one or both eyes*	44 (8.8%)	21 (7.4%)	23 (10.5%)	<0.001
Knowledge score (heart attack symptoms, maximum score of 8)				
Mean (SD)	3.9 (2.3)	3.2 (2.32)	4.8 (1.98)	<0.001
Median (IQR)	4 (2-6)	3 (1-5)	5 (4-6)	<0.001
Knowledge level				
High (>75% correct response)	65 (12.9%)	24 (8.5%)	41 (18.7%)	<0.001
Low (≤75% correct response)	437 (87.1%)	259 (91.5%)	178 (81.3%)	
Knowledge of stroke symptoms				
Sudden numbness or weakness of the face, arm, or leg	291 (58.0%)	166 (58.7%)	125 (57.1%)	0.72
Sudden confusion or trouble speaking or understanding others	249 (49.6%)	141 (49.8%)	108 (49.3%)	0.91
Sudden dizziness, trouble walking, or loss of balance	237 (47.2%)	134 (47.3%)	103 (47.0%)	0.94
Sudden trouble seeing in one or both eyes	159 (31.7%)	90 (31.8%)	69 (31.5%)	0.94
Sharp pain in the jaw or mouth	128 (25.5%)	80 (28.3%)	48 (21.9%)	0.11
Sudden chest pain or discomfort*	68 (13.5%)	21 (7.4%)	47 (21.5%)	<0.001
Severe headache with no known cause	76 (15.1%)	45 (15.9%)	31 (14.2%)	0.59
Feeling sick to your stomach*	9 (1.8%)	6 (2.1%)	3 (1.4%)	<0.001
Knowledge score (stroke symptoms, maximum score of 8)				
Mean (SD)	2.8 (2.5)	2.7 (2.6)	2.8 (2.5)	0.70
Median (IQR)	2.5 (0-5)	2 (0-5)	3 (0-5)	0.51
Knowledge level				
High (>75% correct response)	104 (20.7%)	61 (21.6%)	43 (19.6%)	0.60
Low (≤75% correct response)	398 (79.3%)	222 (78.4%)	176 (80.4%)	
Knowledge of CVD risk factors				
Smoking/tobacco use	304 (60.6%)	159 (56.2%)	145 (66.2%)	0.02
Alcohol use in excess	297 (59.2%)	157 (55.5%)	140 (63.9%)	0.05
Unhealthy diet – high saturated fatty acids, and salt	324 (64.5%)	185 (65.4%)	139 (63.5%)	0.66
Obesity	299 (59.6%)	168 (59.4%)	131 (59.8%)	0.92
Stress	416 (82.9%)	234 (82.7%)	182 (83.1%)	0.90
Depression	407 (81.1%)	228 (80.6%)	179 (81.7%)	0.03
Positive family history of cardiovascular disease	243 (48.4%)	129 (45.6%)	114 (52.1%)	0.15
High Cholesterol levels in blood	445 (88.6%)	252 (89.0%)	193 (88.1%)	0.75
Hypertension	407 (81.1%)	223 (78.8%)	184 (84.0%)	0.14
Diabetes Mellitus	317 (63.1%)	165 (58.3%)	152 (69.4%)	0.01
Sleeping too much	76 (15.1%)	39 (13.8%)	37 (16.9%)	0.33
Daily exercise*	114 (22.7%)	73 (25.8%)	41 (18.7%)	0.08

Knowledge score				
Mean (SD)	7.0 (2.6)	6.8 (2.6)	7.3 (2.5)	0.05
Median (IQR)	8 (6-9)	7 (5-9)	8 (6-9)	0.05
Knowledge level				0.47
High (>75% correct response)	87 (17.3%)	46 (16.3%)	41 (18.7%)	
Low (\leq 75% correct response)	415 (82.7%)	237 (83.7%)	178 (81.3%)	

*Correct answer to these questions was No.

CVRF=Cardiovascular Risk Factors, CVD=cardiovascular disease.

P-value reports the difference between people with CVRF vs people with CVD.

Table 3. Factors associated with the knowledge of heart attack and stroke symptoms, and risk factors.

