

1 **Title page**

2 **Acceptability of fixed-dose combination treatments for hypertension in Kenya: a qualitative**  
3 **study using the Theoretical Framework of Acceptability.**

4 Daniel Mbutia<sup>1</sup>, Ruth Willis<sup>2</sup>, Mary Gichagua<sup>3</sup>, Jacinta Nzinga<sup>1</sup>, Peter Mugo<sup>1</sup> †, Adrianna  
5 Murphy\*<sup>2</sup>

6 1 Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Program, Nairobi, Kenya

7 2 London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

8 3 Department of Health, Kiambu, Kenya

9 † Deceased

10

11

12 \*Corresponding author

13 Email: [Adrianna.Murphy@lshtm.ac.uk](mailto:Adrianna.Murphy@lshtm.ac.uk)

14

15 **Acknowledgement**

16 We acknowledge UKRI for funding this research study through the UKRI Future Research Leader

17 Fellowship grant awarded to Dr Adrianna Murphy by the UK Research and Innovation fund,

18 grant number MR/T042508/1. The funding sources had no role in the study design, writing of

19 the report and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. We would also like to  
20 acknowledge all the healthcare workers, patients and caregivers who participated in the study.

21

22 **Conflict of interest**

23 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 Acceptability of fixed-dose combination treatment for hypertension in  
32 Kenya: a qualitative study using the Theoretical Framework of  
33 Acceptability

34 Abstract

35 **Background**

36 Fixed-dose combinations (FDCs) – 2-3 anti-hypertensive medications in a single pill - have the  
37 potential to improve hypertension treatment and outcomes. Yet, they are not widely  
38 implemented. Factors undermining implementation remain unknown, particularly in sub-  
39 Saharan Africa, where hypertension is a major cause of disease burden and is poorly treated.

40 **Methods**

41 We used in-depth semi-structured interviews to explore the acceptability of FDCs among  
42 patients, caregivers, and healthcare workers. We interviewed a total of 58 participants across  
43 four purposively selected health facilities in one county in Kenya. Data were analyzed using  
44 abductive thematic analysis approach, and emergent themes categorized according to the  
45 Theoretical Framework of Acceptability.

46 **Results**

47 Overall, FDCs are potentially acceptable to all participant groups. Acceptability is supported by a  
48 perception of FDCs as a means of reducing treatment burden (for patients and healthcare  
49 workers) and improving treatment adherence, and patients' deferral to and trust in health

50 workers. Acceptability among health workers may be undermined by variable levels of FDC  
51 coherence, concerns among health workers about FDCs as an “inflexible” treatment that does  
52 not allow dose titration or identifying causes of side effects, and concerns about consistent  
53 availability and affordability of FDCs in Kenya.

54

## 55 **Conclusion**

56 FDCs are a potentially acceptable treatment approach for hypertension in Kenya. Efforts to  
57 improve acceptability and thus implementation of FDCs in Kenya should consider improving  
58 understanding of treatment and strengthening the capacity of all health worker cadres to  
59 appropriately prescribe, inform about, and support adherence to FDCs. These efforts must align  
60 with work to address upstream health system factors such as poor availability and affordability.

61

## 62 **Key words**

63 Hypertension

64 Fixed dose combinations

65 Implementation Research

66 Acceptability

67 Sub Saharan Africa

68

## 69 Background

70 Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death globally, accounting for almost 18  
71 million deaths annually (1). Of these, over 10 million CVD deaths are due to uncontrolled  
72 hypertension (blood pressure  $\geq$  140/90 mm Hg). Most of these deaths occur in low- and middle-  
73 income countries (LMICs) (1) and are in part due to low rates of treatment. In Kenya, for example,  
74 the prevalence of hypertension among people aged 18–69 years is estimated at 24.5% (2), and  
75 only 3% of those diagnosed have their blood pressure controlled (3). This gap in treatment has  
76 been attributed to inconsistent availability and affordability of antihypertensives (4), poor  
77 adherence to prescribed treatment, (5) the high number and diversity of anti-hypertensive  
78 medication treatment options, which can make treatment complex (6), and ‘therapeutic inertia’,  
79 or the failure of physicians to initiate or intensify therapy when BP remains elevated (7). Despite  
80 evidence that 75-80% of hypertensive patients require multiple classes of drugs to effectively  
81 control their blood pressure, many receive monotherapy (one drug) (8).

### 82 [Fixed-dose combination treatments: a potential solution for bridging the treatment gap](#)

83 Fixed-dose combination (FDC) treatments – a combination of 2-3 anti-hypertensive medications  
84 in a single pill – offer one potential tool to address the gap in hypertension treatment in LMIC  
85 settings. FDCs can enhance patient compliance by reducing the pill burden, making it easier for  
86 patients to adhere to their treatment regimen compared to taking multiple single-molecule pills  
87 (9). FDCs have been shown to have other benefits including faster achievement of blood pressure  
88 targets (10), fewer CVD events (11), reductions in therapeutic inertia (12, 13), and reduction in  
89 healthcare costs (14). In 2019, the World Health Organization (WHO) included FDCs in their

90 Model Essential Medicines List and released a new guideline in 2021 recommending use of FDCs  
91 for treatment of hypertension (15). In Kenya, FDCs for hypertension are authorized for marketing  
92 and there are nine FDCs included in the Kenyan National Essential Medicines List (amlodipine +  
93 hydrochlorothiazide, amlodipine + indapamide, perindopril + amlodipine, perindopril +  
94 amlodipine + indapamide, losartan + hydrochlorothiazide, lisinopril + hydrochlorothiazide,  
95 telmisartan + amlodipine, telmisartan + hydrochlorothiazide and telmisartan + amlodipine +  
96 hydrochlorothiazide) (16) and recommended in the treatment guidelines for hypertension (17).  
97 However, uptake of FDCs in LMICs, including in Kenya, has been slow (18).  
98 To inform the development of a strategy to improve implementation of FDCs for treatment of  
99 hypertension in Kenya, we aimed to evaluate the acceptability of FDCs for patients with  
100 hypertension, their caregivers, and healthcare providers.

