Health coaching 2.0: redefining a core lifestyle medicine intervention through a structured, BCT-based model

Short title: Health coaching 2.0: a BCT-based model

Authors and affiliations

Ari Langinkoski, Graduate Student of Health Sciences[1,2]*

Johanna Hämäläinen, MSc[1]

Krista Rapo, MSc[1]

Mikko Rinta, MSc, RD[3]

Pekka Aroviita, MD, PhD, DiplBLM[3]

Mika Venojärvi, PhD, Title of Docent[1]

[1] School of Medicine, Institute of Biomedicine: Sports and Exercise Medicine, University of Eastern Finland, Kuopio, Finland

[2] Nordic Health Academy, Helsinki, Finland

[3] Terveystalo Oyj, Helsinki, Finland

* Corresponding author: Ari Langinkoski, University of Eastern Finland, Email: arilan@student.uef.fi

Word count (main text only): [2,254]

Keywords: health coaching; behavior change; lifestyle medicine; digital health; preventive care

Abstract

Background:

Preventing non-communicable diseases (NCDs) is a global health priority, as they remain the leading cause of mortality globally, responsible for over 40 million deaths each year. Health coaching has demonstrated potential to improve lifestyle behaviors and health outcomes, yet its practical application is limited by inconsistent definitions and training standards.

Objective:

This brief report evaluates the feasibility and preliminary effectiveness of a systematically defined health coaching model—PrioMed®—that translates the coaching process into evidence-based Behavior Change Techniques (BCTs), providing a structured and teachable framework for healthcare delivery.

Methods:

A single-arm pilot study (n = 25) was conducted in private healthcare in Finland. Two registered nurses without prior coaching experience were trained for three half-day sessions and used a 25-page manual to deliver PrioMed® coaching across seven phone-based sessions over six months. Participants completed baseline and follow-up surveys, including the PROMIS-10 Global Health instrument. Paired-sample t tests and Cohen's d were used to assess changes in physical and mental health T-scores.

Results:

Participants (mean age 61.9 years, 76% female) showed significant improvements in self-

reported health. Physical health increased by +5.72 T-points ($p < .001$, $d = 1.31$) and mental health by +4.43 T-points ($p < .001$, $d = 0.83$), both indicating large effect sizes.

Conclusions:

Redefining health coaching through an explicit BCT framework appears feasible, teachable, and capable of generating meaningful health improvements within limited coaching time. The PrioMed® model offers a replicable approach for digital and nurse-led lifestyle interventions that warrants further evaluation in controlled trials and more diverse real-world populations.

Introduction

Non-communicable diseases (NCDs) remain the leading cause of global mortality, accounting for approximately 43 million deaths annually and 75% of non-pandemic deaths worldwide (1). The majority of these conditions—such as cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes, chronic respiratory diseases, and certain cancers—are strongly associated with modifiable lifestyle factors including diet, physical inactivity, alcohol use, smoking, and stress-related behaviors (2). Addressing these determinants through effective, scalable, and sustainable interventions remains a cornerstone of preventive health and lifestyle medicine.

Health coaching has emerged as one of the most promising methods for facilitating sustained lifestyle change in both preventive and clinical contexts. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses (3–5) indicate that health coaching can enhance self-efficacy, improve health behaviors, and contribute to better clinical outcomes, often with favorable cost-effectiveness profiles (6). However, despite its growing popularity, *health coaching* remains ambiguously defined across the literature and professional practice. The concept has been variably operationalized—from

62 motivational interviewing and counseling approaches to comprehensive lifestyle medicine
63 interventions—resulting in considerable heterogeneity in both methodology and reported
64 outcomes (4, 5, 7).

65 This lack of a shared operational definition poses two key challenges. First, it impedes the
66 reproducibility and scientific validation of health coaching interventions. Second, it hinders the
67 ability to train health professionals consistently and efficiently. Without a structured and
68 evidence-based framework, coaching programs often rely on individual experience rather than
69 standardized methods, limiting their scalability within healthcare systems.

