

Could behaviour change techniques be used to address under-recognition of work-related asthma in primary care? A systematic review

Walters GI^{1,2}, Foley H², Huntley CC^{1,2}, Naveed A², Nettleton K¹, Reilly C¹, Thomas M¹, Walker C^{1,2},
Wheeler K^{1,2}

Affiliations

¹University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK

²Institute of Applied Health Research, University of Birmingham, UK

Corresponding author

Dr Gareth Walters

Address: Birmingham Regional NHS Occupational Lung Disease Service, Birmingham Chest Clinic,
151 Great Charles Street, Birmingham, B3 3HX

E-mail: gareth.walters@uhb.nhs.uk

Telephone: 0121 424 1950

Funding

There was no funding for this study

Conflicts of interest

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Introduction

Work-related asthma (WRA) is prevalent yet under-recognized in UK primary care. The aim of this systematic review was to identify behaviour change interventions (BCI) intended for use in a primary care setting to identify any chronic disease, that may be used in the context of WRA. The study was registered on the PROSPERO database (19/04/2023; CRD42023418316) and received no funding.

Methods

We searched CCRCT, Embase, PsychINFO and Ovid MEDLINE databases (1st January 1946 - 6th March 2023) for any observational or experimental study which described the development or evaluation (or both) of a BCI for case finding any chronic disease in a primary care setting, aimed at either healthcare professionals or patients or both. We included case reports, series and conference abstracts, and excluded existing reviews and protocols, and abstracts not in English. Abstracts and subsequent full text articles were assessed by two blinded, independent reviewers, and disagreement resolved by consensus. The primary author undertook quality assessments for a variety of methodologies, with quality control by a second reviewer. We undertook narrative synthesis for a variety of outcomes of usability and effectiveness, and for BCI development.

Results

18 studies (14 papers and 4 conference abstracts) were included following full-text review, from an initial literature search yielding n=768 citations for screening, of which there were 3 randomised control trials, 1 uncontrolled experimental study, 4 primarily qualitative studies and 10 studies employing recognized multi-step BC methodologies. Quality varied depending upon the methodology used. None of the studies were concerned with identification of asthma. BCIs had been developed for facilitating screening programmes (5), implementing guidelines (5) and individual case finding (8). Six studies measured effectiveness, in terms of screening adherence rates, pre- and post-

intervention competency, satisfaction and usability, for clinicians, though none measured diagnostic rates.

Discussion

Single and multi-component BCIs have been developed to aid identification of chronic diseases, though not asthma or work-related asthma specifically. Development for the majority has used BC methodologies that involve gathering data from a range of sources, and develop content specific to defined at-risk populations. Nevertheless, such methodologies could be used similarly to develop a BCI for WRA in primary care settings.

Words=348

Introduction

Work-related asthma (WRA) includes asthma caused by exposures at work (occupational asthma) and existing asthma worsening by conditions at work (work-exacerbated asthma). The impetus for this study derives from our clinical experience of WRA as a markedly under-recognized chronic condition. If diagnosis is delayed or missed, affected individuals may suffer poor outcomes in terms of respiratory health and employment [Barber et al., 2022; HSE, 2022], and the societal impacts of healthcare-related costs and productivity losses are significant, with desktop estimates of social cost for the UK in the region of £1 billion per decade [Ayres et al., 2011]. Existing guidelines recommend that attending healthcare professionals (HCP) ask adult patients with new, reactivated or worsening asthma symptoms about the nature of their job, about any relationship of their asthma symptoms with work, and seek expert advice when a relationship is demonstrated [Barber et al., 2022; NICE, 2023]. However, in the UK and elsewhere, it is evident that these guidelines and their previous iterations have not been implemented successfully in a variety of settings, including primary care [Walters et al., 2012; de Bono and Hudsmith, 1999; Fishwick et al., 2007]. In primary care, barriers to diagnosis for patients include poor understanding of asthma and work context, fear of job and economic loss, and the assumption of insolubility [Walters et al., 2015; Bradshaw et al., 2007]. For primary care HCPs barriers include inadequate training and clinical experience, beliefs and perceptions about disease occurrence, pressures on specialist referral, lack of continuity of care, and time constraints [Walters et al., 2021].

Behaviour change interventions (BCI), including education and training aimed at modifying clinical behaviours, audit and feedback, or enablement of collaborative team-based approaches, are broadly effective in changing the individual or collective practice of primary care HCPs [Chauhan et al., 2017]. Additionally, similar approaches may be engaged to influence the health-seeking behaviour of patients. A simple or complex BCI intended to increase early identification of WRA in primary care could be developed and evaluated for clinical effectiveness. An important step, and the rationale for this review, would be to see whether such interventions already exist, or whether similar initiatives from other chronic disease areas could be adapted for this purpose.

Review questions

(1) Have BCIs aimed at modifying health-seeking or clinical behaviour been developed and/or evaluated for identifying (1) WRA or (2) any chronic disease, in primary care settings?

(2) Are such BCIs effective in aiding identification of such chronic diseases?

Methods

This systematic review has been reported according to The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement, 2020 update and PRISMA 2020 for abstracts checklist [Page et al., 2021]. The protocol was registered on the international PROSPERO database of systematic reviews on 19th April 2023 (Registration number: CRD42023418316).

Literature search

The literature search was undertaken via institutional access to the Ovid interface (Ovid technologies, New York City, United States) and included the following databases: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (to 6th March 2023), Embase (<1974-March 6th 2023), Ovid MEDLINE (1946-March 6th 2023) and APA PsycINFO (<1967-March 6th 2023). Search terms combined synonyms for three elements: BCIs, diagnosis and primary care; the search strategy is shown in Supplementary Table 1. Reference lists from studies meeting the inclusion criteria were searched to identify any missed relevant studies.

Inclusion criteria

Any study examining either the development, effectiveness, or both, of the BCI(s) in question, to include qualitative, observational, or experimental studies in biomedical and social science journals. These may have included case reports, case series, published conference abstracts.