	Knowledge score		Unadjusted	Adjusted*
	High N (%)	Low N (%)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Knowledge of heart attack symptoms				
People with CVRF	24 (8.5%)	259 (91.5%)	2.49 (1.45,4.26)	2.57 (1.43,4.62)
Female	24 (10.4%)	206 (89.6%)	1.52 (0.89,2.61)	1.28 (0.74,2.24)
Age	65 (13.0%)	437 (87.0%)	1.01 (0.79, 1.28)	1.02 (0.99,1.05)
Marital Status (Married)	61 (12.9%)	411 (87.1%)	1.04 (0.35,3.07)	1.29 (0.42,3.96)
Education				
<i>Graduation and above</i>	17 (14.3%)	102 (85.7%)	ref	ref
<i>Up to primary schooling</i>	6 (9.8%)	55 (90.2%)	1.53 (0.57,4.1)	1.47 (0.52,4.14)
<i>High school to Secondary school</i>	42 (13%)	280 (87.0%)	1.11 (0.61,2.04)	1.04 (0.54,2.02)
Occupation				
<i>Trained/skilled</i>	26 (14.8%)	150 (85.2%)	ref	ref
<i>Unemployed</i>	25 (10.5%)	213 (89.5%)	1.48 (0.82,2.66)	1.36 (0.60,3.06)
<i>Semiskilled/Unskilled</i>	14 (15.9%)	74 (84.1%)	0.92 (0.45,1.86)	0.96 (0.45,2.02)
Monthly household income (in Indian rupees)				
>20,000	15 (11.9%)	111 (88.1%)	ref	ref
<10,000	32 (11.8%)	240 (88.2%)	1.01 (0.53,1.95)	0.78 (0.37,1.67)
10,000-20,000	16 (15.7%)	86 (84.3%)	0.73 (0.34,1.55)	0.62 (0.28,1.37)
Family history of CHD (No)	52 (12.3%)	372 (87.7%)	1.43 (0.74,2.77)	1.26 (0.64,2.50)
Knowledge of symptoms of stroke				
People with CVRF	61 (21.6%)	222 (78.4%)	0.89 (0.57,1.38)	0.65 (0.38,1.09)
Female	50 (21.7%)	180 (78.3%)	0.89 (0.58,1.37)	0.86 (0.53,1.40)
Age	104 (20.7%)	398 (79.2%)	1.11 (0.91, 1.36)	1.01 (0.99,1.04)
Marital Status (Married)	99 (21.0%)	373 (79.0%)	0.75 (0.28,2.02)	0.58 (0.2,1.66)
Education				
<i>Graduation and above</i>	45 (37.8%)	74 (62.2%)	ref	ref
<i>Up to primary schooling</i>	8 (13.1%)	53 (86.9%)	4.03 (1.76,9.24)	2.05 (0.83,5.05)
<i>High school to Secondary school</i>	51 (15.8%)	271 (84.2%)	3.23 (2.01,5.20)	1.53 (0.90,2.61)
Occupation				
<i>Trained/skilled</i>	51 (29.0%)	125 (71.0%)	ref	ref
<i>Unemployed</i>	46 (19.3%)	192 (80.7%)	1.70 (1.08,2.69)	1.61 (0.79,3.29)
<i>Semiskilled/Unskilled</i>	7 (8.0%)	81 (92.0%)	4.72 (2.04,10.91)	3.43 (1.39,8.43)
Monthly household income (in Indian rupees)				
>20,000	51 (40.5%)	75 (59.5%)	ref	ref
<10,000	29 (10.7%)	243 (89.3%)	5.70 (3.37,9.62)	2.81 (1.54,5.13)
10,000-20,000	24 (23.5%)	78 (76.5%)	2.21 (1.24,3.95)	1.56 (0.83,2.91)
Family history of CHD (No)	79 (18.6%)	345 (81.4%)	2.06 (1.21,3.52)	1.46 (0.81,2.65)
Knowledge of modifiable CVD risk factors				
People with CVRF	46 (16.3%)	237 (83.7%)	1.19 (0.75,1.89)	0.99 (0.58,1.7)
Female	39 (17.0%)	191 (83.0%)	1.05 (0.66,1.67)	1.00 (0.61,1.65)
Age	87 (17.3%)	415 (82.7%)	1.06 (0.85, 1.31)	1.02 (0.99,1.04)
Marital Status (Married)	78 (16.5%)	394 (83.5%)	2.16 (0.96,4.90)	2.16 (0.88,5.28)
Education				
<i>Graduation and above</i>	37 (31.1%)	82 (68.9%)	ref	ref