70 To address these challenges, we developed and tested a new coaching model—PrioMed® Health
71 Coaching—that systematically defines the coaching process using the Behavior Change
72 Technique (BCT) taxonomy v1 (8). The model is grounded in the six pillars of lifestyle medicine
73 (9) and integrates only those BCTs with established evidence of effectiveness (10). By
74 translating the traditionally abstract concept of "coaching" into a set of clearly defined,
75 teachable, and measurable behavior change components, the PrioMed® model aims to make the
76 coaching process both scientifically replicable and practically scalable.

77 In contrast to previous coaching programs that require extensive training, PrioMed® has been
78 specifically engineered for rapid integration into clinical practice. In this pilot, two nurses with
79 no prior coaching experience received concise theoretical and practical training and implemented
80 the intervention with their clients in a private healthcare environment. The training was delivered
81 by the Nordic Health Academy, in collaboration with the University of Eastern Finland and
82 Terveystalo Oyj, a large private healthcare provider. Supplementary data from a related study
83 (11) support the acceptability and feasibility of the PrioMed® training framework, demonstrating

that both coaches and clients viewed the integration of the health coaching into routine clinical practice as practical and well-received.

From a digital health perspective, the PrioMed® model is particularly relevant because it represents a structured, data-compatible coaching process that can be readily integrated with digital monitoring tools and remote care pathways. Each phase of the coaching intervention—goal setting, needs analysis, feedback, and review—corresponds to distinct, codifiable BCT elements. This opens the door to future digital augmentation through wearable data, decision-support algorithms, and artificial intelligence–assisted behavior tracking, enabling personalized and continuous lifestyle support at scale.

The present study reports the findings from the initial feasibility and effectiveness evaluation of the PrioMed® pilot program. Conducted in a real-world private healthcare setting, this pilot explored whether health coaching, redefined through a structured BCT-based framework, could produce measurable improvements in self-reported physical and mental health within a limited intervention time. Specifically, the study aimed to (A) assess the feasibility of implementing the PrioMed® model in practice, and (B) evaluate preliminary health outcomes following a six-month intervention delivered by newly trained nurses.

By addressing long-standing issues in the conceptual clarity and standardization of health coaching, the PrioMed® model seeks to provide a universal, evidence-based structure that bridges the gap between lifestyle medicine theory and scalable digital health implementation.

Methods

Study design and setting

105 This single-arm, six-month pilot study evaluated the feasibility and preliminary effectiveness of
106 the PrioMed® Health Coaching model in a real-world private healthcare environment. The study
107 was conducted at Terveystalo Oyj, one of Finland's largest private healthcare providers, in
108 collaboration with the Nordic Health Academy and the University of Eastern Finland.
109 The study adhered to the Declaration of Helsinki and the ICMJE recommendations for research
110 involving human participants. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from The Regional
111 Medical Research Ethics Committee of Eastern Finland Collaborative Area and all participants
112 provided written informed consent prior to participation.

113 ***Participants and recruitment***

114 Participants were recruited from Terveystalo's existing client base, including those who had
115 previously participated in an annual health check-up or a digital wellness program. Inclusion
116 criteria were age ≥18 years, adequate Finnish language skills, and willingness to participate in
117 remote coaching. Exclusion criteria included acute medical conditions or cognitive impairments
118 preventing informed participation.

119 A total of 25 participants completed both baseline and six-month follow-up assessments. The
120 demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1.

121 ***Intervention***

122 The PrioMed® model operationalizes health coaching through evidence-based Behavior Change
123 Techniques (BCTs) drawn from the taxonomy by Michie et al. (8) and informed by the six pillars
124 of Lifestyle Medicine (9). It provides a structured and teachable framework emphasizing self-
125 assessment, needs analysis, goal setting, graded progression, and feedback.