Exclusion Criteria

(1) Books, book chapters, theses, dissertations, systematic or narrative reviews, opinion pieces, protocols (unless a protocol for an effectiveness trial also describes the development of the intervention)

(2) Abstracts not in English

(3) Non-human research (eg. laboratory studies)

Condition being studied

Any chronic disease, defined here as a disease of any bodily system likely to remain active or require treatment for more than 1 year, and that affects day-to-day functioning, requires medical treatment, or negatively impacts life expectancy. Common examples might include hypertension, diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, depression, multiple sclerosis, coeliac disease (not exhaustive). This definition also includes solid-body and haematological cancers.

Populations being studied

(1) Studies undertaken in any primary care population, with no geographical restriction

AND

(2) Studies in which the target groups are either patients or primary care HCPs, or both

Interventions being studied

Any tool, intervention or initiative described as a ‘behaviour change intervention’ or in such terms, designed to change the health seeking behaviour of patients or the clinical behaviour of primary care HCPs, to aid diagnosis of any chronic disease. This did not include BCIs aimed at uptake of lifestyle modifications or treatments to prevent onset of disease (primary prevention and health promotion). BCIs aimed at increasing participation in screening programmes were considered for inclusion, though studies which described development or evaluation of screening programmes *per se*, were excluded from this review.

Comparator groups being studied

For some relevant and included study designs, no comparator group will have been evident (for example, studies describing the development of BCIs may have been mixed-methods, qualitative, protocols for subsequent trials, or case series). Studies evaluating the effectiveness of BCIs may have included randomised controlled trials, where the comparator groups were either existing standards of care or head-to-head comparisons between novel interventions; or may have been uncontrolled trials.

Primary outcomes

- (1) Related to development of BCI: theoretical framework used (if any), method(s) of development, construct, and function of BCI, any validation undertaken.
- (2) Related to clinical effectiveness of BCI: any effect measure (for example, risk ratios, prevalence ratios, incidence rate ratios) depending upon the experimental study design.

Data selection

Results of literature search were exported in to the Rayyan web-based application (Qatar Computing Research Institute, Doha, Qatar) for abstract screening, and automatically de-duplicated. Each abstract was screened independently and blinded by two reviewers, and any abstract included by at least one reviewer was shortlisted for full-text review. Full-text review was carried out independently and blinded by two reviewers, and a 3rd independent review and discussion with consensus between reviewers undertaken where disagreement occurred. Primary reasons for exclusion were documented according to the categories shown in Supplementary Table 2.

Data gathering

The following data were gathered by the primary author according to a standardised template (detailed in Supplementary Table 3): author(s), year, region, rationale, study design, population, disease entity, BCI, theoretical framework used, construct and function of BCI, any validation undertaken; for RCTs, comparator groups, effect measures and statistical significance were also collected. The data from a small sample (>10%, 3 studies) were checked for accuracy by a 2nd reviewer.

Risk of bias/quality assessment

For each included full-text article, the primary author and a second reviewer undertook blinded quality assessments (Supplementary Tables 4-7). Where the researchers had employed a conventional study design as the primary methodology (ie. qualitative, RCT, uncontrolled trial), a standardised Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal tool was used to assess quality and risk of bias [Barker et al., 2023; Lockwood et al., 2015; Tufanaru et al., 2017] . These were chosen in order to assess quality and

risk of bias at study and outcome levels, for a variety of study designs. Where methodology non-traditional (ie. a multi-step or multi-component BCI methodology) then a narrative appraisal was undertaken, and any factors that would reduce confidence in the study design documented. Any disagreements were moderated by consensus.

Data synthesis

Included studies were grouped primarily by the intended scope of the developed BCI (ie. facilitation of screening, uptake of existing guidelines, individual case finding) and summary of overall study design provided, in terms of geographical reach, aim (BCI development, evaluation or both), target group (patients, HCPs, both) and disease area. No quantitative synthesis or meta-analysis was planned, since pilot searches had revealed heterogeneous study designs, target populations and high likelihood of multi-component studies being included. Studies were considered to have BC methodology if multi-step (>1) components were included to develop or refine BCIs; any underlying theoretical framework was assessed.

Data was tabulated where possible, grouped by variables ie. study design (eg. co-creation, qualitative), disease, target group (patients and/or healthcare professionals), narrative description of function, construct, and for effectiveness studies: summaries of intervention and comparator groups, main outcomes and effect sizes with significance and confidence intervals. An accompanying narrative synthesis of quantitative data was undertaken. It was also intended to make recommendations for use of existing BCIs in the context of WRA.

Results

From the initial database literature searches, n=768 discrete citations were included for abstract screening following automated software de-duplication (see PRISMA flow chart in Figure 1). Seventy-one articles (9%) were shortlisted by at least one abstract reviewer and included for full-text review. On full-text review, agreement was found between both reviewers in 55/71 articles (77%; including n=16 for inclusion n=39 for exclusion), with no further studies added after 3rd review and moderation of disagreement; 2 additional articles identified through screening of reference lists by the lead author were included. Thus n=18 articles were included in the subsequent evidence synthesis, comprising 14 full papers and 4 conference abstracts. Reasons for exclusion at full-text review stage were as follows: wrong outcome=25, wrong population=14, wrong study design=15. A list of the excluded studies at full-text review is available from the authors on request. Where conference abstracts have been included, a search for a subsequent full paper has been undertaken, and none of these had been peer-reviewed and published at the time of writing.