## 101 Methods

### 102 Conceptual Framework: Theoretical Framework of Acceptability

103 To conceptualize acceptability of FDC treatments for hypertension, we used the Theoretical  
104 Framework of Acceptability (TFA) (19). TFA has been applied in implementation research across  
105 a range of settings and health domains, including for a hypertension and CVD management in  
106 LMIC settings (20, 21). TFA identifies seven component constructs contributing to acceptability  
107 of healthcare interventions. These include: Affective attitude (How an individual feels about the  
108 intervention); Burden (The perceived amount of effort that is required to participate in the  
109 intervention); Ethicality (The extent to which the intervention has good fit with an individual's  
110 value system); Intervention coherence (The extent to which the individual understands the

111 intervention and how it works); Opportunity costs (The extent to which benefits, values, or profits  
112 must be given up to engage in the intervention); Perceived effectiveness (The extent to which  
113 the intervention is perceived as likely to achieve its purpose); and Self-efficacy (The individuals'  
114 confidence that they can perform the behaviour(s) required to participate in the intervention).  
115 Appendix 1 presents our interpretation of each construct for acceptability of FDC treatment for  
116 hypertension, which informed our overall study design, data collection tools and analysis.

117

## 118 [Study design](#)

119 We used an explorative qualitative study design. This design allows for in-depth exploration and  
120 understanding of a phenomenon when there is limited prior evidence - to the best of our  
121 knowledge, this is the first study exploring the acceptability of FDCs for hypertension in Kenya,  
122 and only one of the few in the world. We conducted non-participant observation and semi-  
123 structured in-depth interviews in Kiambu County, Kenya. Non-participant observation was used  
124 to orientate the study team to facility operations and current practices for treatment of patients  
125 with hypertension in context, and to inform criteria for selection of participants for semi-  
126 structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews were used to explore participant experiences  
127 and attitudes in depth.

## 128 [Study setting](#)

129 The study was set in one county in order to develop a robust understanding of a specific context  
130 (22) to enable identification of both locally specific factors affecting acceptability, and the  
131 categories of factors to consider in potential design and scale-up of a subsequent intervention to

132 improve implementation of FDCs. The choice of county was informed by consideration of (i)  
133 contextual diversity, to include urban and rural populations from a range of socio-economic  
134 situations; (ii) receptiveness of county stakeholders to NCD implementation research, while not  
135 being overburdened with ongoing research projects, and (iii) practicality in relation to the  
136 operational base of the study team in Nairobi and to national policy stakeholders. Kiambu County  
137 is adjacent to Nairobi County in central Kenya, and whilst aggregated county level socio-economic  
138 indicators are above the national average, for example overall poverty rate of 20.5% (Kiambu  
139 County) compared with 38.6% (national) (23), there is diversity within the county population  
140 across 14 urban and rural sub-counties (24)].

141 The Kenyan public health system is organized in 6 care levels. Treatment of hypertension in public  
142 hospitals is mainly delivered at primary healthcare centres (level 3) subcounty hospitals (level 4)  
143 and county referral hospitals (level 5) (18). We collected data in four public sector facilities  
144 located in three sub-counties, purposively selected with input from county stakeholders to  
145 include a range of facility levels, urban/rural and socio-demographically diverse catchment  
146 populations. Based on these criteria we selected one county referral hospital (level 5), one sub-  
147 county hospital (level 4), and two primary healthcare centres (level 3) serving contrasting urban  
148 and rural populations (25). All facilities provide care to people living with hypertension, including  
149 prescription of anti-hypertensive medication, through non communicable disease (NCD) or  
150 Medical Outpatient Clinics (MOPCs). Specific facilities selected and their characteristics are  
151 outlined in Table 1.

152



153 Table 1: Study facility characteristics

Facility	Characteristics
Health facility 1	Level 4 sub-county referral hospital  Serves mostly urban population.  High patient volume  Medical officers, clinical pharmacists, clinical officers [non-physician clinicians], nurses, nutritionists
Health facility 2	Level 3 primary healthcare center  Serves urban population.  Low patient volume  1 Medical officer and 1 clinical officer
Health facility 3	Level 5 county referral hospital  Serves both urban and rural populations  Very high patient volume  Medical consultants, medical officers, clinical pharmacists, clinical officers, nurses, nutritionists
Health facility 4	Level 3 primary health center  Serves rural population

High patient volume

1 nurse supported by 1 community health promoter (CHP)

(often referred to as community health workers in other settings) and occasional locum hire of clinical officer

154

155

## 156 Participant recruitment

157 Patients living with hypertension were selected purposively from patient registers to represent a  
158 range of categories relevant to experiences of hypertension treatment (age, sex, comorbidities,  
159 length of time since diagnosis, caregiver accompaniment) (Table 2). A small number of caregivers  
160 (1-2) were recruited from each facility following patient interviews, with prior permission from  
161 patients. Healthcare worker participants were purposively selected to ensure inclusion of one  
162 member from each staff cadre involved in hypertension treatment at each facility.

163 Eligible study participants were approached face to face or by telephone (caregivers) and invited  
164 to join the study. Participants were provided with a study information sheet [English/Swahili].  
165 DM reviewed the information sheet with each participant and written consent was obtained from  
166 all participants. Recruitment at each facility stopped when patients from a pre-specified range of  
167 category combinations had been included, and no substantial new themes were emerging during  
168 interviews. A total of 58 participants were involved in this study (Table 3).

169 Table 2: Patient and caregiver characteristics

170

<b>Patients</b>		Number (total n=24)
Gender	Female	14
	Male	10
Age (years)	<40	2
	41-50	2
	51-60	9
	61-70	6
	>71	5
Mean Age	60 years	
Education level	None	1
	Primary	6
	Secondary	15
	Tertiary	2
Comorbidity	Hypertension	13
	Hypertension + Diabetes	11
NHIF	Active NHIF membership	12
<b>Caregivers</b>		Number (total n=7)
Gender	Female	5
	Male	2

Age (years)	18-40	4
	>40	3
Mean Age	41 years	
Education level	Primary	3
	Secondary	3
	Tertiary	1
Comorbidity	Hypertension	2
	Hypertension + Diabetes	5

171

172

173 Table 3: Study participants across levels of care

Participant Role

	Level 3 Primary Health Centres	Level 4 & 5 Hospitals	Total
Patients (n)	12	12	24
Caregivers (n)	2	5	7
CHPs (n)	4	0	4
Nurses	2	2	4

Pharmacists/Pharmaceutical technologists (n)	3	3	6
Community pharmacists (n)	1	3	4
Clinical Officers, Medical doctors, and medical consultants (n)	2	7	9
Total (n)	26	32	58

174

175

## 176 [Data Collection](#)

177 Data were collected between November 2022 and June 2023. First, we conducted non-  
178 participant observations spanning 1-3 days in each facility, (DM, PM, RW) structured by a  
179 checklist designed to support familiarization with medication procurement and dispensing  
180 [Additional file 1]. Observational data were recorded in fieldnotes, subsequently summarized,  
181 and cross-checked with facility staff. Medical consultations were not observed.

