

Communication of Cardiovascular Disease Risk and Prevention Strategies at the Healthy Lifestyle Centres- reality vs expected quality: A cross-sectional mix-methods study

Sameera Ranasinghe, Crishal Lakshitha, Lakshitha Iroshan Ranasinghe, Sampath Tennakoon

Abstract

INTRODUCTION *In the multiple-risk approach of cardiovascular disease management, communication of cardiovascular disease risk and its prevention play a significant role. In Sri Lanka, this function is conducted via Healthy Lifestyle Centres.*

METHODOLOGY *A clinical audit was conducted to describe communication quality in 79 healthy lifestyle centers. A checklist developed based on Patient-Centered Communication Tools with the support of an expert panel. Two trained observers independently conducted the observations while the healthcare provider at the Healthy Lifestyle Centre revealed details of cardiovascular disease risk communication and health education sessions.*

RESULTS: *The majority of Healthy Lifestyle Centers involved patients in decision-making ($n = 228$, 92.0%), explained patient choices ($n = 230$, 92.8%) and responded to patients' interest in decision-making ($n = 235$, 99.2%). Most patients received a summary ($n = 159$, 67.1%), a follow-up plan ($n = 212$, 89.5%) and were communicated in a jargon-free language ($n = 127$, 53.6%). The majority of sessions demonstrated satisfactory use of examples (95.7%, $n = 22$), and responsiveness to questions (73.9%, $n = 17$). However, most sessions were unsatisfactory regarding provision of a follow-up plan (95.7%, $n = 22$), encouragement of questions (95.7%, $n = 22$), allowing clients to talk (87.0%, $n = 20$), and active listening (69.6%, $n = 16$).*

CONCLUSIONS: *Strengthening healthcare worker training in patient-centred communication especially shared decision-making, active listening, and encouraging patient questions are*

essential to improve cardiovascular disease risk communication and patient adherence to preventive guidelines at Healthy Lifestyle Centres.

Key words

Communication, Cardiovascular disease risk, health communication, effective communication, paternalistic healthcare

Background and introduction

Non-Communicable Diseases (NCD) are responsible for a high percentage of global deaths and disabilities, causing 41 million deaths (71% of all global deaths) yearly. Out of which 30% were premature. Further, Low- And Middle-Income Countries (LMIC) report 77% of total number deaths due to NCDs (1). The 2019 global burden of disease study illustrates that Ischemic Heart Disease (IHD) and Stroke have been ranked in the top causes of mortality in Sri Lanka (2). According to 2021 STEPS survey conducted in Sri Lanka, 72.5% of the population did not take five servings of fruits and vegetables daily, 30.1% did not do sufficient physical activity, 15.0% were current smokers, and 17.9% were current alcohol drinkers (3).

Screening for NCDs has been identified as a significant action area in NCD's strategic framework for prevention (4,5). Screening for Diabetes and cardiovascular diseases (CVD) happens mainly

through Healthy Life-style Centres (HLC). In these centres, CVD risk is calculated by using WHO ISH CVD risk prediction charts. Thereafter, referring or managing the identified patients according to the availability of resources will be carried out by these centres (6). Understanding the quality of these service provisions is essential to determine clients' responses to the multiple-risk approach. However, these centres are mainly conducted at peripheries, which can have a diversity in service delivery as against the guidelines. The core of patient management at the centre is the personal communication of CVD risk and how to adhere to lifestyle changes for minimising this risk. However, Communication among healthcare personnel have been found to be full of deficiencies worldwide (7). Such a gap can result in non-adherence to the health guidance about a complex concept of CVD risk due to incomprehension by the public (7,8).