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

<i>Up to primary schooling</i>	10 (16.4%)	51 (83.6%)	2.30 (1.05,5.03)	1.26 (0.54,2.94)
<i>High school to Secondary school</i>	40 (12.4%)	282 (87.6%)	3.18 (1.91,5.30)	1.76 (1.01,3.07)
Occupation				
<i>Trained/skilled</i>	38 (21.6%)	138 (78.4%)	ref	ref
<i>Unemployed</i>	39 (16.4%)	199 (83.6%)	1.41 (0.86,2.31)	1.02 (0.49,2.10)
<i>Semiskilled/Unskilled</i>	10 (11.4%)	78 (88.6%)	2.15 (1.01,4.55)	1.45 (0.65,3.23)
Monthly household income (in Indian rupees)				
<i>>20,000</i>	36 (28.6%)	90 (71.4%)	ref	ref
<i><10,000</i>	27 (9.9%)	245 (90.1%)	3.63 (2.08,6.32)	1.84 (0.98,3.45)
<i>10 000-20,000</i>	24 (23.5%)	78 (76.5%)	1.30 (0.71,2.37)	0.91 (0.48,1.72)
Family history of CHD (No)	69 (16.3%)	355 (83.7%)	1.54 (0.86,2.77)	1.09 (0.58,2.04)

The model is adjusted for age, sex, city, and presence of existing CVD/CVRFs
 CVRF=Cardiovascular Risk Factors, CHD=coronary heart disease

Table 4. Attitudes towards the non-physician health workers and text messages for cardiovascular disease management.

	Overall N=502 (%)	People with CVRF (N=283) (%)	People with existing CVD (N=219) (%)	P-value
Difficulty in understanding written information received from the hospital	300 (71.9%)	128 (64.6%)	172 (78.5%)	0.002
Need assistance to read physician prescription or medical notes	304 (72.9%)	113 (57.1%)	191 (87.2%)	<0.001
Acceptability of NPHW delivered care				
Offer advice on healthy diet	248 (59.9%)	122 (61.9%)	126 (58.1%)	0.42
Offer advice on exercise	246 (59.3%)	126 (63.6%)	120 (55.3%)	0.08
Offer advice on smoking cessation	142 (34.2%)	76 (38.4%)	66 (30.4%)	0.08
Measure blood pressure	212 (51.1%)	76 (38.4%)	136 (62.7%)	<0.001
Measure blood glucose	198 (47.7%)	68 (34.3%)	130 (59.9%)	<0.001
Measure blood cholesterol	192 (46.3%)	63 (31.8%)	129 (59.4%)	<0.001
Helping patients managing their prescribed medicine	241 (58.1%)	127 (64.1%)	114 (52.5%)	0.01
Reminder for clinic visits	250 (60.2%)	142 (71.7%)	108 (49.8%)	<0.001
Reminder for lab appointments	150 (36.1%)	57 (28.8%)	93 (42.9%)	0.01
Willing to receive text messages on healthy lifestyle	344 (84.3%)	174 (88.3%)	170 (80.57%)	0.03
Reasons for not opting text messages (N=64)				
Too expensive	4 (6.2%)	0 (0%)	4 (9.9%)	0.26
Not worried about my health	4 (6.3%)	2 (3.2%)	2 (4.9%)	

NPHW=non-physician health worker

The model is adjusted for age, sex, city, and presence of existing CVD/CVRFs

CVRF=Cardiovascular Risk Factors, CVD=cardiovascular disease

Table 5. Factors associated with acceptability of non-physician health worker and text messages for cardiovascular disease management.