126 Two registered nurses with no prior coaching experience were trained by the first author in three
127 four-hour sessions using a 25-page instructor manual. The training combined theoretical
128 instruction and practical exercises focusing on motivational communication, goal-oriented
129 dialogue, and structured session management.

130 Each participant received up to seven phone-based sessions across six months, combining an
131 initial assessment and goal-setting phase with five to six follow-up sessions focused on feedback
132 and reinforcement. Total contact time averaged less than four hours per participant.

133 A detailed description of the PrioMed® coaching process, including session structure, BCT
134 mapping, and sample tools (PrioMed® Lifestyle Medicine Vital Signs [PMLMVS] and
135 PrioMed® Needs Analysis [PMNA]), is provided in Supplementary Material 1.

136 ***Outcome measures***

137 The primary outcomes were self-reported physical and mental health, measured using the
138 PROMIS-10 Global Health questionnaire, which produces standardized T-scores (mean = 50, SD
139 = 10; higher scores indicate better health). Surveys were completed electronically at baseline and
140 at six-month follow-up.
141 Secondary outcomes included demographic data and descriptive summaries of lifestyle self-
142 assessments (PMLMVS) and applied BCT frequencies recorded by the coaches.

143 ***Data analysis***

144 PROMIS-10 raw scores were converted to T-scores using the *HealthMeasures Scoring Service*.
145 Data normality was verified with the Shapiro–Wilk test, and pre-post differences were analyzed

using paired-sample t-tests. Effect sizes were expressed as Cohen's d, using the standard deviation of the mean difference as the denominator. The threshold for statistical significance was $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed). Analyses were conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics v29. Complementary qualitative findings related to training and user experience are presented in a companion study (11).

Results

Participant characteristics

Twenty-five participants completed both baseline and six-month follow-up surveys. Demographic characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Participants were predominantly older, well-educated adults, mostly women, and nearly half were retired or not currently working.

Primary outcomes

Statistically significant improvements were observed in both physical and mental health domains of the PROMIS-10 Global Health measure after six months of PrioMed® health coaching.

- Physical Health T-score: Baseline mean = 45.51 ± 5.59; follow-up mean = 51.23 ± 5.04; mean change = + 5.72 points (95 % CI 3.92–7.51; $p < .001$).
- Mental Health T-score: Baseline mean = 50.20 ± 6.91; follow-up mean = 54.63 ± 5.47; mean change = + 4.43 points (95 % CI 2.24–6.62; $p < .001$).

Effect sizes were large for both scales (Cohen's $d = 1.31$ for physical health; $d = 0.83$ for mental health), suggesting clinically meaningful changes in perceived wellbeing.

165 ***Secondary observations***

166 Analysis of coaching session documentation indicated high adherence to the intended PrioMed®
167 protocol. The most frequently used Behavior Change Techniques (BCTs) were:

168 - *Goal setting (behavior)* – 100 % of participants
169 - *Goal setting (outcome)* – 88 %
170 - *Self-monitoring of behavior* – 68 %
171 - *Social reward* – 64 %
172 - *Review behavior goals* – 60 %
173 - *Comparative imagining of future outcomes* – 60 %
174 - *Action planning* – 56 %.

175 Other BCTs were applied in fewer than half of the coaching relationships, reflecting the limited
176 duration and goal-oriented nature of the intervention. Average total contact time remained below
177 four hours per participant, confirming the intended efficiency of the model.

178 ***Feasibility and implementation findings***

179 From an implementation standpoint, the PrioMed® model proved feasible for delivery by nurses
180 with no prior coaching experience. Both coaches successfully completed the training, adhered to
181 the structured protocol, and maintained consistent client engagement throughout the study. No
182 technical or logistical difficulties were reported in the telephone-based format.