Objective

To describe the quality of cardiovascular risk communication in HLCs in Kurunegala District of Sri Lanka

Methodology

An observational study was conducted to describe the quality of cardiovascular risk communication in HLCs. We obtained a sample of 35 randomly selected HLCs based in hospitals and 44 HLCs based in Primary Medical Care Units (PMCU) of the Kurunegala district of Sri Lanka. Data collection was done on chosen HLCs causing minimal interruption to HLCs functions. For risk-communication assessment, a check list was developed based on Patient-Centred Communication Tools (PACT) (9). The PACT was originally developed to assess the risk communication by pharmacists. However, due to the comprehensive and generalisable nature of

the questionnaire, the tool was selected for our purpose. All communications conducted with the client, including CVD risk divulgation and health talk, were assessed using two checklists developed based on the Patient-Centred Communication Tools (PACT) questionnaire. The checklists were developed with the consensus of an expert panel consisting of a Consultant Community Physician (CCP), a Medical Officer (MO), and a Health Education Officer (HEO) who chose the most appropriate items from the original questionnaire to adopt them to assess CVD risk communication at HLC. The data collection was conducted by two trained data collectors (for communication assessment) using independent observation during the clinic sessions at HLCs. The two assessments were compared for any discrepancies, and the consensus obtained at the end was used for the analysis.

Results

Quality of Cardiovascular Disease Risk communication

The initial assessment of CVD risk was carried out by a healthcare worker, in most instances a medical officer, on a one-to-one basis. During risk communication with individual clients, rapport building was observed. In the rapport building phase, out of 237 interviews observed (3 per HLC), the following aspects involving patients in decision-making were unsatisfactory; including patients in decision-making (N = 228, 92.0%), explaining choices (N=230, 92.8%), and responding to patients' interest in decision-making (N = 235, 99.2%). Only 0.8% (N = 2) of communications involved agreement on short- and long-term goals. Provision of a summary (N = 159, 67.1%) and a plan for follow-up (N=212, 89.5%) was satisfactory in most interviews. In maintaining rapport, a high proportion of conversations were found to be lacking in encouragement of questions (N =

226, 95.4%) and active listening (N = 120, 50.6%). However, responding to questions (N=210, 88.6%) and allowing the patient to talk (N=205, 86.5%) were prevalent in the majority of stations. Most practitioners (N = 127, 53.6%) used technical jargon-free vocabulary but did not use appropriate examples (N = 179, 75.5%). Professionalism (N = 224, 94.5%) and confidence (N = 219, 92.4%) were satisfactory in the majority. In the skill of organizing the conversation, balancing patient and healthcare provider priorities was lacking in most cases (N = 218, 92.0%) (Table 1)."

Quality of Communication at the Health Education Sessions

Health education sessions were conducted for groups of clients by a Public Health Nursing Officer or Public Health Midwife in most instances. Provision of a plan for follow up (N=22,95.7%) was unsatisfactory in majority of the centres, whereas provision of a summary at the end of the health talk was adequate in a high percentage (N=17, 73.9%) of centres. In maintenance of rapport, a high proportion of conversations were found to be lacking encouragement of questions (N=22,95.7%), allowing the clients to talk (N=20,87.0%) and active listening (N=16,69.6%). However, responding to questions (N=17,73.9%) was satisfactory in high proportion of stations. Most of the practitioners (N=22,95.7%) used technical jargon free vocabulary and used appropriate examples (N=22,95.7%). Professionalism (N=22,95.7%) and confidence (N=16, 69.6%) was satisfactory in majority. (Table 2)

Discussion

Cardiovascular Disease Risk communication

In the majority of HLCs, there was no involvement of clients in decision making. Since HLCs focus heavily on lifestyle modification, shared decision making would be much more effective as

it has shown to produce better health outcomes (10). However, previous research has shown that this aspect was lacking among physicians (11). This fact is reflected in the present study's findings. Hence, the lack of follow-up visits might be due either to clients not understanding the CVD risk concept or to not recognizing the necessity of follow-up. Nevertheless, follow-up advice and a summary were provided adequately in the majority of HLCs. While follow-up advice is favourable towards better patient outcomes, there is a tendency for the clients to disagree with the directions given, as they were not involved in decision making or goal setting. Such disagreement can be detrimental as CVD risk is a concept often misinterpreted by the public (12,13). Therefore, a lack of clear understanding of CVD risk communication can lead to non-adherence to healthy lifestyle modifications. Overestimation of CVD risk by the client can create unnecessary anxiety. These problems can be prevented by clear and effective CVD risk communication.