182 Second, we conducted in-depth interviews using semi-structured topic guides [Additional file 1]  
183 informed by the TFA constructs applied to FDCs for hypertension [Appendix 1]. The interview  
184 guide for patients and caregivers focused on experiences with treatment, support in managing  
185 hypertension, process of obtaining medication, and familiarity with and perceptions about FDCs.  
186 The interview guide for healthcare workers focused on the process of diagnosing and treating  
187 hypertension and experiences of and views around use of FDCs to treat hypertension. Interviews  
188 were conducted in Swahili/English depending on the participant's preference. Patient and

189 caregiver interviews were conducted by DM, mainly in Swahili. Interviews with healthcare  
190 workers were conducted by DM and RW (social scientists experienced in qualitative research) in  
191 English or Swahili. Interviews were conducted in person in a private room at each facility, with  
192 only the researcher(s) and participant present. Interviews lasted 15-84 minutes and were audio  
193 recorded with participants' consent. During data collection and analysis reflective meetings were  
194 held with the broader research team, composed of researchers with diverse backgrounds and  
195 experience (public health, medicine, pharmacy) to discuss interpretation of emergent findings  
196 and iteratively inform data collection. Audio data were transcribed verbatim and translated into  
197 English where necessary. Transcripts were checked for accuracy, translations reviewed, and  
198 transcripts imported into NVIVO 12 (QSR International, Australia) for analysis.

### 199 [Data analysis](#)

200 We used an abductive thematic analysis approach (26), which builds on 'grounded theory'  
201 approaches but explicitly allows for framing of analysis with reference to existing theory, with  
202 the aim of fostering conceptual innovation. This involved reading transcripts and identifying  
203 initial themes of relevance to the research aim through open coding. Initial themes were then  
204 compared with TFA constructs and used to develop a coding framework which was applied across  
205 the transcripts, adapted iteratively as needed. Two researchers independently coded a set of five  
206 transcripts to ensure inter-coder reliability. Themes were then charted across the seven TFA  
207 constructs. The Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR) guidelines (27) were  
208 followed in our reporting (additional file 2).

## 209 Results

210 In our research we found that the only FDC available in the public sector in Kiambu County during  
211 the study period was a dual therapy FDC of losartan (an angiotensin receptor blocker (ARB)) +  
212 hydrochlorothiazide (a diuretic). Of the 24 patients interviewed, seven were currently prescribed  
213 this FDC. Patient interview data therefore includes both anticipated (n=17) and experienced (n=7)  
214 cognitive and emotional responses to FDCs for hypertension. We present key themes affecting  
215 acceptability of FDCs for patients and caregivers, and then for healthcare workers, according to  
216 the TFA domain to which they relate. Only TFA domains for which there was evidence from our  
217 study of key themes related to acceptability are presented in our results.

### 218 Acceptability of FDC treatment for hypertension for patients and caregivers

#### 219 Affective attitude: FDCs as a means of reducing treatment burden

220 Data from patient and caregiver interviews suggested a positive perception of FDCs as a means  
221 of reducing overall burden associated with taking FDCs compared with taking multiple single-  
222 molecule pills. The perception of FDCs as a means of reducing treatment burden was related to  
223 the reduction in the burden of obtaining and taking multiple pills, including the time and effort  
224 needed to obtain separate pills if they were not available at the public pharmacy, the cognitive  
225 work of remembering the correct daily medication schedule and planning ahead to take  
226 medication supplies if travelling, the physical discomfort of taking several tablets, and cost. For  
227 example:

228           *"It would be better than what I'm getting now, separate pills. If it were possible to combine*  
229           *all these medicines together, that would be great... it would save me time of having to*  
230           *look for the other medicines [Individual medicines]." [Patient\_17]*

231 A combined pill was seen as more convenient - *'you take it once and off you go' [Patient\_01]* -  
232 and easier than taking multiple tablets that can feel *'stuck'* in the throat; *'when you take one [pill]*  
233 *it's good because it will make the work of swallowing [medicines] easier"* [Patient\_02]. It was also  
234 seen as less costly: *"buying the medicine when it's one [combined], it's not like buying three*  
235 *[separate pills]. One is much cheaper to buy than buying three' [Caregiver\_07].* The potential role  
236 of FDCs in reducing the burden of taking many pills was particularly highlighted by patients with  
237 comorbidities. For example, a patient with hypertension, diabetes and HIV noted that when  
238 taking multiple medications for different conditions *'you are in trouble because you don't know*  
239 *if you should take them all at once'*, and that if taking an FDC for hypertension *'the luggage of*  
240 *taking a lot of medicine has been reduced' [Patient\_11].* A patient with hypertension and diabetes  
241 explained misgivings about ingesting large volumes of *'chemicals'* when taking multiple pills, and  
242 expressed preference for FDC treatment to reduce the volume of chemicals introduced to the  
243 body through separate pills, echoing concerns of several patients that taking multiple  
244 medications could be *'harmful'* to the body.

245 Intervention coherence: Limited awareness hampering understanding

246 Overall, the extent to which patients and caregivers understand FDCs, or hypertension treatment  
247 generally, is low. This is in part due to a lack of information about the concept (with the exception  
248 of a small number of patients who had prior experience of FDCs in treatment of other conditions  
249 such as HIV or diabetes). Some patients taking the losartan + hydrochlorothiazide combination



250 were unaware that their medication was an FDC. Most patients were not familiar with the  
251 medication they were currently taking, for example knowing the name (e.g., losartan) or class  
252 (e.g., ARB). Only one patient could describe in simple terms how their antihypertensive  
253 medication worked. Some expressed misunderstandings of why an FDC would be effective,  
254 suggesting that FDCs create a synergistic effect due to the drugs being combined, for example: “I  
255 think it can work faster when it is one pill than the other ones [separate pills].” [Patient\_24].  
256 Discussing prospective acceptability, patients emphasized the importance of the concept of  
257 combined medications being clearly explained so that patients understood why the number of  
258 medicines in their prescription was reduced, for example “it will be best to explain to the patients  
259 that the drugs have been combined into one pill because they must have questions...why would I  
260 take one instead of three tablets as I was taking?” [Patient\_13]

261 Deferral of decision making to healthcare workers

262 Our interviews with patients and caregivers revealed a key theme affecting FDC acceptability that  
263 did not fit neatly under any of the TFA domains - a very strong trust in and deferral to healthcare  
264 workers. The interviews suggested a belief that knowledge and decisions about medications are  
265 the responsibility of healthcare workers and should not be questioned:

266 “A patient cannot do research. Their doctor does the research and tells them that if they  
267 take this medication, it has no side effects or something of the sort. So, we [patients] wait  
268 for the decision from the doctor” [Patient\_19]

269 Some patients also noted that they trusted government facility staff to prioritize patients' best  
270 interests in prescription decisions, unlike in the private sector where they felt staff may prioritize  
271 financial profits.