183 Complementary qualitative findings, reported in a companion study (11), reinforce these
184 findings: Coachees characterized the sessions as supportive, personalized, and motivating, while

coaches reported marked improvements in their confidence and competence over the six-month period.

Discussion

This pilot study evaluated the feasibility and preliminary effectiveness of a newly developed health coaching model grounded in BCTs, within a real-world private healthcare setting. Despite the brief duration and limited contact time, the intervention was associated with notable improvements in participants' self-reported physical and mental health outcomes. These findings indicate that a structured, behaviorally defined coaching framework can feasibly be implemented and may contribute to enhanced subjective wellbeing, even when delivered with a minimal resource investment.

Interpretation of main findings

The observed effect sizes in the present study are substantially larger than those typically reported in lifestyle intervention meta-analyses (12, 13). From clinical perspective, changes in this magnitude are typically regarded as meaningful, reflecting noticeable enhancement in functional capacity and reduction symptom burden. The observed gains are particularly notable considering the brevity of the intervention (< 4 h per participant) and the fact that coaches were newly trained nurses with no prior experience in behavioral counseling. Together, these results suggest that redefining health coaching through clearly operationalized BCTs can enhance both its efficiency and trainability.

Documentation from the coaching sessions demonstrated high protocol adherence, with frequent use of core BCTs such as goal setting, self-monitoring, and action planning. This supports the fidelity of the intervention and reinforces its theoretical grounding.

Comparison with previous literature

Previous systematic reviews have identified health coaching as a potentially effective yet highly heterogeneous intervention domain (3, 4, 5). Variability in definitions, training, and delivery formats has hindered replication and large-scale implementation. By explicitly structuring the PrioMed® model around empirically supported BCTs (8, 10), this study addresses a long-standing gap in the literature: the need for a reproducible, evidence-linked framework that preserves the person-centered ethos of coaching while enabling systematic evaluation.

The present results are consistent with emerging evidence showing that targeted, time-limited coaching interventions can yield measurable health benefits, particularly when they include goal setting, self-monitoring (12–14), and graded tasks (13). The structured yet autonomy-supportive design of PrioMed® may explain the strong adherence observed among participants. Additional qualitative insights from the companion study (11) further supports the feasibility of intervention. Both coaches and coachees reported high levels of satisfaction and perceived the sessions as relevant and beneficial, even delivered via remote modalities (11).

Practical implications and digital health relevance

From an implementation perspective, these findings support the integration of structured health coaching models into both primary care and digital health ecosystems. The PrioMed® framework—by defining the coaching process in modular, codifiable BCT units—creates a

225 foundation for digitally augmented coaching, in which wearable-derived data and algorithmic
226 decision support can inform personalized behavioral feedback loops. Such standardization also
227 enables quality assurance and competence-based training for health professionals, addressing a
228 key barrier to scaling lifestyle interventions in healthcare systems.

229 In practical terms, the model demonstrates that brief, remote coaching interactions can be
230 sufficient to produce meaningful improvements in perceived health status. This efficiency is
231 particularly relevant for preventive care models that seek to reach large populations at moderate
232 cost. The structured PrioMed® model further allows delegation of coaching to non-specialist
233 healthcare staff, such as nurses or health advisors, thereby expanding access while maintaining
234 methodological fidelity.

235 Within the broader digital health landscape, the PrioMed® approach aligns with current priorities
236 in data-driven, personalized preventive healthcare—an area increasingly supported by wearable
237 sensors, continuous monitoring, and AI-enabled behavior analytics. The BCT-based logic of the
238 model provides an interpretable bridge between behavioral science and digital system design,
239 facilitating future research on how human and automated coaching elements can complement
240 each other.

241 ***Strengths, limitations, and future directions***

242 The main strengths of this pilot include its pragmatic design, use of a validated outcome measure
243 (PROMIS-10), and detailed documentation of coaching content using BCT taxonomy.
244 Conducting the study within an active private healthcare setting enhances ecological validity and
245 demonstrates feasibility under real-world conditions.