Questions from clients were not encouraged in many consultations, and low active listening was observed in the majority of HLCs in the present study. Similarly, many clinical encounters lack encouragement for clients to ask questions (14). This leads to a lack of understanding among clients, as they do not get a chance or were actively discouraged to clarify their doubts. Further, adding to the above behaviour by healthcare providers, CVD risk communication in the UK has been described as one-way communication rather than a discussion with the client (15). It has also been found that encouraging questions from patients can lead to higher adherence to the guidelines provided by the healthcare professional (16). Nevertheless, the doctor-patient relationship in Sri Lanka is described being paternalistic (17). Therefore, CVD risk communication by medical doctors in Sri Lanka may have even more drawbacks than in the UK, due to the authoritative nature of doctors in communication with patients. Another possible reason is the lack of risk

communication skills among healthcare workers, which has also been observed in other parts of the world (18,19). This issue needs to be addressed in in-service training for HLC staff. The effective use of calculated CVD risk will be very challenging in the Sri Lankan setting if the staff had not been trained on proper risk communication.

From a positive standpoint, the use of technical jargon-free language was prevalent in most HLCs. This is notable because physicians worldwide have reportedly used medical jargon, creating a barrier to communication (20). This difference may be due to socio-cultural influences in Asia, particularly where the doctor-patient bond extends beyond a purely professional relationship. Ultimately, such simple language can convey the message of CVD risk more effectively to clients.

Quality of Communication at the Health Education Sessions

Both in Norway and the UK, HLCs conduct individual-level counselling (21,22), but in most of the HLCs in our study, the health talk remained a low priority. The primary reason might be doctors' lack of time due to their dual roles in the HLC and Outpatient Department (OPD), especially in PMCUs. In contrast, in other countries, HLCs are conducted mainly by allied health professionals or non-clinical staff and do not involve patient screening (23,24). Whereas in Sri Lanka, both screening and counselling occur at HLCs. Differences in socio-cultural backgrounds between countries might also be a reason, as clients' expectations differ accordingly. However, health communication remains an essential tool for behavioural change and is a significant objective of HLCs (25). The paternalistic doctor-patient relationship referred to in the above paragraph might negatively affect two-way communication between the client and the doctor. Participation in HLCs is a crucial opportunity to break down communication barriers between the

doctor and the patient and to empower the public, for which health talks and individual-level counselling are essential strategies.

There were some positive aspects of the constitution at the HLC such as using technical jargon-free language, using examples, and providing a summary in the health talks conducted in a few of the HLCs in this study. The use of technical jargon has been found to be a significant barrier to effective outcomes in patient encounters (26). In contrast to present study's findings, some offshore studies have shown frequent use of medical jargon by health staff leading to confusion among patients (Russell et al., 2020). This aspect of communication being superior in HLCs in the present study may stem from grassroots-level healthcare workers' familiarity with their clients' literacy levels and the stronger public relationships shaped by the country's socio-cultural influences. However, encouragement of questions and active listening were lacking in the health talks at HLCs in the current study, which are practices that should be avoided in a health talk (27). The underlying reason may be the dominant nature of healthcare workers in their relationships with clients/patients, which has also been reported in other countries (28). This can lead to comprehension problems and non-adherence in the long run.

Conclusions

While primary healthcare workers in Healthy Lifestyle Centres demonstrate strengths in using jargon-free language, major gaps in shared decision making, follow-up planning, and patient engagement, the gaps highlight the critical need for systematic communication skills training. This will enhance cardiovascular risk communication and public health outcomes.

Ethics approval

All the observations were conducted with written informed consent from the participants. Ethical clearance for the study was obtained from the Ethics review committee of the University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka.