272 *Perceived effectiveness: no concerns about effectiveness of FDC treatment*

273 Patients and caregivers did not express concerns about effectiveness of FDCs compared with  
274 single molecules, instead anticipating that their doctor would prescribe effective medication  
275 based on knowledge of their condition, reinforcing the importance of trust in healthcare workers  
276 to make decisions about medications. This finding of no concern is noteworthy as it indicates that  
277 patients did not doubt the effectiveness of FDC treatment.

278

279 *Acceptability of FDC treatment for hypertension for healthcare workers*

280 *Affective attitude: FDCs as a means of reducing treatment burden*

281 Healthcare workers' affective attitude about FDCs was also related to perceived reduced burden  
282 associated with FDCs compared with multiple single-molecule pills, although healthcare workers  
283 identified a wider range of drivers of this burden, considering both burden for the patients and  
284 for themselves and the health system. For instance, FDCs were perceived as a treatment  
285 approach that could support patient treatment adherence by reducing the likelihood that one  
286 individual medication would be unavailable:

287

288 *"if we are to be able to package all... drugs in one pill... then I think patients would like*  
289 *it...the compliance is much better and the other side [with separate pills] you know*

290 *sometimes this drug is over [supply run out] then they only have to use this one...”*

291 *[Medical Officer\_01]*

292

293 Reduction in the number of pills required was again particularly important for when healthcare

294 workers considered patients with co-morbidities. In addition to reducing practical burdens

295 associated with taking multiple pills, FDCs were seen to confer a psychological benefit to patients,

296 as patients associate taking many pills with a condition being *‘serious and it’s like they are going*

297 *to die’* however *‘when it’s few medicines, they feel like their condition is not that serious.’*

298 *[CHP\_01]*. Reducing the number of pills through introduction of combined losartan +

299 hydrochlorothiazide was described as having been a *‘relief’* for patients, who a nurse predicted

300 would welcome other combinations as *‘they always look forward to taking fewer drugs’*

301 *[Nurse\_18]*.

302 Healthcare workers also perceived FDCs as something that would reduce their own burden by

303 reducing the time and resources needed to educate patients about their treatment when

304 prescribing or dispensing medication.

305 *“it’s even easier for me as a person who is dispensing to explain a drug when it’s in fixed*

306 *dose combination as opposed to explaining like three different drugs to a patient who is*

307 *not getting it” [Pharmacist\_07]*

308 Intervention coherence: Comparison with FDCs for HIV treatment

309 The concept of FDCs was well understood by all cadres of healthcare workers except by CHPs.

310 For the CHPs interviewed, intervention coherence was similar to that for patients and caregivers.

311 CHPs were unfamiliar with the concept of FDCs, but demonstrated understanding after neutral  
312 explanation by the interviewer, showing potential for intervention coherence if educational  
313 support is provided. CHPs noted a similarity with FDCs used in the treatment of HIV, suggesting  
314 that familiarity with FDCs for HIV might inform intervention coherence, and thus acceptability,  
315 for FDCs for hypertension. For example:

316 *“Just like they did with HIV, they used to prescribe so many medicines, these days they give out*  
317 *one, which is good.” [CHP\_02]*

318 Ethicality: FDCs as cause of inequality in access to or affordability of treatment

319 Healthcare workers’ value systems prioritised equitable distribution of treatment benefits to as  
320 many patients as possible. While the anticipated reduction in burden of FDCs fit well with this  
321 value system, FDCs were often perceived to be costlier, and possibly not suitable for all patients,  
322 raising ethical concerns regarding how best to distribute limited financial resources to benefit  
323 the most patients:

324 *“ a fixed dose, you find some are taking this, some are not... the best thing is to have them*  
325 *separate so that I can serve these two branches of clients at the same time.”*  
326 *[Pharmacist\_17]*

327 Further, healthcare workers felt ethically obligated to prescribe consistently available and  
328 affordable medication, and therefore expressed reluctance to prescribe FDCs if doing so created  
329 financial or logistical barriers to treatment. Perceptions of FDC affordability were influenced by  
330 the local context, in which the majority of FDCs except losartan + hydrochlorothiazide were only  
331 available in the private sector at relatively high cost. Some healthcare workers had experienced

332 an initiative introducing FDC of lisinopril + hydrochlorothiazide at subsidized cost in selected  
333 higher-level facilities for a fixed time period (28) and observed that the FDC became unaffordable  
334 and difficult to locate when the initiative ended, for example:

335 *“In the hospital [it was sold] at Ksh. 200 or 300. The same drug outside, in the chemist,*  
336 *would be almost Ksh. 1000. Then sustainability of that supply was not there...the*  
337 *prescriber prescribes and then the patient comes two, three times and they’re like ‘I can’t*  
338 *find this medicine out there’...they’re going to switch to a more readily available molecule”*  
339 *[Pharmacist\_04]*

340 *Perceived effectiveness: FDCs as a means to improve treatment adherence, but with limitations*

341 Healthcare worker interview data demonstrated an overall attitude that FDC treatment would  
342 be more effective in achieving blood pressure control than separate pills. This was due to  
343 perception of FDCs as simpler and more likely to be taken as prescribed, as explained by a  
344 pharmacist:

345 *“They're standardized in a way... as opposed to previously having a particular pill where*  
346 *the patient was forced to split [it] into two, and you are not sure whether the patient is*  
347 *going to achieve that ...the fixed dose, because they come already prepackaged, and a*  
348 *single tablet has that particular concentration of both drugs... It makes the plasma*  
349 *concentration of that particular drug.... within the required range to achieve that effect*  
350 *that is desired” [Pharmacist\_08]*

351 However, the perceived effectiveness of FDCs was tempered by the perception of FDCs as  
352 “inflexible”, in particular that the combined nature of FDCs means that they do not allow for dose

353 titration of individual drug components, or the identification of which individual component may  
354 be causing any side effects.