However, some limitations must be acknowledged. The study lacked a control group and randomization, limiting causal inference. The relatively small, self-enrolled sample—predominantly older, well-educated women—restricts generalizability. Furthermore, the coaches' dual roles as healthcare employees may have introduced unmeasured contextual effects. Outcomes were self-reported, and objective behavioral or physiological measures (e.g., activity tracking, biometrics) were not included.

Future studies should therefore employ randomized controlled designs, larger and more diverse samples, and multimodal outcome measures integrating both subjective and digital health data. Longer-term follow-up would also clarify the sustainability of observed changes. Additional research could evaluate the PrioMed® framework's integration with wearable technologies and adaptive algorithms, as well as its cost-effectiveness in large-scale preventive health programs.

Conclusion

Overall, the pilot demonstrated that a standardized, BCT-based coaching model can be effectively implemented in private healthcare, achieving meaningful improvements in health-related quality of life with minimal time investment. The findings support continued development of standardized and scalable coaching frameworks that can effectively integrate principles of lifestyle medicine with emerging innovations in digital health.

Declarations

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

267 ***Conflicts of Interest***

268 The authors declare the following potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research,
269 authorship, and/or publication of this article:

270• *PrioMed*® is a trademark registered in Finland by Nordic Health Academy.
271• Ari Langinkoski is employed by Nordic Health Academy as Head of Education and is a
272 shareholder of the company.
273• Ari Langinkoski, Mikko Rinta, Pekka Aroviita, and Mika Venojärvi serve as members of the
274 Scientific Advisory Board of Nordic Health Academy.
275• Mikko Rinta is employed by Terveystalo as Lead Nutritionist and is a minority shareholder in
276 Nordic Health Academy.
277• Pekka Aroviita works as an independent private lifestyle medicine practitioner and is a minority
278 shareholder in Nordic Health Academy.
279• Ari Langinkoski is also Chair of the EuropeActiveTechnical Expert Group (TEG), which is
280 developing European standards to support the health and lifestyle coaching role.

281 All other authors declare no additional conflicts of interest.

282 ***Ethics approval and consent to participate***

283 The study was approved by The Regional Medical Research Ethics Committee of Eastern
284 Finland Collaborative Area (approval number: [1121/13.02.00/2022]). All participants provided
285 written informed consent prior to enrollment, and the study was conducted in accordance with
286 the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Author contributions

- **Ari Langinkoski:** Conceptualization, methodology, training design, data analysis, writing – original draft.
- **Johanna Hämäläinen:** Data collection, survey analysis, writing – review & editing.
- **Krista Rapo:** Data collection, survey analysis, writing – review & editing.
- **Mikko Rinta:** Methodological input, nutrition expertise, writing – review & editing.
- **Pekka Aroviita:** Medical oversight, study supervision, writing – review & editing.
- **Mika Venojärvi:** Supervision, methodology, writing – review & editing.

All authors have read and approved the final manuscript and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the participating nurses and study participants for their valuable contributions. The authors also acknowledge the use of OpenAI's ChatGPT (GPT-5, 2025) to assist in language editing, reference formatting, and structural alignment with the *Digital Health* author guidelines. The authors remain fully responsible for the content and accuracy of this manuscript.

Availability of data and materials

Deidentified participant data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. Supplementary materials describing the intervention are available as Supplementary Material 1.