Data availability statement

The raw data used to depict these findings are available from the corresponding author on request.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding any part of this manuscript

Author Contributions

Sameera Ranasinghe – Conceptualization of research question, study design, data collection, data analysis, drafting of manuscript
Ministry of Health of Sri Lanka
rasu.ranasinghe@gmail.com
ORCID-0000-0002-3738-3901

Crishal Lakshitha – Conceptualization, study design and data collection
Postgraduate Institute of Medicine, University of Colombo
m20907@pgim.com.ac.lk
ORCID-0000-0002-2527-6797

Lakshitha Iroshan Ranasinghe – Data analysis, drafting of work and critical review
Directorate for Youth, Elderly and Disabled Persons', Ministry of Health of Sri Lanka.
ranasinghe.li2017@pgim.cmb.ac.lk
ORCID-0000-0001-7500-7846

Sampath Tennakoon – Supervision, monitoring and critical review
Faculty of Medicine, University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka
Sampath.tennakoon@med.pdn.ac.lk
ORCID-0000-0002-0648-614X

References

1. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable diseases progress monitor 2022 [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022. Available from: <https://who.int>
2. Munasinghe H, Dissanayaka P, Jayasundara M, Piyasena MP, Sivaprasad S, Nugawela MD. Trends in Mortality from Diabetes and Other Non-Communicable Diseases Among Sri Lankan Adults: A Retrospective Population-Based Study, 2004–2020/2021. *J Clin Med*. 2025 Dec 3;14(23):8568. doi:10.3390/jcm14238568 PubMed PMID: 41375873; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC12693623.
3. Chandraratne NK, Negi NS, Siyambalapitiya H, De Seram S, Selladurai N, Pieris K, et al. Public opinion on alcohol policies in Sri Lanka. *Front Public Health*. 2024 Jul 12;12:1409012. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2024.1409012 PubMed PMID: 39071156; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC11272549.
4. Mallawaarachchi CS, Sri Ranganathan S, de Silva A. Implementation and evaluation of Healthy Lifestyle Centres for non-communicable disease screening in primary care settings in Sri Lanka. *WHO South-East Asia J Public Health* [Internet]. 2016;5(2):142–9. Available from: <https://who.int>
5. Ministry of Health, Sri Lanka. Guideline for the establishment of Healthy Lifestyle centers in healthcare institutions throughout the country [Internet]. Secretariat of Non-Communicable Diseases; 2011. Available from: <https://health.gov.lk>
6. Herath H, Perera K, Kasturiratne A. Family and community factors influencing the utilization of healthy lifestyle centers. 2021.
7. Fassier T, Azoulay E. Conflicts and communication gaps in the intensive care unit. *Curr Opin Crit Care*. 2010 Dec;16(6):654–65. doi:10.1097/MCC.0b013e32834044f0 PubMed PMID: 20930623.
8. Navar AM, Pencina MJ, Mulder H, Elias P, Peterson ED. Improving Patient Risk Communication: Translating Cardiovascular Risk into Standardized Risk Percentiles. *Am Heart J*. 2018 Apr;198:18–24. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2017.12.005 PubMed PMID: 29653642; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5901888.
9. Grice GR, Gattas NM, Prosser T, Voorhees M, Kebodeaux C, Tiemeier A, et al. Design and validation of patient-centered communication tools (PaCT) to measure students' communication skills. *Am J Pharm Educ*. 2017;81(8).
10. Stiggelbout AM, Pieterse AH, De Haes JC. Shared decision making: concepts, evidence, and practice. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2015;98(10):1172–9.
11. Oerlemans AJM, Knippenberg ML, Olthuis GJ. Learning shared decision-making in clinical practice. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2021 May 1;104(5):1206–12. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2020.09.034