355 *“some are dosages issues... like the Losartan H. Maybe you need a higher dose of HCTZ*  
356 *(hydrochlorothiazide), but in FDC it’s around 12.5mg. The second thing is concerning what*  
357 *we call allergies (side effects) ... There are those people (patients) who come and*  
358 *complain... So sometimes if you have FDC, you don't know whether it is the first drug, the*  
359 *second drug or third drug that has an issue. [Clinical officer\_19]*

360 Self-efficacy: Capacity building as crucial to supporting FDC implementation

361 Familiarity with FDCs varied across cadres of health workers in our study. While physicians  
362 working in higher-level facilities had some experience with FDCs, in lower-level facilities,  
363 clinicians had experience only indirectly through prescriptions of patients referred from higher  
364 level facilities. Data from clinical officers and nurses, who were required to prescribe  
365 medications in lower-level facilities, highlighted the lack of awareness of hypertension  
366 medications generally, *‘most of us we don’t have that knowledge’ [Nurse\_02]*, and of FDCs in  
367 particular, which may undermine levels of self-efficacy in prescribing FDCs. As described by one  
368 clinical officer:

369 *“so, one thing we need to do in terms of support is training! Training! Training! That is*  
370 *number one. You need to let everyone know that there are combinations [FDCs]. I might*  
371 *be knowing a few but not every other drug. You might tell me of some combination*  
372 *[FDCs] and I ask you, “When was it launched in Kenya? How long has it been in use?” So,*  
373 *we need training” [Clinical officer\_19]*

## 374 Discussion

375 We applied the TFA (29) to evaluate acceptability of FDC treatment, for patients with  
376 hypertension, their caregivers and healthcare workers at facilities in Kiambu County. Our results  
377 have implications for efforts to improve implementation of FDCs, as well as for the application of  
378 the TFA to similar research.

379 Overall, we found that acceptability of FDCs is potentially high, driven by the perceived capacity  
380 of FDCs to reduce treatment burden for patients and healthcare workers. The perception of FDCs  
381 as a means of reducing treatment burden is supported by evidence of the positive impact on  
382 treatment adherence (30-32) (33), and reducing therapeutic inertia (34), and should therefore  
383 be promoted by any efforts to improve uptake of FDCs in Kenya.

384 We also found that patients defer to health workers' understanding of and decisions on  
385 treatment. Deferral of patients to health professionals, or trust in health professionals, is not  
386 unusual, (35) and is likely helpful in promoting uptake of evidence-based medicine, including in  
387 relation to combination therapy for cardiovascular disease (36). In our study, we found that  
388 deferral to healthcare workers was sometimes accompanied by misconceptions among patients  
389 about hypertension treatment (e.g., that an FDC acts on the system more quickly than individual  
390 molecules). Knowledge among patients about their medication is crucial to improving treatment  
391 adherence and reducing poor health outcomes (37, 38). Efforts to improve effective  
392 implementation of FDCs and hypertension treatment generally should consider improving  
393 patient awareness of the mechanisms involved, building on trust in healthcare workers by giving  
394 them a key role in delivering awareness-raising campaigns.

395 The deferral of patients to health workers also clearly highlights the importance of ensuring  
396 acceptability of FDCs among health workers, both to promote prescription of FDCs and  
397 knowledge sharing to patients. Like previous studies on FDCs, we found that acceptability among  
398 health workers is likely to be impacted by concerns about FDCs as “inflexible” (for identifying  
399 causes of side effects and dose titration) (34, 39-42), intervention coherence, and feelings of self-  
400 efficacy, or capacity to appropriately prescribe and support adherence to FDCs (43-45). Efforts to  
401 improve implementation of FDCs should therefore consider strengthening knowledge and  
402 capacity of health workers of all cadres, including through dissemination of and training in clinical  
403 treatment guidelines. Training may focus on the use of FDCs with patients who have shown  
404 tolerance to constituent drugs (21, 39), to reduce concerns about side effects. Strengthening  
405 capacity of lower cadre health workers will be particularly important where growing integration  
406 of NCDs in primary care shifts new responsibility for treatment prescription and support to these  
407 cadres. Capacity strengthening initiatives should be continuous rather than “one-off”, possibly  
408 incorporating annual refreshers or updates similar to those applied in HIV management training  
409 (46-49).

410 Another major driver of acceptability of FDCs among health workers was consistent availability  
411 and affordability of this treatment option. While this may seem an obvious pre-requisite for  
412 implementation, key health system enablers of implementation are often overlooked by  
413 implementation trials of hypertension treatment, including of FDCs (18). Any effort to improve  
414 awareness and capacity among patients and health workers must be complemented by work to  
415 promote prioritisation of low cost generic FDCs in guidelines, county procurement, and  
416 reimbursement schemes. The case for prioritisation can be supported by evidence that FDCs are



417 more cost effective to implement compared to usual care (multiple single-molecule pills) (50),  
418 with potential cost savings to the health system attributed to better BP control and reduced  
419 hospital visits (51).

420 Finally, our study provides insights for the application of the TFA to research on FDCs or other  
421 treatment approaches for NCDs, and for future refinement of the TFA. We found the TFA enabled  
422 a granular assessment of acceptability, and highlighted inter-relationships between domains,  
423 particularly the influence of anticipated burden on other domains. The ethicality domain, defined  
424 as ‘the extent to which FDC treatment has a good fit with patients’ value systems’ was challenging  
425 to operationalise with patients and caregivers, although it was a clearly conceptualized domain  
426 among health workers reflecting on their role in delivering care. This may be because in the space  
427 of the interview, patients did not easily identify or reflect on their own value system in relation  
428 to treatment, and replacement of multiple single molecules with FDC treatment was a sufficiently  
429 similar fit to not provoke reflection or comment. A recent review of research that applied the  
430 TFA to acceptability of HIV prevention and treatment measures noted that ethicality was not  
431 reported as a distinct construct, and suggested that future refinement of the TFA reconsider the  
432 role of value systems and measurement of this dimension (52). We suggest that ethicality  
433 remains a relevant construct but may be more readily identified by people receiving interventions  
434 where the intervention more dramatically disrupts value systems than where it has a good fit or  
435 is less ‘seen’. We also found that trust in healthcare workers played a significant role in informing  
436 acceptability and was distinct from the existing TFA domains. This theme merits exploration in  
437 future studies on treatment approaches for NCDs, and in refinement of the TFA.

## 438 Limitations

439 This study was conducted in public facilities in one county in Kenya and therefore was not  
440 intended to be nationally representative of the Kenyan population. However, it includes a  
441 diverse, purposively selected participant sample of patients, caregivers, CHPs, nurses,  
442 pharmacists, clinical officers and medical doctors drawn from different levels of care,  
443 strengthening transferability.