	Acceptability of NPHW facilitated care		Unadjusted	Adjusted*
	No N (%)	Yes N (%)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Acceptability of NPHW for any services				
People with CVRF	47 (23.7%)	151 (76.3%)	0.99 (0.63,1.55)	0.92 (0.55,1.53)
City (Delhi)	24 (24.5%)	191 (60.3%)	4.67 (2.80,7.80)	9.30 (4.54,19.03)
Female	45 (24.7%)	137 (75.3%)	0.90 (0.57,1.41)	0.89 (0.54,1.47)
Age (in years)	98 (23.6%)	317 (76.4%)	0.97 (0.95,0.99)	0.97 (0.95,0.99)
Marital Status (Married)	93 (23.9%)	297 (76.1%)	0.80 (0.29,2.19)	0.76 (0.25,2.32)
Education				
<i>Graduation and above</i>	19 (18.1%)	86 (81.9%)	ref	ref
<i>Up to primary schooling</i>	13 (26.0%)	37 (74.0%)	0.63 (0.28,1.40)	1.79 (0.69,4.65)
<i>High school to Secondary school</i>	66 (25.4%)	194 (74.6%)	0.65 (0.37,1.15)	1.72 (0.86,3.45)
Occupation				
<i>Trained/skilled</i>	26 (17.9%)	119 (82.1%)	ref	ref
<i>Unemployed</i>	55 (27.4%)	146 (72.6%)	0.58 (0.34, 0.98)	0.94 (0.433, 2.05)
<i>Semiskilled/Unskilled</i>	17 (24.6%)	52 (75.4%)	0.67 (0.33,1.34)	1.01 (0.48,2.13)
Monthly household income (in Indian rupees)				
>20 000	25 (21.5%)	91 (78.5%)	ref	ref
<10000	98 (23.7%)	315 (76.3%)	0.85 (0.50, 1.47)	3.22 (1.50, 6.93)
10000-20000	22 (25.0%)	66 (75.0%)	0.82 (0.43,1.59)	1.83 (0.83,4.04)
Family history of CHD (No)	87 (25.1%)	259 (74.9%)	0.56 (0.28,1.12)	0.79 (0.38,1.64)
Willing to receive text messages about heart healthy living				
People with CVRF	23 (11.6%)	174 (88.4%)	1.82 (1.05,3.17)	2.25 (1.19,4.26)
City (Delhi)	9 (14.1%)	203 (59.0%)	8.8 (4.21,18.38)	6.79 (2.84,16.21)
Female	32(18.4%)	142 (81.6%)	0.70 (0.41,1.20)	0.53 (0.29,0.98)
Age (in years)	64 (15.7%)	344 (84.3%)	0.96 (0.94,0.98)	0.96 (0.93,0.98)
Marital Status (Married)	61 (15.9%)	323 (84.1%)	0.76 (0.22,2.61)	0.67 (0.16,2.81)
Education				
<i>Graduation and above</i>	4 (3.8%)	101 (96.2%)	ref	ref
<i>Up to primary schooling</i>	15 (31.3%)	33 (68.7%)	0.09 (0.03,0.28)	0.32 (0.09,1.16)
<i>High school to Secondary school</i>	45 (17.6%)	210 (82.0%)	0.18 (0.06,0.53)	0.57 (0.18,1.8)
Occupation				
<i>Trained/skilled</i>	9 (6.2%)	137 (93.8%)	ref	ref
<i>Unemployed</i>	39 (20.2%)	154 (79.8%)	0.26 (0.12,0.55)	0.61 (0.22,1.71)
<i>Semiskilled/Unskilled</i>	16 (23.2%)	53 (76.8%)	0.22 (0.09,0.52)	0.38 (0.15,0.97)
Monthly household income (in Indian rupees)				
>20,000	5 (4.4%)	109 (95.6%)	ref	ref
<10,000	47 (22.9%)	158 (77.1%)	0.15 (0.06,0.40)	0.41 (0.14,1.24)
10,000-20,000	11 (12.6%)	76 (87.4%)	0.32 (0.11,0.95)	0.61 (0.19,2.01)
Family history of CHD (No)	61 (18.0%)	278 (82.0%)	0.21 (0.06,0.68)	0.25 (0.07,0.88)

*Each covariate is adjusted with city, age and sex

CVRF=Cardiovascular Risk Factors, CHD=coronary heart disease

eTable 1. Practices related to monitoring of cardiovascular risk factors.

Parameters	Overall N=502 (%)	Control N=283 (%)	Cases N=219 (%)	P-value
Blood pressure checked last time				<0.001
Checked in the last 12 months	374 (74.5%)	192 (67.8%)	182 (83.1%)	
Checked >12 months ago	108 (21.5%)	76 (26.9%)	32 (14.6%)	
Never checked	20 (4.0%)	15 (5.3%)	5 (2.3%)	
Blood cholesterol checked last time				<0.001
Checked in the last 12 months	285 (56.8%)	139 (49.1%)	146 (66.7%)	
Checked >12 months ago	166 (33.1%)	113 (39.9%)	53 (24.2%)	
Never checked	51 (10.2%)	31 (11.0%)	20 (9.1%)	
Blood glucose checked last time				<0.001
Checked in the last 12 months	348 (69.3%)	176 (62.2%)	172 (78.5%)	
Checked >12 months ago	124 (24.7%)	89 (31.4%)	35 (16.0%)	
Never checked	30 (6.0%)	18 (6.4%)	12 (5.5%)	
Body weight checked last time				0.007
Checked in the last 12 months	322 (64.1%)	171 (60.4%)	151 (68.9%)	
Checked >12 months ago	142 (28.3%)	95 (33.6%)	47 (21.5%)	
Never checked	38 (7.6%)	17 (6.0%)	21 (9.6%)	
Monitoring CVRF*				0.083
All four	194 (38.6%)	100 (35.3%)	94 (42.9%)	
Any one	308 (61.4%)	183 (64.7%)	125 (57.1%)	
Recent blood pressure (perceived)				<0.001
Normal	406 (80.9%)	219 (77.4%)	187 (85.4%)	
High	37 (7.4%)	18 (6.4%)	19 (8.7%)	
Don't Know	57 (11.4%)	46 (16.3%)	11 (5.0%)	
Recent blood cholesterol (perceived)				<0.001
Normal	335 (66.7%)	180 (63.6%)	155 (70.8%)	
High	22 (4.4%)	5 (1.8%)	17 (7.8%)	
Don't Know	136 (27.1%)	97 (34.3%)	39 (17.8%)	
Recent fasting blood glucose(perceived)				0.019
Normal	369 (73.5%)	202 (71.4%)	167 (76.3%)	
High	49 (9.8%)	24 (8.5%)	25 (11.4%)	
Don't Know	81 (16.1%)	57 (20.1%)	24 (11.0%)	


