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Understanding the role of behavioural change in the design and development of digital behavioural change interventions (DBCIs)

Taxonomy and Framework to aid design and development

ProACT: Incorporating a behavioural change/science approach to the deliver a complex digital intervention into a complex healthcare ecosystem
Behavioural Change (BC) can be defined as the use of techniques such as motivating approaches, improving education, constructing a problem definition, serious gaming, continuing support and evaluation (Peyrot and Rubin 2007) to help individuals maximise their ability to act on personal and professional feedback to improve their health and wellbeing.
Digital behavior change interventions (DBCIs): are interventions that employ digital tech to encourage and support behavior change that will promote and maintain health, through primary or secondary prevention and management of health problems

• Behavioural change is poorly understood and implemented in digital health

• Design and development of many digital health interventions lack a solid theoretical basis for behavioural change

• Most have modest/variable effects
Using BCTs in Apps – Physical Activity

• Systematically assess the features, content, and quality of the most popular apps

• 51 apps included, none specified the age of the target group and only one mentioned the involvement of health professionals.

• n=18 followed the guidelines for physical activity

• On average, 5.5 BCTs were identified per app; the most frequently used techniques were “provide feedback on performance” and “prompt self-monitoring of behavior” (n=50)

• The overall quality score was 3.88/5 (SD 0.34)
Challenge with Incorporating BC Theory

- Large amount theories and methods for intervention design and evaluation (83 identified) (Michie et al., 2014 & Prestwich et al., 2014)

- Majority generally poor specification, both in construct definitions and in the relationships between them.

- Most behavioral theories emphasized group-level and largely static generalization (predict average changes in outcomes in groups).

  Ideally, a good theory will provide both group-level and individual-level generalizations.
Opportunity for DCBIs

• Individuals that use digital tech have a wide range of data gathered about them. These “digital traces” are aggregated, connected, and organized and can be used for a variety of purposes such as highly targeted recommendations or inferring psychological characteristics, such as personality & personal preferences.

• Advances in Artificial Intelligence can enable more “context-sensitive” understanding of (teachable) moments to deliver interventions and behaviour change techniques.
BCT Taxonomy v1

- Developed by 400 experts from 12 countries
- Clearly labelled, well defined, distinct, precise; can be used with confidence by a range of disciplines and countries
- Hierarchically organised to improve ease of use
- Applies to an extensive range of behaviour change interventions
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Abstract

Background CONSORT guidelines call for precise reporting of behavior change interventions: we need rigorous methods of characterising active content of interventions with precision and specificity.

Objectives The objective of this study is to develop an extensive, consensus-agreed hierarchically structured taxonomy of techniques (Behavior change techniques (BCTs)) used in behavior change interventions.

Methods A Delphi-type exercise, 14 experts rated labels and definitions of 124 BCTs from six published classification systems. Another 18 experts grouped BCTs according to similarity of active ingredients in an open-sort task. Inter-rater agreement amongst six researchers coding 85 intervention descriptions by BCTs was assessed.

Results This resulted in 93 BCTs clustered into 16 groups. Of the 26 BCTs occurring at least five times, 23 had a definable label, loss of 0.00 or above.

Conclusions “BCT taxonomy v1,” an extensive taxonomy of 93 consensus-agreed, distinct BCTs, offers a step change as a method for specifying interventions, but we anticipate further development and evaluation based on international, interdisciplinary consensus.
BCT Taxonomy v1: 93 items in 16 groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Grouping and BCTs</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Grouping and BCTs</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Grouping and BCTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Goals and planning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6. Comparison of behaviour</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12. Antecedents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1. Goal setting (behavior)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1. Demonstration of the behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1. Restructuring the physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2. Social comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2. Restructuring the social environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Goal setting (outcome)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3. Information about others’ approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3. Avoidance/reducing exposure to cues for the behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. Action planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4. Distraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5. Review behavior goal(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5. Adding objects to the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6. Discrepancy between current behavior and goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.6. Body changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7. Review outcome goal(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8. Behavioral contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9. Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7. Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1. Prompts/cues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2. Cue signalling reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3. Reduce prompts/cues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Goals and planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 | **Goal setting (behavior)** | Set or agree on a goal defined in terms of the behavior to be achieved  
Note: only code goal-setting if there is sufficient evidence that goal set as part of intervention; if goal unspecified or a behavioral outcome, code 1.3, **Goal setting (outcome)**: if the goal defines a specific context, frequency, duration or intensity for the behavior, also code 1.4, Action planning | Agree on a daily walking goal (e.g. 3 miles) with the person and reach agreement about the goal  
Set the goal of eating 5 pieces of fruit per day as specified in public health guidelines |
Implementing BCTs in Design and Development

- Synthesis of 19 frameworks to classify interventions (health, environment, culture change and social marketing)
- Centre: COM-B model
- Inner ring: Nine intervention functions (what purpose(s) we the intervention serves)
- Outer ring: Seven policy categories

Michie et al, 2011 & 2014
BCW: Framework for Implementing the Taxonomy

Behavioural Change Wheel (Michie et al, 2011 & 2014)
AIMS:

1- Challenge the EU focus on supporting a single disease framework of care to create a patient centric integrated care (IC) ecosystem to understand and manage multimorbidity.