## 444 Conclusion

445 FDCs are a potentially acceptable treatment approach for hypertension in Kenya. Efforts to  
446 improve acceptability and thus implementation of FDCs in Kenya should consider improving  
447 hypertension patients and caregivers understanding of treatment and strengthening the capacity  
448 of all health worker cadres to appropriately prescribe, inform about, and support adherence to  
449 FDCs. These efforts must align with work to address upstream health system factors such as poor  
450 availability and affordability, which will impede implementation. The TFA provides an  
451 appropriate framework for exploring the multifaceted nature of FDC acceptability, allowing  
452 incorporation of multiple stakeholder perspectives.

## 453 List of abbreviations

454 CHPs: Community health promoters

455 CVD: Cardiovascular diseases

456 EML: Essential medicines list

457 FDCs: Fixed dose combinations

458 LMICs: Low- and middle-income countries

459 NCDs: Non communicable diseases

460 NHIF: National Health Insurance Fund

461 TFA: Theoretical framework of acceptability

462

## 463 Declaration

### 464 Ethics

465 This study was approved by Kenya Medical Research Institute’s scientific and ethics review unit  
466 (SERU) (Approval NO: KEMRI/RES/7/3/1), National Commission of Science and Technology  
467 (NACOSTI) (Approval NO: NACOSTI/P/22/21524) and London School of Hygiene and Tropical  
468 Medicine Research Ethics Committee (28062). Permissions were also granted by the county  
469 government and each facility before commencement of the study. Written informed consent was  
470 obtained from all participants. Researchers took care to ensure that potential participants  
471 understood that participation was optional, and that participation or non-participation in the  
472 study would not affect the care which patients received.

### 473 Consent for publication

474 Not applicable.

#### 475 Availability of materials and data

476 The dataset used during this study is available from the authors upon reasonable request and  
477 permission from the KEMRI Wellcome Trust Research and Governance Committee.

#### 478 Competing interests

479 All the authors declare that they have no competing interests.

#### 480 Funding

481 This work was supported by UKRI Future Research Leader Fellowship grant awarded to AM by  
482 the UK Research and Innovation fund, MR/T042508/1. The funding sources had no role in the  
483 study design, writing of the report and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

#### 484 Author contribution

485 DM: Investigation; analysis, writing (review and editing); project administration; MG:  
486 Conceptualization; review and editing; JN: Writing (review and editing); project administration  
487 PM: Conceptualization; formal analysis; project administration; RW: Conceptualization;  
488 investigation; formal analysis; writing (review and editing); AM: Conceptualization; investigation;  
489 formal analysis; writing (review and editing); funding; project administration.

490

#### 491 Acknowledgement

492 We would also like to acknowledge all the healthcare workers, patients and caregivers who  
493 participated in the study. We also thank Hillary Koros for supporting with data collection.

494

## 495 References

- 496 1. World Health Organization. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) 2021 [cited 2023 15/09/2023].  
497 Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-(cvds)#:~:text=At%20least%20three%2Dquarters%20of,with%20risk%20factors%20for%20CVDs.)  
498 [cvds\)#:~:text=At%20least%20three%2Dquarters%20of,with%20risk%20factors%20for%20CVDs.](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-(cvds)#:~:text=At%20least%20three%2Dquarters%20of,with%20risk%20factors%20for%20CVDs.)
- 499 2. Mohamed SF, Mutua MK, Wamai R, Wekesah F, Haregu T, Juma P, et al. Prevalence, awareness,  
500 treatment and control of hypertension and their determinants: results from a national survey in Kenya.  
501 BMC public health. 2018;18(3):1-10.
- 502 3. Ministry of Health. KENYA STEPwise SURVEY FOR NON COMMUNICABLE DISEASES RISK FACTORS  
503 2015 REPORT 2015 [cited 2023 30/10/2023]. Available from: [http://www.nutritionhealth.or.ke/wp-](http://www.nutritionhealth.or.ke/wp-content/uploads/Downloads/Kenya%20STEPwise%20Survey%20for%20Non-Communicable%20Diseases%20Risk%20Factors%20Report%202015.pdf)  
504 [content/uploads/Downloads/Kenya%20STEPwise%20Survey%20for%20Non-](http://www.nutritionhealth.or.ke/wp-content/uploads/Downloads/Kenya%20STEPwise%20Survey%20for%20Non-Communicable%20Diseases%20Risk%20Factors%20Report%202015.pdf)  
505 [Communicable%20Diseases%20Risk%20Factors%20Report%202015.pdf.](http://www.nutritionhealth.or.ke/wp-content/uploads/Downloads/Kenya%20STEPwise%20Survey%20for%20Non-Communicable%20Diseases%20Risk%20Factors%20Report%202015.pdf)
- 506 4. Lotfizadeh A, Palafox B, Takallou A, Balabanova D, McKee M, Murphy A. Factors associated with  
507 the availability and affordability of essential cardiovascular disease medicines in low-and middle-income  
508 countries: A systematic review. PLOS Global Public Health. 2022;2(3):e0000072.
- 509 5. Vrijens B, Vincze G, Kristanto P, Urquhart J, Burnier M. Adherence to prescribed antihypertensive  
510 drug treatments: longitudinal study of electronically compiled dosing histories. Bmj.  
511 2008;336(7653):1114-7.
- 512 6. Cohn J, Bygrave H, Roberts T, Khan T, Ojji D, Ordunez P. Addressing failures in achieving  
513 hypertension control in low-and middle-income settings through simplified treatment algorithms. Global  
514 Heart. 2022;17(1).
- 515 7. Lebeau J-P, Cadwallader J-S, Aubin-Auger I, Mercier A, Pasquet T, Rusch E, et al. The concept and  
516 definition of therapeutic inertia in hypertension in primary care: a qualitative systematic review. BMC  
517 family practice. 2014;15(1):1-10.
- 518 8. Mancia G, Rea F, Corrao G, Grassi G. Two-drug combinations as first-step antihypertensive  
519 treatment. Circulation Research. 2019;124(7):1113-23.
- 520 9. Gupta AK, Arshad S, Poulter NR. Compliance, safety, and effectiveness of fixed-dose combinations  
521 of antihypertensive agents: a meta-analysis. Hypertension. 2010;55(2):399-407.
- 522 10. Webster R, Salam A, De Silva HA, Selak V, Stepien S, Rajapakse S, et al. Fixed low-dose triple  
523 combination antihypertensive medication vs usual care for blood pressure control in patients with mild  
524 to moderate hypertension in Sri Lanka: a randomized clinical trial. Jama. 2018;320(6):566-79.
- 525 11. Verma AA, Khuu W, Tadrous M, Gomes T, Mamdani MM. Fixed-dose combination  
526 antihypertensive medications, adherence, and clinical outcomes: a population-based retrospective cohort  
527 study. PLoS medicine. 2018;15(6):e1002584.
- 528 12. Sarfo FS, Mobula LM, Burnham G, Ansong D, Plange-Rhule J, Sarfo-Kantanka O, et al. Factors  
529 associated with uncontrolled blood pressure among Ghanaians: evidence from a multicenter hospital-  
530 based study. PloS one. 2018;13(3):e0193494.
- 531 13. van der Linden EL, Agyemang C, van den Born BJH. Hypertension control in sub-Saharan Africa:  
532 Clinical inertia is another elephant in the room. The Journal of Clinical Hypertension. 2020;22(6):959.
- 533 14. Sherrill B, Halpern M, Khan S, Zhang J, Panjabi S. Single-pill vs free-equivalent combination  
534 therapies for hypertension: a meta-analysis of health care costs and adherence. The Journal of Clinical  
535 Hypertension. 2011;13(12):898-909.
- 536 15. World Health Organization. Guideline for the pharmacological treatment of hypertension in adults  
537 2021 [cited 2023 15/09/2023]. Available from:  
538 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/344424/9789240033986-eng.pdf.](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/344424/9789240033986-eng.pdf)
- 539 16. Ministry of Health. Kenya Essential Medicines List. Ministry of Health; 2023.