eTable 2. Factors associated with low monitoring of CVD risk factors.

	Knowledge score		Unadjusted	Adjusted*
	High N (%)	Low N (%)	Odds ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Monitoring of CVD risk factors				
People with CVRF	100 (35.3%)	183 (64.7%)	1.38 (0.96,1.98)	1.50 (1.00,2.23)
Female	89 (38.7%)	141 (61.3%)	1.00 (0.69,1.43)	0.92 (0.63,1.34)
Age (in years)	194 (38.7%)	308 (61.3%)	0.99 (0.97,1.00)	0.99 (0.97,1.01)
Marital Status (Married)	186 (39.4%)	286 (60.6%)	0.56 (0.24,1.28)	0.57 (0.24,1.34)
Education				
<i>Graduation and above</i>	52 (43.7%)	67 (56.3%)	ref	ref
<i>Up to primary schooling</i>	20 (32.8%)	41 (67.2%)	1.59 (0.83,3.03)	2.84 (1.39,5.78)
<i>High school to Secondary school</i>	122 (37.9%)	200 (62.1%)	1.27 (0.83,1.95)	2.07 (1.27,3.38)
Occupation				
<i>Trained/skilled</i>	70 (39.8%)	106 (60.2%)	ref	ref
<i>Unemployed</i>	95 (39.9%)	143 (60.1%)	0.99 (0.67,1.48)	1.34 (0.76,2.36)
<i>Semiskilled/Unskilled</i>	29 (33.0%)	59 (67.0%)	1.34 (0.79,2.30)	1.77 (1.00,3.13)
Monthly household income (in Indian rupees)				
>20,000	51 (40.5%)	75 (59.5%)	ref	ref
<10,000	100 (36.8%)	172 (63.2%)	1.17 (0.76,1.80)	2.02 (1.19,3.41)
10,000-20,000	43 (42.2%)	59 (57.8%)	0.93 (0.55,1.59)	1.25 (0.71,2.20)
Family history of CHD (No)	163 (38.4%)	261 (61.6%)	1.06 (0.64,1.73)	1.19 (0.71,1.99)

*The regression model is adjusted for city, age and sex. #monitoring of CVD risk factors includes blood pressure, blood glucose, and blood cholesterol

CVRF=Cardiovascular Risk Factors


eFigure 1a. Lower level knowledge of heart attack symptoms among people with existing CVD vs people with CVRF by socio-demographic categories.



*p-value <0.001 for difference in poor knowledge ($\leq 75\%$ correct responses) between people with existing CVD and those with CVRF across age-group and sex. $p=0.16$ for education categories.

Case=People with cardiovascular disease, Control=People with cardiovascular risk factors


eFigure 1b. Lower level knowledge of stroke symptoms among people with existing CVD vs people with CVRF by socio-demographic categories.



*p-value <0.001 for difference in poor knowledge (lowest tertile, ≤75% correct responses) between people with existing CVD and those with CVRF across age-group and sex. p=0.25 for education categories.

Case=People with cardiovascular disease, Control=People with cardiovascular risk factors

eFigure 1c. Lower level knowledge of modifiable risk factors among people with existing CVD vs people with CVRF by socio-demographic categories.



*p-value <0.001 for difference in poor knowledge (lowest tertile, $\leq 75\%$ correct responses) between people with existing CVD and those with CVRF across age-group and sex.

Case=People with cardiovascular disease, Control=People with cardiovascular risk factors

*Modifiable risk factors included: smoking/tobacco use, alcohol use in excess, unhealthy diet (high saturated fatty acids, and salt), obesity, stress, depression, high cholesterol levels in blood, hypertension, diabetes, sleep, exercise.