2 - ProACT aims to develop and evaluate a cloud based open API to integrate a variety of new and existing technologies to advance ‘home based’ integrated care (IC) for multimorbidity self-management.
Focus – Self-Management

• Self-management is a core activity

• Self-management of multimorbidity is **challenging**, requiring engagement in **multiple tasks** such as symptom monitoring, recognition of exacerbation, medication adherence and inter-stakeholder communication.

• A **digital, integrated care approach** is a critical part of the solution.

• The main objective of our work is to design a technology ecosystem to facilitate older adults to self-manage multimorbidity, with support from their care network.
Designing ProACT as a BC intervention

- Behavioural Change
- Human Computer Interaction

- User Needs and Requirements
- Co-Design and Development
- User Evaluation
Project Outline (2016-2019)

- Phase 1: User Needs Research and Scoping *(M1-9 complete)*
- Phase 2: System Design, Development and Testing *(M9 – M40)*
- Phase 3: Pilot Trials and further co-design and development *(M14 to M26)*
- Phase 4: Main Proof of Concept Trial *(2018: M26/27 to M37/38)*
  - Ireland: 60 PwM and support actors
  - Belgium: 60 PwM and support actors
  - Conditions: Diabetes, COPD, CHF/CHD
  - Longitudinal Action Research Design (12 months)
- Phase 5: Transfer Feasibility Study *(2018: M30 to M36)*
  - Italy: 15 PwM and support actors
Meet Sarah

Sarah is 85

**Conditions:** Diabetes and Heart Failure

Everyday for the last 5 years she has measured her:
- Weight
- Blood Pressure
- Blood sugar

She writes readings in notebooks and brings them with her to her GP and specialist clinics that she attends for her conditions.

Sarah is finding it hard to remember when to take measurements and to write down the different readings into separate notebooks every day.
How Can ProACT Help Sarah

Monitoring Symptoms

• Sarah’s GP recommended that she try a new technology to help her monitor her symptoms automatically
• ProACT also help Sarah to keep track of other important parameters such as sleep, activity, mood and breathlessness.

Viewing Symptoms

• Her new devices now send her readings automatically to a tablet where she can view her symptoms over the last day, week or month
Knowledge and Education:

• The system also provides Sarah with tips that might be useful for her to manage her conditions and stay as healthy as possible.

• ProACT gives Sarah trustworthy and clear information on managing diabetes and heart failure but also on general topics such as exercise and how to get off the floor safely after a fall.

Health and Care Network:

• Person driven modular ability to personalise care network

• Sarah’s daughter Mary can view the health readings that she chooses to share with her from her phone.
User Requirements: Scoping

Significant desk research;
Literature and policy reviews on disease management, treatment and care pathways within national contexts
Person with Multimorbidity

Pharmacy

GP

Informal carer

Formal care

Community-based clinicians

Hospital-based clinicians

Peers
User Requirements

- Qualitative study
- Interviews and focus groups – semi-structured; 45-120 minutes
- Demographic questionnaires (PwM and informal carer)
- 124 participants across Ireland and Belgium
- Thematic analysis
- Diabetes + CHF/CHD most prevalent
- 57% women
- 21% MCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Belgium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person with Multimorbidity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal carer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal carer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based healthcare Public health nurse; care coordinator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital based clinician Geriatrician; Clinical Nurse Specialists; Physio; Occupational Therapist; Dietician; Speech and Language Therapist; Cardiologist; Endocrinologist</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal care provider</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Outcomes - PwM

• **Hugely impacts on:** Lifestyle, relationships, psychological well-being

• **Lack of awareness of** strategies for self-management

• **Complexities of interactions** between conditions aren’t understood

• **Maintaining independence** - remaining at home - **key motivator!**

• **Barriers to self-management;** Lack of physical mobility; Limitations of conditions

• **Polypharmacy:** difficult keeping track of many medications; Paper-based lists managed by PwM

“If there was one thing I believe that would help people that end up going back into hospital, or end up being at home safer, is a much better pathway in minding their medications”

(Healthcare Professional interviewed in Ireland)
Key Outcomes – Support Actors

- Lack of info on **how to navigate the healthcare system** & absence of one unified care plan.

- **Most information** received verbally/ info leaflets

- Essential role played by **informal carers**

- Additional training needs among **formal carers**

- **Pharmacist** reliable/trusted source of info/support

- **GP** – essential coordinating role

- **Communication difficulties** between healthcare professionals

- “It’s so disjointed, and people are running blind – families, carers, you name it - everyone”
  (Formal care worker interviewed in Ireland)

- “It’s definitely a case of detective work linking into the community, the family, and any of the MDTs that the patient is linked with. God, it’s hard.” (Healthcare Professional interviewed in Ireland)
47 key requirements across a number of categories:

1. Reducing impact of multimorbidity (3)
2. Self-management of multimorbidity (14)
3. Medication management (7)
4. Information, knowledge and education (7)
5. Sources of support (3)
6. Communication (2)
7. Technology use (11)

We employed traditional user-centred HCI techniques to help to translate this qualitative data into meaningful requirements for design supported by the BCW:
Systematically Incorporating BC into Design

• What is the aim of the system?