Quality and risk of bias assessments

Quality and risk of bias assessments are shown in Supplementary Tables 4-7. There were 3 RCTs, 1 quasi-RCT, 4 studies employing predominantly qualitative methodology, and 10 studies describing BCI development using behaviour change (BC) methodology. Included RCTs lacked methodological detail on selection and allocation of participants or sites, in particular the process of randomisation, and on blinding of those evaluating outcomes to allocation; one of these articles [Kronish et al., 2022] was a conference abstract, so many methodological details were absent. The two full-paper RCTs were published in subject-specific journals, so may have lacked the rigorous methodological detail required by a clinical trials journal. The trial with pre- and post-intervention outcome measurements, authored by Porcheret et al. [2018], was nested in a larger RCT described elsewhere, but recruitment and dropout are described in detail. One qualitative study was a conference abstract; methods were described sufficiently to use the correct assessment tool, but lacked detail relating to reflexivity,

participant demographics, and ethical permissions. The other 3 studies had full and detailed methods sections.

Critical appraisal of 10 studies employing multi-step BC methodologies revealed inter-study variation, with no single standardised methodology or framework employed. Most commonly the theoretical domains framework (TDF) was used to establish barriers and enablers, with many of these studies applying the behaviour change wheel (BCW) to map barriers and enablers to intervention functions, behaviour change techniques (BCT) and intervention components, and APEASE criteria for final selection [Smits et al., 2018; Jinks et al., 2015; Bravington et al., 2022; Moise et al., 2020; Porcheret et al., 2014; Riordan et al., 2020; Toh et al., 2016, Tuot et al., 2020]. Two studies employed the Medical Research Council (MRC) complex interventions framework [Campbell et al., 2000; Campbell et al., 2007; Lester et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2012]. There were methodological differences between studies for establishing barriers and enablers, identifying and selecting BCTs, and no standardised method for reporting multi-step methods; indeed, due to the need to report multiple work packages in BC methodology studies, the qualitative elements for example, lacked the reporting rigour of papers where qualitative analysis was the sole method used. In some BC methodology papers, individual work packages had been described in detail in separate citations, signposted from the paper [Larkey et al., 2015; Smits et al., 2018; Moise et al., 2020].

Narrative synthesis

Study characteristics for all included articles are shown in Table 1, grouped by scope of BCI, and displayed with primary methodology, study population, intervention group, comparators, and relevant outcomes.

(1) Facilitation of screening programmes

Three studies evaluated effectiveness of BCIs in facilitating a screening programme. Rubenstein et al. [2011] undertook a practice cluster RCT of an existing patient-facing internet-based risk assessment

tool for stratifying personal risk and providing tailored messages. Absolute screening adherence increased in both intervention and control groups (standard care) at all levels of personal risk, though there were no significant differences between the two groups (unadjusted or adjusted for risk); the authors noted high baseline screening rates in the sample population. Kronish et al. [2022] developed a multi-component BCI (clinician, nursing and patient education and information) for hypertension screening using BC methodology, which was then evaluated by practice cluster RCT against standard care. There was a significant relative increase in ordering and completion of ambulatory and home blood pressure monitoring in the intervention group (0.5% to 4%; $p < 0.001$ vs. 3.1% to 2.8%; $p = 0.66$ for ordering and 0.5% to 3.0%; $p < .001$ vs. 2.2% to 2.0%, $p = 0.76$ for completion) though absolute adherence levels remained low. Larkey et al. [2015] undertook a RCT of BCIs to encourage colorectal cancer screening adherence in low income and minority ethnic groups. Head-to-head comparison of ‘storytelling’ (a video created from personal stories composited into a drama) versus personal risk control (a risk assessment tool based upon the Harvard Cancer Risk Index) found no significant differences in screening adherence (37% and 42% screened respectively).

Two studies described development of BCIs using methodologies underpinned by the TDF, aimed at increasing screening adherence; these were for cervical cancer [Bravington et al., 2022] comprising a patient leaflet and video animation for HCP training, and diabetic retinopathy [Riordan et al., 2020] incorporating a range of BC techniques (audit/feedback, electronic prompts targeting HCPs, HCP-endorsed reminders (face-to-face, by phone and letter), and patient leaflet). Riordan et al. [2020] employed a multi-step BCW methodology and measured acceptability and feasibility of their BC techniques via stakeholder consensus groups, refining the final BCI by applying APEASE criteria [Michie et al., 2014].

(2) Implementation of diagnostic guidelines

Two authors undertook qualitative interview studies, analysed using the TDF framework, to identify barriers and enablers to adoption of clinical practice guidelines by HCPs, for any chronic disease [Kredo et al., 2018] and specifically for self-harm [Leather et al., 2022]. Both studies mapped

findings to BCI functions using COM-B/BCW matrices, and identified multiple BCI groups of relevance for clinical practice guideline adherence (including feedback and monitoring, shaping knowledge, natural consequences, associations, repetition and substitutions, antecedents, goals and planning, and self-belief; Leather et al., 2022), stopping short of selection. Kredon et al. specified a number of BCIs suitable for further evaluation including design improvements, accessibility, digital formatting, and patient engagement materials.

Other authors employed multi-step BC methodology; Moise et al. [2020] developed and refined a multi-component BCI aimed at increasing uptake of hypertension guidelines by patients and HCPs, comprising exploration of barriers via qualitative focus groups, mapping of barriers to functions using the BCW, and feasibility evaluation through stakeholder interviews. Porcheret et al. [2014] drew on four theoretical frameworks: implementation of change model, TDF, theoretical mapping of behavioural determinants to behaviour change techniques (BCT; after Michie et al., 2008) and principles of adult learning, in order to develop an enhanced consultation for identifying osteoarthritis through implementation of UK national guidelines. They developed and refined workshops for General Practice that incorporated BCIs developed via (i) HCP consensus discussion, (ii) GP focus groups and (iii) review of known enablers and barriers to innovation implementation; 10 BC techniques were incorporated including information provision, skills rehearsal, and persuasive communication. A subsequent effectiveness study by the same group [Porcheret et al., 2018] described an uncontrolled trial of the final workshop, with GP competency measured through review of a video-recorded simulated consultation, before and after the intervention; competency score increased significantly at two time points, one month ($p=0.001$) and five months ($p=0.001$) after the workshop.