12. Cao Q, Xu L, Wen S, Li F. <p>Investigating the Influence of the Shared Decision-Making Perception on the Patient Adherence of the Home- and Exercise-Based Cardiac Rehabilitation After Percutaneous Coronary Intervention</p>. *Patient Prefer Adherence*. 2021 Feb 22;15:411–22. doi:10.2147/PPA.S292178
13. Fisher KA, Tan ASL, Matlock DD, Saver B, Mazor KM, Pieterse AH. Keeping the patient in the center of decision making: common challenges in the practice of shared decision making. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2018 Dec;101(12):2195–201. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2018.08.007 PubMed PMID: 30144968; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6376968.
14. Bristowe K, Patrick PL. ‘Any questions?’—Clinicians’ usage of invitations to ask questions (IAQs) in outpatient plastic surgery consultations. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2014;97(3):347–51.
15. Glidewell JC, Livert DE. Confidence in the Practice of Clinical Psychology. *Prof Psychol Res Pract*. 1992 Oct;23(5):362–8. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.23.5.362
16. Légaré F, Witteman HO. Shared decision making: examining key elements and barriers to adoption into routine clinical practice. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2013;32(2):276–84.
17. Safeer D, Wijerathne S, Weerasekara P, Wickramasinghe U, Edirisinghe S, Hewavithana A, et al. Aspects of patient rights in a developing country: a qualitative study. *BMC Med Ethics*. 2025 May 28;26:69. doi:10.1186/s12910-025-01232-2 PubMed PMID: 40437532; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC12121050.
18. Souvatzi E, Katsikidou M, Arvaniti A, Plakias S, Tsiakiri A, Samakouri M. Trust in Healthcare, Medical Mistrust, and Health Outcomes in Times of Health Crisis: A Narrative Review. *Societies*. 2024 Dec;14(12):269. doi:10.3390/soc14120269
19. Tiwary A, Rimal A, Paudyal B, Sigdel KR, Basnyat B. Poor communication by health care professionals may lead to life-threatening complications: examples from two case reports. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2019 Jan 22;4:7. doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15042.1 PubMed PMID: 31448336; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6694717.
20. Links AR, Callon W, Wasserman C, Walsh J, Beach MC, Boss EF. Surgeon use of medical jargon with parents in the outpatient setting. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2019 Jun 1;102(6):1111–8. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2019.02.002
21. Rankin D, Backett-Milburn K, Platt S. Practitioner perspectives on tackling health inequalities: findings from an evaluation of healthy living centres in Scotland. *Soc Sci Med*. 2009;68(5):925–32.
22. Samdal GB, Meland E, Eide GE, Berntsen S, Abildsnes E, Stea TH, et al. Participants at Norwegian Healthy Life Centres: Who are they, why do they attend and how are they motivated? A cross-sectional study. *Scand J Public Health*. 2018;46(7):774–81.
23. Mallawaarachchi CS, Sri Ranganathan S, de Silva A. Healthy Lifestyle Centres: a service for screening noncommunicable diseases through primary health-care institutions in Sri Lanka.

- WHO South-East Asia J Public Health [Internet]. 2016;5(2):142–9. Available from: <https://www.ecoi.net/en/file/local/2017150/seajph2016v5n2.pdf>
24. World Health Organization. Primary Health Care: Integrating Allied Health Professionals and Brief Interventions for Behaviour Change [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2022. Available from: <https://ispah.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/WHO-Primary-Health-Care.pdf>
 25. Kreuter MW, Skinner CS. Tailoring: what’s in a name? Health Educ Res. 2000 Feb 1;15(1):1–4. doi:10.1093/her/15.1.1
 26. Lin I, O’Sullivan P, Coffin J, Mak D, Toussaint S, Straker L. “I can sit and talk to her”: Aboriginal people, chronic low back pain and healthcare practitioner communication. Aust Fam Physician. 2014;43(5):320–4.
 27. Prozesky D. Giving a health talk. Community Eye Health. 2014;27(88):76.
 28. Hattab AS. Healthcare Ethics. In: Laher I, editor. Handbook of Healthcare in the Arab World [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2021. p. 1603–19. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36811-1_77 doi:10.1007/978-3-030-36811-1_77