To improve self management skills and support for PwMs using a digital rather than paper based system

• What is the behaviour that needs to change to do this?

PwM - needs to change their behaviour from managing their conditions using memory and paper based strategies to a digital self management tool

• Systematic approach to address this?

The Behavioural Change Wheel approach involves an 8-stage process for developing behavioural change diagnoses and targeted interventional strategies.

• Synthesis of 19 frameworks to classify interventions (health, environment, culture change and social marketing)

• Centre: COM-B model

• Inner ring: Nine intervention functions (what purpose(s) we the intervention serves)

• Outer ring: Seven policy categories

(Michie, Atkins and West, 2014)
Why apply the BCW model?

• Enabled us to design ProACT technology as a behaviour change intervention

• Understanding target behaviours within the framework of COM-B provides the first steps in selecting appropriate intervention strategies to bring about the desired change.

• UI Through the process of creating intervention strategies for each of the targets, we have translated intervention functions into additional application features.

• Behaviour change interventions may fail because the wrong assumptions have been made about what needs to change (Michie, Atkins and West, 2014).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention functions</th>
<th>COM-B components served by intervention functions</th>
<th>BCTs to deliver intervention functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Education              | Psychological capability Reflective motivation  | 5.1 Information about health consequences  
|                        |                                                  | 1.2 Feedback on behaviour            |
|                        |                                                  | 2.7 Feedback on outcome(s) of the behaviour |
|                        |                                                  | 7.1 Prompts/cues                      |
| Training               | Psychological capability Automatic Motivation    | 4.1 Instruction on how to perform a behaviour.  
|                        |                                                  | 6.1 Demonstration of the behaviour      |
|                        |                                                  | 8.3 Habit Formation                   |
| Environmental Restructuring | Physical opportunity                       | 12.5 Adding objects to the environment  
|                        |                                                  | 12.1 Restructuring the physical environment. |
| Persuasion             | Reflective motivation                           | 9.1 Credible source                   |
| Enablement             | Social opportunity                              |                                      |
| Incentivisation        | Reflective motivation                           | 3.1 Social support                    |
|                        |                                                  | 10.4 Social reward                     |
BCW: Implications for Analytics

• BCW has highlighted the importance of *User Engagement metrics and analytics* to help us to evaluate ProACT as a BC intervention

• The BCW has highlighted the need for the *personalisation* of behaviour change techniques and interventions which we have considered in the design of our CareAnalytics (PROACT Artificial Intelligence - IBM)
GOAL SETTING

- Presents particular challenges and complexities for multimorbidity. Due to link with age additional conditions impact on ability to achieve goals.

- S.M.A.R.T goals (Doran, 1981) were not common practice for PwM or care network. Goals were general and not measureable.

- Issue: Lack of awareness around types of realistic goals to set, lack of support from care network (time, not wanting to overload PwM, sense PwM should self direct, care network insufficient data to inform goals). Peer rather than clinical support a key motivator.
1. Data cleaner

2. Probabilistic Health and Wellness Profile Builder

3. Goal Recommender

4. Education Recommender

5. User Engagement Analyser
1. Present PwM Goal Suggestions taking into account their complete profile and health and well-being status

2. Education to understanding how to set realistic goals themselves based on data feedback

3. System to support true collaborative goal settings, initiated by PwM

4. System can support single disease if necessary when acute difficulty with one condition is identified.

5. Flexibility of goal revision - to account for bad and good health days
Evaluating ProACT as a BC Intervention

Each of the BC targets will be evaluated by:

- **Analysing system usage statistics** – how participants engage with specific features of the system i.e. measuring symptoms, recognising change, view education content

- **Quantitative trial assessment data (assessment measures)**

- **Qualitative interview data** – Thematic Analysis - Understand experiences

**23 key metrics including:** Session length, dashboard time, reflection screen time, view readings time, view reading screen responses health tips time, my info time, button presses on each screen, daily app opens etc.

**19 Assessments including:** Usability (T2;T3;T4), Burden (T2;T3;T4), technology proficiency (T1;T4), social connectedness (T1, T4), QoL (T1-T4), self efficacy (T1-T4, illness perceptions (T1-4), self-management (T1-T4), Demo (T1), med lists (T1;T4)

**Interview schedules, reflect key assessment areas above.**
Conclusion

• DBCIs require theories and models of behavior change that capture and take into account individual variation and changes over time and in context.

• There should be increased movement toward theories and models that are as precise, quantitative, and testable as possible for describing the complexity of behavior change.

• Digital interventions should systematically adopt behavioural change approaches.

• The inherent complexity of behavior change implies that no one research group is likely to, alone fully understand its application in DBCI’s. Need for more transdisciplinary research consortia.