- 540 17. Ministry of Health. KENYA NATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES  
541 MANAGEMENT 2018 [cited 2023 15/09/2023]. Available from:  
542 [http://guidelines.health.go.ke:8000/media/Kenya\\_National\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_Cardiovascular\\_Diseases\\_M](http://guidelines.health.go.ke:8000/media/Kenya_National_Guidelines_for_Cardiovascular_Diseases_Management.pdf)  
543 [anagement.pdf](http://guidelines.health.go.ke:8000/media/Kenya_National_Guidelines_for_Cardiovascular_Diseases_Management.pdf).
- 544 18. Webster R, Murphy A, Bygrave H, Ansbro É, Grobbee DE, Perel P. Implementing fixed dose  
545 combination medications for the prevention and control of cardiovascular diseases. *Global Heart*.  
546 2020;15(1).
- 547 19. Sekhon M, Cartwright M, Francis JJ. Acceptability of healthcare interventions: an overview of  
548 reviews and development of a theoretical framework. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017;17(1):88.
- 549 20. Jafar TH, Tavajoh S, de Silva HA, Naheed A, Jehan I, Kanatiwela de Silva C, et al. Post-intervention  
550 acceptability of multicomponent intervention for management of hypertension in rural Bangladesh,  
551 Pakistan, and Sri Lanka—a qualitative study. *PloS one*. 2023;18(1):e0280455.
- 552 21. Murphy A, Willis R, Ansbro É, Masri S, Kabbara N, Dabbousy T, et al. Implementation of fixed-dose  
553 combination therapy for secondary prevention of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease among Syrian  
554 refugees in Lebanon: a qualitative evaluation. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2022;22(1):1-12.
- 555 22. Paparini S, Papoutsis C, Murdoch J, Green J, Petticrew M, Greenhalgh T, et al. Evaluating complex  
556 interventions in context: systematic, meta-narrative review of case study approaches. *BMC Medical*  
557 *Research Methodology*. 2021;21(1):225.
- 558 23. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. The Kenya Poverty Report: Based on the 2021 Kenya  
559 Continuous Household Survey. Nairobi: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics; 2023.
- 560 24. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. COUNTY STATISTICAL ABSTRACT: KIAMBU COUNTY 2015  
561 [cited 2023 30/10/2023]. Available from: <https://www.knbs.or.ke/download/kiambu/>.
- 562 25. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. 2019 Kenya Population and Housing Census Volume I:  
563 Population by County and Sub County. 2019 November 2019.
- 564 26. Timmermans S, Tavory I. Theory construction in qualitative research: From grounded theory to  
565 abductive analysis. *Sociological theory*. 2012;30(3):167-86.
- 566 27. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research:  
567 a synthesis of recommendations. *Academic medicine*. 2014;89(9):1245-51.
- 568 28. Ngariko GW. Impact of the Healthy Heart Africa Program on the Adequacy of Blood Pressure  
569 Control in Kiambu County: University of Nairobi; 2021.
- 570 29. Sekhon M, Cartwright M, Francis JJ. Acceptability of healthcare interventions: an overview of  
571 reviews and development of a theoretical framework. *BMC health services research*. 2017;17(1):1-13.
- 572 30. Bramlage P, Schmidt S, Sims H. Fixed-dose vs free-dose combinations for the management of  
573 hypertension—An analysis of 81 958 patients. *The Journal of Clinical Hypertension*. 2018;20(4):705-15.
- 574 31. Czarnecka D, Koch E, Gottwald-Hostalek U. Benefits of a fixed-dose combination of bisoprolol and  
575 amlodipine in the treatment of hypertension in daily practice: results of more than 4000 patients. *Current*  
576 *Medical Research and Opinion*. 2015;31(5):875-81.
- 577 32. Du LP, Cheng ZW, Zhang YX, Li Y, Mei D. The impact of fixed-dose combination versus  
578 free-equivalent combination therapies on adherence for hypertension: a meta-analysis. *The Journal of*  
579 *Clinical Hypertension*. 2018;20(5):902-7.
- 580 33. Kawalec P, Holko P, Gawin M, Pilc A. Effectiveness of fixed-dose combination therapy in  
581 hypertension: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Archives of medical science*. 2018;14(5):1125-36.
- 582 34. DiPette DJ, Skeete J, Ridley E, Campbell NR, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Kishore SP, et al. Fixed-dose  
583 combination pharmacologic therapy to improve hypertension control worldwide: Clinical perspective and  
584 policy implications. *The Journal of Clinical Hypertension*. 2019;21(1):4.
- 585 35. Gale NK, Greenfield S, Gill P, Gutridge K, Marshall T. Patient and general practitioner attitudes to  
586 taking medication to prevent cardiovascular disease after receiving detailed information on risks and  
587 benefits of treatment: a qualitative study. *BMC Family Practice*. 2011;12(1):1-10.