(3) Individual case-finding

The majority of papers within this scope ($n=6$) used multi-step BC methodologies and describe development of BCIs to aid individual case finding in: unspecified long terms conditions [Jinks et al., 2015], first episode psychosis [Lester et al., 2005], lung cancer [Smith et al., 2012], unspecified

cancers [Smits et al., 2018] and chronic kidney disease [Tuot et al., 2020]. Four studies used multi-step BCW frameworks; Jinks et al. [2015] developed their multi-component enhanced consultation, which included tools for HCPs for case finding (not described in any further detail in conference abstract) using the TDF/COM-B framework, with steps comprising evidence synthesis, community of practice via stakeholder workshops, and thematic analysis of focus groups to assess training needs. Smits et al., [2018] also employed the TDF/BCW framework to refine content and delivery of an existing BCI, ‘The health check’, a touchscreen questionnaire delivered face-to-face by a trained lay advisor, aiming to raise awareness of cancer risk and encourage health-seeking behaviour in the presence of symptoms, and targeting specifically patients ≥ 40 years old living in socioeconomically deprived communities. The authors also applied APEASE criteria to make judgements on the most appropriate BCI functions for their objectives. Tuot et al. [2020] developed a patient-facing online risk calculator (brief questionnaire, risk assessment, self-management tools) and a clinician-facing ‘Clinical Practice Toolkit’ platform for identifying chronic kidney disease in at-risk populations. The clinician toolkit included a population-risk identifier, education about detection and management, patient health literacy assessment, and quality improvement intervention suggestions. The authors used a TDF/BCW framework in a multi-step process which comprised establishing barriers and enablers to diagnosis (eg. awareness of guidelines, availability of data analytics) from qualitative data, and mapping these to intervention functions (in this case: education, persuasion, enablement, and modelling) to develop the BCI. In a subsequent effectiveness (usability) study Tuot et al. [2022] undertook thematic analysis of think-aloud exercises completed with patients and primary care HCPs, for the patient-facing online risk calculator element only. They found that patients and clinicians could easily navigate the tool, though there was tension between promotion of medical versus lay terminology; the authors recommend that their findings inform development of future education materials. Toh et al. [2016] have used thematic analysis of primary care stakeholder interviews (patients, pharmacists, nurses, doctors), subsequently applying the BCW to identify a multi-component BCI for osteoporosis case finding consisting of (i) a pharmacist-led risk assessment for osteoporosis, (ii) an education session, and (iii) restructuring of the current practice which incorporates this intervention into daily clinic practice.

Two studies employed the MRC framework for complex interventions; Lester et al. [2005] developed an educational BCI for GPs consulting on first-episode psychosis, via a multi-step process including a literature review, analysis of data from focus groups, and feedback gained from surveys of GPs users following initial and booster training. The BCI was well received amongst GPs with increase in self-reported knowledge, skills, and attitudes in psychotic illness. Smith et al. [2012] used the MRC framework to develop a complex intervention for symptomatic patients at risk of lung cancer, which comprised a detailed self-help manual and extended consultation with a trained research nurse, at which specific action plans were devised. Elements comprised evidence review, multi-disciplinary group design, and thematic analysis of user focus group data.

One study used primarily qualitative methodologies to identify barriers and enablers to BCI for unspecified chronic diseases [Payne and Hysong, 2014]. Payne and Hysong investigated the determinants of acceptability in clinician performance feedback, using deductive analysis from qualitative interviews with GPs to identify barriers (eg. untimely feedback, unrealistic advice, performance based on small sample size) and enablers (eg. sense of competition, showing patient-level data).

Table 2 summarises the 6 studies where full papers were available and that described multi-step BC methodologies using TDF (+/- BCW) frameworks.

Discussion

Statement of principal findings

This review identified no study describing development of single or multi-component BCIs for the identification of asthma or work-related asthma specifically. Three studies described stages in BCI development for unspecified chronic diseases, that could be employed for asthma, including outlining potential interventions for guideline adherence [Kredo et al., 2018], identifying enablers and barriers to accepting performance feedback for GPs [Payne and Hysong et al. 2014] (conference abstract only), and a multi-component BCI for practice nurses in the format of an enhanced review consultation [Jinks et al., 2015] (conference abstract only). More generally BCI development has focused on adherence to screening programmes, implementation of guidelines and improving individual case finding (eg. through performance feedback, risk assessment and medical education). The majority of studies have drawn on qualitative research with patients and/or HCPs, to define behaviours which require change, usually resulting in identification of multiple BCTs and therefore multi-component BCIs; additionally, a number of theoretical frameworks have been employed, resulting in multi-step development processes, most commonly the TDF (+/- BCW), but also implementation of change theory and the MRC complex interventions framework. Evaluation of BCIs for effectiveness in implementation of guidelines and individual case finding had been limited to outcomes related to diagnostic confidence, competency, improvement in learning, and other self-reported measures amongst HCPs; three RCTs of BCIs aimed to increase screening programme uptake have given both positive and negative results, depending upon background levels of absolute risk.

Strengths and weaknesses

We have aligned our methods and reporting with the standardised PRISMA checklist and used established quality and risk of bias assessment tools as far as possible. However, no tool or benchmark for assessment of multi-step BC methodologies was available at the time of writing. Often due to the number of work packages involved in a BC methodology study, detail was missing on

methods and conduct of individual components, seen most frequently with qualitative methods, though occasionally individual work packages had been published separately. Literature searches were undertaken using search terms which accounted for various spellings of behaviour and acronyms for behaviour change intervention. However, it is possible that such interventions have been missed due to being labelled otherwise.