Tables

Table 1

Quality of Cardiovascular Disease Risk Communication

Component of communication	Subcomponent	Satisfactory N = 237 n (%)	Unsatisfactory N = 237 n (%)
Create rapport	Address patient appropriately ° Mr./Ms./Mrs. or asks how patient prefers to be addressed	127(53.6)	110(46.4)
	Offer warm greeting	177(74.7)	60(25.3)
	Introduce self (name and role) •	13(5.5)	224(94.5)
	Acknowledge known information about patient	181(76.4)	56(23.6)
	Involve patient in decision-making to the extent he/she desires	19(8.0)	218(92.0)
	Offer and explain options and choices when appropriate °	17(7.2)	220(92.8)
	Respond to patient's degree of interest in decision-making	2(0.8)	235(99.2)
	Identify if there are any decision/support partners	2(0.8)	235(99.2)
Determine goals with patient	Jointly agree on short and/or long-term goals	2(0.8)	235(99.2)
Complete the visit	Provide summary (verbal and/or written) doing.	159(67.1)	78(32.9)
	Discuss plan for follow-up (including timeline)	212(89.5)	25(10.5)
Maintain rapport	Use conversation to keep patient at ease	12(5.1)	225(94.9)
	Encourage questions	11(4.6)	226(95.4)
	Respond to questions	210(88.6)	27(11.4)
	Allow patient to talk ° Do not interrupt or cut off patient	205(86.5)	32(13.5)
	Demonstrate attentive listening and interest in patient	113(47.7)	124(52.3)
	Suppress own negative reactions	117(49.4)	120(50.6)
	Acknowledge patient's efforts toward understanding key messages, changing behaviours, and improvement	114(48.1)	123(51.9)
Appropriate language to patient's health literacy	Use proper vocabulary and clear, jargon-free language	127(53.6)	110(46.4)
	Use applicable analogies and/or specific examples ° Verbal or pictorial	58(24.5)	179(75.5)
Confidence	Confident when stating what one knows or does not know	219(92.4)	18(7.6)
	Display confidence during encounter	223(94.1)	14(5.9)
Professionalism	Display appropriate physical appearance, comportment, demeanor, tact, manners, etc	224(94.5)	13(5.5)
Organization	Balance patient and health care provider priorities	19(8.0)	218(92.0)
	Maintain focus • Flexible, yet retains control of interview	224(94.5) 157(66.2)	13(5.5) 80(33.8)

Table 2

Quality of Communication at the Health Education Sessions

Component of communication	Subcomponent	Satisfactory N = 23 n (%)	Unsatisfactory N = 23 n (%)
Complete the visit	Provide summary (verbal and/or written) doing.	17(73.9)	6(26.1)
	Discuss plan for follow-up (including timeline)	1(4.3)	22(95.7)
Maintain rapport	Use conversation to keep patient at ease	21(91.3)	2(8.7)
	Encourage questions	1(4.3)	22(95.7)
	Respond to questions	17(73.9)	6(26.1)
	Allow patient to talk ° Do not interrupt or cut off patient	3(13.0)	20(87.0)
	Demonstrate attentive listening and interest in patient	7(30.4)	16(69.6)
	Suppress own negative reactions	7(30.4)	16(69.6)
	Acknowledge patient's efforts toward understanding key messages, changing behaviours, and improvement	19(82.6)	4(17.4)
Appropriate language to patient's health literacy	Use proper vocabulary and clear, jargon-free language	22(95.7)	1(4.3)
	Use applicable analogies and/or specific examples ° Verbal or pictorial	22(95.7)	1(4.3)
Confidence	Confident when stating what one knows or does not know	16(69.6)	7(30.4)
	Display confidence during encounter	16(69.6)	7(30.4)
Professionalism	Display appropriate physical appearance, comportment, demeanour, tact, manners, etc	22(95.7)	1(4.3)
Organization	Balance patient and health care provider priorities	3(13.0)	20(87.0)
	Maintain focus	22(95.7)	1(4.3)
	Flexible, yet retains control of interview	22(95.7)	1(4.3)