- 588 36. IU H, MY M, P G. Patients' knowledge about medicines improves when provided with written  
589 compared to verbal information in their native language. *Plos one*. 2022;17(10):e0274901.
- 590 37. Bosworth HB, Fortmann SP, Kuntz J, Zullig LL, Mendys P, Safford M, et al. Recommendations for  
591 providers on person-centered approaches to assess and improve medication adherence. *Journal of*  
592 *general internal medicine*. 2017;32:93-100.
- 593 38. Takaki H, Abe T, Hagihara A. Physicians' and pharmacists' information provision and patients'  
594 psychological distress. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. 2017;31(5):575-82.
- 595 39. Salam A, Huffman MD, Kanukula R, Hari Prasad E, Sharma A, Heller DJ, et al. Two-drug fixed-dose  
596 combinations of blood pressure-lowering drugs as WHO essential medicines: an overview of efficacy,  
597 safety, and cost. *The Journal of Clinical Hypertension*. 2020;22(10):1769-79.
- 598 40. Godman B, McCabe H, D Leong T, Mueller D, Martin AP, Hoxha I, et al. Fixed dose drug  
599 combinations—are they pharmaco-economically sound? Findings and implications especially for lower-and  
600 middle-income countries. *Expert review of pharmaco-economics & outcomes research*. 2020;20(1):1-26.
- 601 41. Gupta YK, Ramachandran SS. Fixed dose drug combinations: Issues and challenges in India. *Indian*  
602 *journal of pharmacology*. 2016;48(4):347.
- 603 42. Webster R, Castellano JM, Onuma OK. Putting polypills into practice: challenges and lessons  
604 learned. *The Lancet*. 2017;389(10073):1066-74.
- 605 43. Singh A, Dhaneria S, Gupta D. Physician's knowledge, attitude and practice of fixed drug  
606 combinations: Can we recognize the lacunae? *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*.  
607 2022;11(5):2019.
- 608 44. Gupta R, Malhotra P, Malhotra A. Assessment of knowledge, attitude, and practices about  
609 prescribing fixed dose combinations among doctors—An observational study. *National Journal of*  
610 *Physiology, Pharmacy and Pharmacology*. 2018;8(3):347-52.
- 611 45. Gupta R, Malhotra A, Malhotra P. Assessment of rational use of fixed dose combinations in  
612 hypertension in a tertiary care teaching hospital in north India. *International Journal of Advances in*  
613 *Medicine*. 2018;5(5):1263.
- 614 46. Frieden TR, Varghese CV, Kishore SP, Campbell NR, Moran AE, Padwal R, et al. Scaling up effective  
615 treatment of hypertension—a pathfinder for universal health coverage. *The Journal of Clinical*  
616 *Hypertension*. 2019;21(10):1442-9.
- 617 47. Okoroafor SC, Christmals CD. Health Professions Education Strategies for Enhancing Capacity for  
618 Task-Shifting and Task-Sharing Implementation in Africa: A Scoping Review. *Journal of Continuing*  
619 *Education in the Health Professions*. 2022:10.1097.
- 620 48. Crowley T, Mayers P. Trends in task shifting in HIV treatment in Africa: Effectiveness, challenges  
621 and acceptability to the health professions. *African journal of primary health care & family medicine*.  
622 2015;7(1):1-9.
- 623 49. Vedanthan R, Bernabe-Ortiz A, Herasme OI, Joshi R, Lopez-Jaramillo P, Thrift AG, et al. Innovative  
624 approaches to hypertension control in low-and middle-income countries. *Cardiology clinics*.  
625 2017;35(1):99-115.
- 626 50. Lung T, Jan S, de Silva HA, Guggilla R, Maulik PK, Naik N, et al. Fixed-combination, low-dose, triple-  
627 pill antihypertensive medication versus usual care in patients with mild-to-moderate hypertension in Sri  
628 Lanka: a within-trial and modelled economic evaluation of the TRIUMPH trial. *The Lancet Global Health*.  
629 2019;7(10):e1359-e66.
- 630 51. Putignano D, Orlando V, Monetti VM, Piccinocchi G, Musazzi UM, Piccinocchi R, et al. Fixed versus  
631 free combinations of antihypertensive drugs: analyses of real-world data of persistence with therapy in  
632 Italy. *Patient preference and adherence*. 2019:1961-9.
- 633 52. Ortblad KF, Sekhon M, Wang L, Roth S, van der Straten A, Simoni JM, et al. Acceptability  
634 assessment in HIV prevention and treatment intervention and service delivery research: a systematic  
635 review and qualitative analysis. *AIDS and Behavior*. 2023;27(2):600-17.

636 Appendix 1

637 Theoretical Framework of Acceptability constructs (19) applied to FDCs for hypertension

<b>Construct</b>	<b>Meaning</b>	<b>Meaning for acceptability of FDC treatment for hypertension for patients, caregivers, and healthcare workers</b>
Affective attitude	How an individual feels about the intervention	How patients, caregivers and healthcare workers feel about FDC treatment
Burden	The perceived amount of effort that is required to participate in the intervention	<p>The perceived amount of effort required for patients to use FDCs according to their prescribed use.</p> <p>The perceived amount of effort required by caregivers to support patients to use FDC treatment</p> <p>The perceived amount of effort required by healthcare workers to treat hypertensive patients using FDCs</p>
Ethicality	The extent to which the intervention has good fit with an individual's value system	The extent to which FDC treatment has a good fit with patients'/caregivers'/healthcare workers' value systems
Intervention coherence	The extent to which the individual understands the	The extent to which patients/caregivers understand FDC treatment and how it works ( <i>i.e. understand the concept of combining separate hypertension medications in one pill, rather</i>



	intervention and how it works	<i>than understanding the mechanism of action of each medication)</i>  The extent to which healthcare workers understand FDC treatment and how it works
Opportunity costs	The extent to which benefits, values or profits must be given up to engage in the intervention	The extent to which benefits, values or profits must be given up:  - by patients to adhere to FDC treatment  - by caregivers to support patients to adhere to FDC treatment  - by healthcare workers to use FDCs to treat patients
Perceived effectiveness	The extent to which the intervention is perceived as likely to achieve its purpose	The extent to which patients/caregivers/healthcare workers perceive FDC treatment as likely to achieve management of hypertension
Self-efficacy	The participant's confidence that they can perform the behaviour(s) required to participate in the intervention	Patient's confidence that they can adhere to FDC treatment  Caregivers' confidence that they can support patients to adhere to FDC treatment  Healthcare workers' confidence that they can use FDCs to treat patients