Meaning of findings in view of other work

The most encountered framework for research was the TDF, where qualitative methods have been employed to gather data to establish barriers and enablers of behaviour change. This has been frequently undertaken in combination with the more recently developed and simpler COM-B model of behaviour (capability, opportunity, and motivation are the key ingredients of behaviour change), and the BCW approach to intervention design, with demonstrable steps to identification of intervention functions and a range of suitable BCTs. Following a systematic literature review of intervention frameworks, Michie et al. [2011] developed the BCW framework given that no existing framework (including the MRC complex interventions framework) met their criteria of comprehensive coverage of intervention or policy function, coherence, and link to an overarching model of behaviour, including the MRC complex intervention framework. Indeed, interventions are commonly designed without consideration of the type of intervention likely to be effective, rationale for choice of interventions, the full range of possible influences on behaviour, and understanding the target behaviour [Davies et al., 2010; van Bokhoven et al., 2003]. Many frameworks exist but have not been intended for- or been tested in healthcare settings. The BCW framework (Figure 2) consists of the COM-B model at the core with its three critical components; surrounding this are nine intervention functions and seven policy categories that aim to address any COM-B components identified as deficient. Thus, each domain of TDF or COM-B can be used with the BCW to identify BCTs and design and refine interventions (Figure 2). The eight step process outlined by Michie et al. [2011] standardises a comprehensive approach to intervention development as follows: (1) define the problem in behavioural terms; (2) select the target behavior(s) most likely to bring about change to address the problem, (3) specify the target behavior in as much detail as possible, (4) identify what

needs to shift in order to achieve the target behavior, (5) identify intervention functions, (6) identify policy categories, (7) identify behavioural change techniques, and (8) identify mode of delivery. In a further step APEASE criteria [Michie et al., 2014] can be used to refine or select BCTs and their delivery, for an intervention, by considering a wider context of affordability, practicability, cost-effectiveness, acceptability, safety and equity; in three included studies [Smits et al., 2018; Riordan et al., 2010; Moise 2020] this was undertaken via consensus methods and evidence review. Although now popular in healthcare research (and elsewhere) for its comprehensive and practical approach to intervention design, limitations have been acknowledged, in terms of over simplifying human behaviour, lack of stakeholder involvement including the target population, vagueness where judgement is required for decision making, and the requirement to understand psychological processes [O’Cathain et al., 2019].

Although no specific intervention or technique is recommended for use in patients with asthma and work-related asthma, there are some general and transferable insights into BCI design from a recent systematic review by Mather et al. [2022], focused on barriers and enablers of behaviour change by primary care HCPs. The authors reported that HCPs commonly perceive those in the ‘capability’ and ‘opportunity’ domains of COM-B, which are linked with interventions related to education, training, restriction, environmental re-structuring and enablement; these results are therefore in keeping with those of the only full-text study focused on the area of guidelines for unspecified chronic diseases, by Kredo et al. [2018], which identified high priority functions relating to education, training and enablement. A specific BCI for use with patients at risk of work-related asthma could be developed using a standardised and establish BC methodology, taking account of local variation in employment, industry, and causative exposures.

References (for studies included in review see list underneath)

Atkins L, Francis J, Islam R et al. A guide to using the Theoretical Domains Framework of behaviour change to investigate implementation problems. *Implement Sci.* 2017;12(1):77.

Ayres JG, Boyd R, Cowie H, Hurley JF. Costs of occupational asthma in the UK. *Thorax.* 2011;66(2):128-33.

Barber CM, Cullinan P, Feary J et al. British Thoracic Society Clinical Statement on occupational asthma. *Thorax.* 2022;77(5):433-42.

Barker TH, Stone JC, Sears K, et al. The revised JBI critical appraisal tool for the assessment of risk of bias for randomized controlled trials. *JBI Evidence Synthesis.* 2023;21(3):494-506.

van Bokhoven MA, Kok G, van der Weijden T. Designing a quality improvement intervention: a systematic approach. *Qual Saf Health Care.* 2003;12(3):215-20.

de Bono J, Hudsmith L. Occupational asthma: a community-based study. *Occup Med.* 1999;49(4):217-9.

Bradshaw LM, Barber CM, Davies J, Curran AD, Fishwick D. Work-related asthma symptoms and attitudes to the workplace. *Occup Med.* 2007;57(1):30-5.

Campbell M, Fitzpatrick R, Haines A et al. Framework for design and evaluation of complex interventions to improve health. *Br Med J.* 2000;321:694-6.

Campbell NC, Murray E, Darbyshire J, et al. Designing and evaluating complex interventions to improve health care. *Br Med J.* 2007; 334(7591): 455-9.

Chauhan BF, Jeyaraman MM, Mann AS, et al. Behaviour change interventions and policies influencing primary healthcare professionals' practice-an overview of reviews. *Implement Sci.* 2017;12(1):3.

Davies P, Walker AE, Grimshaw JM. A systematic review of the use of theory in the design of guideline dissemination and implementation strategies and interpretation of the results of rigorous evaluations. *Implement Sci.* 2010;5:14.

Fishwick D, Bradshaw L, Davies J et al. Are we failing workers with symptoms suggestive of occupational asthma? *Prim Care Respir J.* 2007;16(5):304-10.

Health and Safety Executive. *Work-related asthma statistics, 2022*; 2022. Buxton, UK: HSE.

Accessed 21st July 2023. Online at: <https://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/causdis/asthma.pdf>

Lockwood C, Munn Z, Porritt K. Qualitative research synthesis: methodological guidance for systematic reviewers utilizing meta-aggregation. *Int J Evid Based Healthc.* 2015;13(3):179-87.

Mather M, Pettigrew LM, Navaratnam S. Barriers and facilitators to clinical behaviour change by primary care practitioners: a theory-informed systematic review of reviews using the Theoretical Domains Framework and Behaviour Change Wheel. *Syst Rev.* 2022;11:180.

Michie S, Johnston M, Francis J, Hardeman W, Eccles M: From theory to intervention: mapping theoretically derived behavioural determinants to behaviour change techniques. *Appl Psychol.* 2008, 57(4):660-80.

Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implement Sci.* 2011;6:42.

Michie S, Atkins L, West R. *The behaviour change wheel, A guide to designing interventions, 1st Edn.* Great Britain: Silverback Publishing 2014.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Asthma: diagnosis, monitoring, and chronic asthma management (NG80)*; 2023. NICE. Accessed 21st July 2023. Online at:

<https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng80/resources/asthma-diagnosis-monitoring-and-chronic-asthma-management-pdf-1837687975621>

O'Cathain A, Croot L, Sworn K et al. Taxonomy of approaches to developing interventions to improve health: a systematic methods overview. *Pilot Feasibility Stud.* 2019;5:41.

Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Br Med J.* 2021;372:n71.

Tufanaru C, Munn Z, Aromataris E, Campbell J, Hopp L. *Chapter 3: Systematic reviews of effectiveness.* In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). *Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's Manual.* The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017. Accessed 24th January 2024. Available from <https://reviewersmanual.joannabriggs.org/>

Walters GI, McGrath EE, Ayres JG. Audit of the recording of occupational asthma in primary care. *Occup Med.* 2012;62(7):570-3.

Walters GI, Soundy A, Robertson AS, Burge PS, Ayres JG. Understanding health beliefs and behaviour in workers with suspected occupational asthma. *Respir Med.* 2015;109(3):379-88.

Walters GI, Barber CM. Barriers to identifying occupational asthma among primary healthcare professionals: a qualitative study. *Br Med J Open Respir Res.* 2021;8(1):e000938.

INCLUDED STUDIES

Bravington A, Chen H, Dyson J, et al. Translating qualitative data into intervention content using the Theoretical Domains Framework and stakeholder co-design: a worked example from a study of cervical screening attendance in older women. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2022;22(1):610.

Jinks C, Morden A, Chew-Graham C et al. Case-finding for joint pain and anxiety and depression: The enhance study. *Ann Rheum Dis.* 2015;2:1182.

Kredo T, Cooper S, Abrams A, Muller J, Volmink J, Atkins S. Using the behavior change wheel to identify barriers to and potential solutions for primary care clinical guideline use in four provinces in South Africa. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2018;18(1):965.

Kronish IM, Phillips E, Carter E et al. Effectiveness of A Multicomponent Implementation Strategy on Increasing Uptake of USPSTF Hypertension Screening Recommendations in A Primary Care Network: The Embrace Cluster Randomized Trial. *Hypertension*. 2022;79:AP222.

Larkey LK, McClain D, Roe DJ et al. Randomized controlled trial of storytelling compared to a personal risk tool intervention on colorectal cancer screening in low-income patients. *Am J Health Promot*. 2015;30(2):e59-70.

Leather JZ, Keyworth C, Kapur N, Campbell SM, Armitage CJ. Examining drivers of self-harm guideline implementation by general practitioners: A qualitative analysis using the theoretical domains framework. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2022;27(4):1275-95.

Lester H, Tait L, Khera A, Birchwood M, Freemantle N, Patterson P. The development and implementation of an educational intervention on first episode psychosis for primary care. *Med Educ*. 2005;39(10):1006-14.

Moise N, Phillips E, Carter E et al. Design and study protocol for a cluster randomized trial of a multi-faceted implementation strategy to increase the uptake of the USPSTF hypertension screening recommendations: the EMBRACE study. *Implement Sci*. 2020;15(1):63.

Payne V, Hysong S. A grounded provider feedback framework-the relationship between providers' feedback acceptance and performance improvement. *Diagnosis* 2015;2:eA15

Porcheret M, Main C, Croft P, McKinley R, Hassell A, Dziedzic K. Development of a behaviour change intervention: a case study on the practical application of theory. *Implement Sci*. 2014 Apr 3;9(1):42.

Porcheret M, Main C, Croft P, Dziedzic K. Enhancing delivery of osteoarthritis care in the general practice consultation: evaluation of a behaviour change intervention. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2018;19(1):26.

Riordan F, Racine E, Phillip ET et al. Development of an intervention to facilitate implementation and uptake of diabetic retinopathy screening. *Implement Sci.* 2020;15(1):34. Erratum in: *Implement Sci.* 2020;15(1):61.

Rubinstein WS, Acheson LS, O'Neill SM et al. Family Healthware Impact Trial (FHITr) Group. Clinical utility of family history for cancer screening and referral in primary care: a report from the Family Healthware Impact Trial. *Genet Med.* 2011;13(11):956-65.

Smith SM, Murchie P, Devereux G et al. Developing a complex intervention to reduce time to presentation with symptoms of lung cancer. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2012;62(602):e605-15.

Smits S, McCutchan G, Wood F et al. Development of a Behavior Change Intervention to Encourage Timely Cancer Symptom Presentation Among People Living in Deprived Communities Using the Behavior Change Wheel. *Ann Behav Med.* 2018;52(6):474-88.

Toh LS, Lai PSM, Wong KT, Low BY, Anderson C. The development of a pharmacist-led osteoporosis screening intervention using the behavioural change wheel. *International Journal of Pharmacy Practice* 2016;24:30.

Tuot DS, Crowley ST, Katz LA, et al. The Kidney Score Platform for Patient and Clinician Awareness, Communication, and Management of Kidney Disease: Protocol for a Mixed Methods Study. *JMIR Res Protoc.* 2020;9(10):e22024.

Tuot DS, Crowley ST, Katz LA et al. Usability Testing of the Kidney Score Platform to Enhance Communication About Kidney Disease in Primary Care Settings: Qualitative Think-Aloud Study. *JMIR Form Res.* 2022 Sep 28;6(9):e40001.




Figure 1. PRISMA study flow chart after Page et al. [2021].