308 **References**

309 1. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable diseases. Geneva: WHO; 2025. Available
310 from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases
311 [accessed 2025 Oct 6].
312 2. Global Burden of Disease Collaborators. Global, regional, and national age-sex-specific
313 mortality for 282 causes of death, 1980–2019: a systematic analysis. Lancet
314 2020;396:1160–1204. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30925-9
315 3. Kivelä K, Elo S, Kyngäs H, et al. The effects of health coaching on adult patients with
316 chronic diseases: a systematic review. Patient Educ Couns 2014;97:147–157.
317 doi:10.1016/j.pec.2014.07.026.
318 4. Sherifali D, Viscardi V, Bai JW, Ali RMU. Evaluating the effect of a diabetes health
319 coach in individuals with type 2 diabetes. Can J Diabetes 2016;40(1):84–94.
320 doi:10.1016/j.jcjd.2015.10.006
321 5. Pirbaglou M, Katz J, Motamed M, Pludwinski S, Walker K, Ritvo P. Personal health
322 coaching as a type 2 diabetes mellitus self-management strategy: a systematic review and
323 meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Am J Health Promot 2018;32:1613–1626.
324 doi:10.1177/0890117118758234
325 6. Hale R, Giese J. Cost-effectiveness of health coaching: an integrative review. Prof Case
326 Manag 2017;22(5):228–238. doi:10.1097/NCM.0000000000000223
327 7. Mendes Sieczkowska S, Padilha de Lima A, Swinton PA, Dolan E, Roschel H, Gualano
328 B. Health coaching strategies for weight loss: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Adv
329 Nutr 2021;12:1449–1460. doi:10.1093/advances/nmaa159

330 8. Michie S, Richardson M, Johnston M, et al. The behavior change technique taxonomy
331 (v1) of 93 hierarchically clustered techniques: building an international consensus for the
332 reporting of behavior change interventions. Ann Behav Med 2013;46:81–95.
333 doi:10.1007/s12160-013-9486-6
334 9. American College of Lifestyle Medicine. About lifestyle medicine. Available from:
335 https://lifestylemedicine.org/about-lifestyle-medicine/ [accessed 2025 Jan 20].
336 10. Guerreiro M, Strawbridge J, Cavaco AM, Félix IB, Marques MM, Cadogan C.
337 Development of a European competency framework for health and other professionals to
338 support behaviour change in persons self-managing chronic disease. BMC Med Educ
339 2021;21:287. doi:10.1186/s12909-021-02720-w
340 11. Hämäläinen J, Rapo K, Langinkoski A, Rinta M, Aroviita P, Haaranen A, Kettinen J,
341 Venojärvi M. Health coaching as a tool for lifestyle changes: insights from the PrioMed®
342 training and pilot intervention. medRxiv. 2025. doi:10.1101/2025.11.15.25340170. Epub
343 ahead of print.
344 12. Ashton LM, Sharkey T, Whatnall MC, Haslam RL, Bezzina A, Aguiar EJ, Collins CE,
345 Hutchesson MJ. Which behaviour change techniques within interventions to prevent
346 weight gain and/or initiate weight loss improve adiposity outcomes in young adults? A
347 systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Obes Rev.*
348 2020;21(6):e13009. doi:10.1111/obr.13009
349 13. Carraça E, Encantado J, Battista F, Beaulieu K, Blundell J, Busetto L, van Baak M,
350 Dicker D, Ermolao A, Farpour-Lambert N, Pramono A, Woodward E, Bellicha A, Oppert
351 J-M. Effective behavior change techniques to promote physical activity in adults with

352 overweight or obesity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obesity Reviews*
353 2021;22(Suppl 4):e13258. doi:10.1111/obr.13258
354 14. Samdal GB, Eide GE, Barth T, Williams G, Meland E. Effective behaviour change
355 techniques for physical activity and healthy eating in overweight and obese adults:
356 systematic review and meta-regression analyses. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.
357 2017;14(1):42. doi:10.1186/s12966-017-0494-y

358

359 **Table 1. Participants demographics**

Characteristic	Value
Participants, n	25
Age, mean ± SD (range)	61.9 ± 10.8 (33–75)
Female, n (%)	19 (76%)
Married or partnered, n (%)	18 (72%)
Retired or not currently working, n (%)	12 (48%)
Post-secondary or higher education, n (%)	23 (92%)

360

361