Figure 2. The behaviour change wheel (BCW): a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. A: Mapping between theoretical domains framework (TDF) and the COM-B model, frameworks for understanding behaviour and analysing relevant qualitative data; B=The BCW. Taken from Atkins et al. [2017] and Michie et al. [2011] respectively. Soc=social influences; Env=environmental context and resources; Id=social/professional role and identity; Bel Cap=beliefs about capabilities; Opt=optimism; Int=intentions; Bel Cons=beliefs about consequences; Reinf=reinforcement; Em=emotion; Know=knowledge; Cog=cognitive and interpersonal skills; Mem=memory, attention and decision processes; Beh Reg= behavioural regulation; Phys=physical skills.

Scope of BCI	Authors (year)	Region	Stage of implementation	Population studied		Primary methodology	Intervention	Control/comparator	Outcome measures
				Target group	Disease area				
Facilitation and participation in screening programmes	Bravington et al. (2022)	UK	Development	Patients: women aged >50 years, GPs and practice nurses	Cervical cancer	Multi-step BC methodology, using re-analysis of existing qualitative data according to TDF, design of intervention content and mode of delivery via focus groups	Service-user leaflet (patients) and a video animation for practitioner training (HCPs)	n/a	Barriers and enablers of screening adherence, final intervention
	Kronish et al. (2022) ¹	United States	Development; effectiveness	Doctors, practice nurses, patients	Hypertension	Multi-step BCW methodology and subsequent cluster (practice level) RCT	Multi-component BCI comprising education and training for doctors and nurses on screening, access and ordering of ambulatory/home blood pressure monitoring, and patient information	Standard care	Proportion of eligible patients undertaking ambulatory or home blood pressure monitoring
	Larkey et al. (2015)	United States	Development (described in detail elsewhere); effectiveness	Patients of low income aged 50-70 and minority ethnic groups	Colorectal cancer	Head-to-head RCT of two BCIs	Storytelling: a video created from personal stories composited into a drama about colorectal screening	Personal cancer risk instrument based upon Harvard Cancer Risk Index	Proportion of patients screened
	Riordan et al. (2020)	Republic of Ireland	Development	Patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus, and primary care HCPs	Diabetic retinopathy	Multi-step BCW methodology	Multi-component BCI from a range of identified BCTs. Application of APEASE criteria for selection	n/a	Barriers and enablers, final intervention selection
	Rubinstein et al. (2011)	United States	Effectiveness	Patients aged 35-65	Cancers, unspecified	Cluster (practice-level) RCT	Interactive, internet-based risk assessment tool that collects family history for common cancers, stratifies personal risk, and provides tailored prevention messages	Standard care	Change in screening adherence rates, at distinct levels of personal risk
Implementation of existing guidelines	Kredo et al. (2018)	South Africa	Development	Practice nurses and allied health professionals	Chronic diseases, unspecified	Primarily qualitative, using BCW theory and thematic analysis	n/a	n/a	Barriers and enablers of guideline use; interventions for

									potential future use identified and characterised
	Leather et al. (2022)	UK	Development	GPs	Self-harm (poisoning or injury)	Primarily qualitative, using BCW theory and thematic analysis	n/a	n/a	Barriers and enablers of guideline use; intervention functions and BCTs for potential future use identified and characterised
	Moise et al. (2020)	United States	Development	GPs and patients	Hypertension	Multi-step BCW methodology	Multi-component BCI from a range of identified BCTs	n/a	Barriers and enablers of guidelines use; feasibility and acceptability
	Porcheret et al. (2014)	UK	Development	GPs enrolled in trial described in (Porcheret et al., 2018)	Osteoarthritis	Multi-step BC methodology underpinned by 4 theoretical models (implementation of change, TDF, adult learning and BCI selection model (after Michie et al., 2008)	Workshops for GPs incorporating multi-component BCI	n/a	Content and function according to TDF; workshop schedules; identification of methods and measures to evaluate workshops
	Porcheret et al. (2018)	UK	Effectiveness	GPs	Osteoarthritis	Uncontrolled experimental study nested within a larger RCT. Pre- and post-intervention video-simulated consultations	Workshops for GPs incorporating multi-component BCI	n/a	Change in competency (number of tasks undertaken per GP) and task delivery (number of GPs undertaking a specific task) scores
Individual case-finding, other	Jinks et al. (2015) ¹	UK	Development	Practice nurses	Chronic diseases, unspecified	Multi-step BCW methodology and co-design, including evidence synthesis (nature unclear), community of practice and focus groups	A multi-component BCI: enhanced review consultation including tools for case-finding	n/a	Barriers and enablers of case identification, training needs identified
	Lester et al. (2005)	UK	Development; effectiveness	GPs	Episodic psychosis	MRC complex interventions framework, including theoretical phase (SR) and modelling phase (focus groups and training needs analysis); uncontrolled post-intervention survey	Educational-based BCI comprising video-based consultation role-plays, GP- and service user-led discussion	n/a	Identified training needs; self-reported attitude, awareness, knowledge, and satisfaction amongst participating GPs following intervention initial and booster sessions

Payne and Hysong (2014) ¹	United States	Development	GPs	Chronic diseases, unspecified	Qualitative interview and deductive analysis	Framework for improving acceptance of physician performance feedback, intended to reduce diagnostic error	n/a	Barriers and enablers of accepting performance feedback amongst GPs
Smith et al. (2012)	UK	Development	Patients	Lung cancer	MRC complex interventions framework, including SR, HCP-group BCI design, thematic analysis of qualitative interviews with patients and HCP focus groups	A detailed self-help manual and extended consultation with a trained nurse, and development of specific action plans (prompts), aimed at reducing time to presentation with GP	n/a	Barriers and enablers of case identification; final intervention selection
Smits et al. (2018)	UK	Refinement of existing intervention	Patients aged ≥40 living in socio-economically deprived communities	Cancers, unspecified	Multi-step BCW methodology	A touchscreen questionnaire delivered face-to-face by a trained lay advisor, intended to raise awareness of cancer risk and encourage health-seeking behaviour. Application of APEASE criteria for selection	n/a	Barriers and enablers of use. Final intervention selection
Toh et al. (2016) ¹	Malaysia	Development	Community pharmacists; GPs	Osteoporosis	Multi-step BCW methodology	Multi-component BCI: pharmacist assessment of personal risk, educational session, restructuring and systematic introduction within clinical practice	n/a	Barriers to case identification; final intervention selection
Tuot et al., (2020)	United States	Development	GPs and patients	Chronic kidney disease	Multi-step BCW methodology	Patient-facing online risk calculator and a clinician-facing clinical practice toolkit	n/a	Barriers and facilitators to diagnosis; final intervention selection
Tuot et al., (2022)	United States	Effectiveness	GPs and patients	Chronic kidney disease	Qualitative: thematic analysis of think-aloud protocols with GPs and patients	Patient-facing online risk calculator and a clinician-facing clinical practice toolkit (from Tuot et al., 2020)	n/a	Barriers and enablers of use (usability)


Table 1. Summary of all included studies; ¹conference abstract. BC=behaviour change; BCI=behaviour change intervention; BCT=behaviour change technique; BCW=behaviour change wheel; GP=general practitioner; HCP=healthcare professional; Medical Research Council=MRC; RCT=randomised controlled trial; SR=systematic review; TDF=theoretical domains framework.

Author, disease area, and target group	Barriers/enablers itemised and displayed?	Barriers and enablers mapped to TDF (+/- COM-B where used explicitly), and displayed?	Intervention functions identified and displayed?	A range of BCTs identified ?	APEASE or other selection criteria applied	Examples (not exhaustive)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smits et al., 2018 Case finding for cancers, unspecified Aimed at patients 	✓	✓ COM-B	✓ Using BCW	✓	✓ APEASE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prompts/cues (education) eg. using shower time to look for bodily lumps, Credible source for information (persuasion) eg. associated with Tenovus Cancer Care, lay advisors, Restructuring the physical environment (environmental restructuring) eg. intervention delivered in non-medical community settings, Information about health consequences (education, persuasion) eg. results highlight improvements in cancer treatment to reduce negative cancer beliefs, Social support (enablement) eg. Results encourage people to take someone with them to primary care appointments; results provide information and advice for making a primary care appointment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bravington et al., 2022 Cervical cancer screening programme Aimed at patients and HCPs 	✓	✓	Not itemised	✓	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Persuasive communication eg. warm and empathetic tone, Information regarding behaviour and outcome eg. question and answer format, distinguishing myths and misunderstandings from facts, and address age-related questions about the screening process, Stress management eg. illustrate importance of rapport with practitioner, sensitivity of practitioner to experiences of women over 50, Modelling of behaviour, social processes of encouragement, pressure, support eg. use social influences meaningful to women over 50, role modelling of discussing and attending screening by people they can relate to
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moise et al., 2020 Hypertension screening guidelines Aimed at HCPs 	✓	✓ COM-B	✓ Using BCW	✓	✓ APEASE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstration of behaviour (training, modelling) eg. materials (laminated cards, website) that demonstrate how to order and interpret home and ambulatory blood pressure measurements, Instruction on performing behaviour (training and education) eg. Emails, newsletters, physician grand rounds, Feedback on behaviour (persuasion, education) eg. Feedback on how many Ambulatory and home blood pressure monitors have been ordered, and new diagnoses made, Adding objects to environment (environmental restructuring, enablement) eg. easy-to-understand reports, financially sustainable testing service, nurses formally trained to assist, Information about health consequences (education, persuasion) eg. evidence base for guidelines (including benefits such as medication burden, side effects).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Porcheret et al., 2014 • Osteoarthritis screening guidelines • Aimed at HCPs 	✓	✓	Not explicitly	✓	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information provision to address knowledge gaps about the nature and management of OA, NICE OA recommendations, and the model OA consultation (knowledge), • Enhanced consultation skills for GPs eg. rehearsal, graded problem-solving tasks (skills), • Engendering a positive approach to guideline implementation and support for self-care (Professional and social role and identity) • Enhance perceived abilities to deliver the model OA consultation (beliefs about capabilities), • Information provision and persuasive communication to counter perceived lack of efficacy of interventions for OA (beliefs about consequences), • Prompts triggers and cues for delivery of model OA consultation in day-to-day practice (MADP)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riordan et al., 2020 • Diabetic retinopathy screening guidelines • Aimed at patients and HCPs 	✓	✓	Not explicitly	✓	✓ <i>APEASE</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinician feedback on behaviour eg. practice audit of diabetic patients (knowledge) • Information about social and environmental consequences eg. persuading patients to register and attend will lead to routine care closer to home, and better knowledge of disease status (beliefs about consequences) • Framing and re-framing eg. persuading HCPs that influencing patients' attendance is part of their role in good diabetes care • Prompts and cues eg. electronic prompts within patient care record (knowledge, MADP) • Re-imburement eg. payment schemes (environmental context) • Social support eg. face-to-face, telephone or letter reminder messages for patients (social influences, MADP)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuot et al., 2020 • Case finding for chronic kidney disease • Aimed at patients and HCPs 	✓	✓ COM-B	✓ Using BCW	✓	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online risk interface for patients (education, persuasion, enablement), • Practice assessment of competency (persuasion), • Online teaching materials eg. CKDInform 2.0 (education), • Teaching-back videos with model consultations (modelling), • Online compendium of tools for implementation of kidney score platform (enablement)


Table 2. Multi-component BCIs developed using the theoretical domains framework (+/- behaviour change wheel), implied functions, and associated BCTs (full papers only, abstracts excluded). NICE=National Institute for Health and Social Care Excellence; OA=osteoarthritis; HCP=healthcare professional; BCW=behaviour change wheel; TDF=theoretical domains framework; MADP= memory, attention and decision processes.

Identification of studies via database search





A



B