

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Quality of life and disease experience in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in Spain: an ethnographic study

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID | bmjopen-2021-053216 |
| Article Type: | Original research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 07-May-2021 |
| Complete List of Authors: | <p>Rubio, Raül; Piece of Pie, Palacios, Beatriz; AstraZeneca Farmacéutica Spain SA Varela, Luis; AstraZeneca Farmacéutica Spain SA Fernández de la Fundación, Raquel; AstraZeneca Farmacéutica Spain SA Camargo Correa, Selene; Piece of Pie Estupiñan, María Fernanda; Piece of Pie Calvo, Elena; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group José, Nuria; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Ruiz Muñoz, Marta; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Yun, Sergi; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Jiménez-Marrero, Santiago; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Alcoberro, Lidia; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Garay, Alberto; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardio-Oncology Unit Moliner, Pedro; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardio-Oncology Unit Sánchez-Fernández, Lydia; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardio-Oncology Unit Soria Gómez, María Teresa; Puerta de Hierro University Hospital of Majadahonda, Heart Failure Unit Hidalgo, Encarna; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Enjuanes, C; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group</p> |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | Calero-Molina, Esther; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Rueda, Yolanda; CardioAlianza San Saturnino, Maite; CardioAlianza Garcimartín, Paloma; Hospital del Mar, Outpatients Clinics; Hospital del Mar Institute for Medical Research, Biomedical Research in Heart Diseases López-Ibor, Jorge; Puerta de Hierro University Hospital of Majadahonda, Cardiology Segovia-Cubero, Javier; Puerta de Hierro University Hospital of Majadahonda, Cardiology; Carlos III Health Institute, CIBER of Cardiovascular Diseases Comin-Colet, Josep; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group |
| Keywords: | Heart failure < CARDIOLOGY, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

Original research

Quality of life and disease experience in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in Spain: an ethnographic study

Raül Rubio,¹ Beatriz Palacios,² Luis Varela,² Raquel Fernández de la Fundación,² Selene Camargo Correa,¹ María Fernanda Estupiñan,¹ Elena Calvo,^{3,4} Nuria José,^{3,4} Marta Ruiz Muñoz,^{3,4} Sergi Yun,^{3,4} Santiago Jiménez-Marrero,^{3,4} Lidia Alcoberro^{3,4} Alberto Garay,^{3,5} Pedro Moliner,^{3,5} Lydia Sánchez-Fernández,^{3,5} María Teresa Soria Gómez,⁶ Encarna Hidalgo,^{3,4} Cristina Enjuanes,^{3,4} Esther Calero-Molina,^{3,4} Yolanda Rueda,⁷ Maite San Saturnino,⁷ Paloma Garcimartín,^{8,9} Jorge V. López-Ibor,¹⁰ Javier Segovia-Cubero,^{11,12} Josep Comin-Colet^{3,4,13}

1. A Piece of Pie SL, Barcelona, Spain
2. AstraZeneca Farmacéutica Spain SA, Madrid, Spain
3. Cardiology Department and Heart Failure Program, Bellvitge University Hospital, Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain
4. BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group, Bellvitge Biomedical Research Institute (IDIBELL), Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain
5. Cardio-Oncology Unit, Bellvitge University Hospital, Catalan Institute of Oncology, L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Spain
6. Heart Failure Unit, Puerta de Hierro University Hospital, Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain
7. CardioAlianza, Barcelona, Spain
8. Outpatient Clinics, Hospital del Mar, Parc de Salut Mar, Barcelona, Spain

- 1
2
3 9. Biomedical Research in Heart Diseases, Hospital del Mar, Medical Research
4
5 Institute (IMIM), Barcelona, Spain
6
7 10. Outpatient Heart Failure Clinic, Department of Cardiology, Puerta de Hierro
8
9 University Hospital, Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain
10
11 11. Department of Cardiology, Puerta de Hierro University Hospital, Majadahonda,
12
13 Madrid, Spain
14
15 12. CIBER of Cardiovascular Diseases, Carlos III Institute, Madrid, Spain
16
17 13. Department of Clinical Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Barcelona,
18
19 Barcelona, Spain
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Correspondence to: Raül Rubio, A Piece of Pie SL, Aribau 179, 08036 Barcelona,
27
28 Spain

29
30 Email: raul@piecepie.com
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Word count: 3,746

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To gather insights on the disease experience of patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), assessing the correlation between patients' experiences and narratives related to the disease and data collected through standardized patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs). Also, to explore new ways of evaluating the burden experienced by patients and caregivers.

Design: Observational, descriptive, multicenter, cross-sectional, qualitative study.

Setting: Secondary care, patient's homes.

Participants: Twenty patients with HFrEF (NYHAs I-III) aged 38-85 years.

Measures: PROMs EuroQoL 5D-5L and Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire and patient interview and observation.

Results: A total of 20 patients with HFrEF participated in the study. The patients' mean (SD) age was 72.5 (11.4) years, 65% were male, and were classified in NYHA functional classes I (N=4), II (N=7) and III (N=9). The study showed a strong impact of HF in the patients' quality of life (QoL) and disease experience, as revealed by the in-depth interviews and the standardized PROMs. Patients and caregivers often disagreed describing and evaluating perceived QoL. Patients related current QoL to distant life experiences or to critical moments in their disease, such as hospitalizations. Anxiety over the disease progression is apparent in both patients and caregivers, suggesting that caregiver-specific tools should be developed.

Conclusions: PROMs are an effective way of assessing symptoms over the most recent time period. However, especially in chronic diseases such as HFrEF, PROM scores could be complemented with additional tools to gain a better understanding of the patient's status. New PROMs designed to evaluate and compare specific points in the life of the patient could be clinically more useful to assess changes in health status.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study followed an ethnographic approach to collect data on patient's experiences and narratives related to heart failure, a type of study not before carried out in Spain and with scarce reports worldwide.
- Both patients and caregivers could discuss freely and explain in detail the aspects of the disease that they considered under control and those where change was deemed necessary.
- The often-contrasting views of patients and caregivers highlighted the difficulties in obtaining accurate and objective evaluations of quality of life.
- Although the selection of patients aimed for inclusiveness and diversity, the limited number of HFrEF patients selected for in-depth analysis may not be fully representative of the population of HFrEF patients in Spain.
- The ethnographic interviews took place in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, which transformed the daily routines of patients and caregivers and may have to a certain extent altered their perspective of living with HFrEF.

INTRODUCTION

Despite advances in treatment, heart failure (HF) remains one of the leading causes of hospitalization and readmissions, death and disability worldwide.^{1,2} The economic burden of HF, mainly driven by recurrent hospitalizations, consumes an estimated 1-2% of healthcare budgets.^{3,4} The progressive aging of the population in some Western countries, such as Spain, and increasing HF prevalence, have positioned this disease as a major public health problem.⁵⁻⁷

Clinically, HF can be classified based on the left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) into HF with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), defined as an EF $\leq 40\%$, mid-range ejection fraction (HFmrEF), defined as EF $>40\%$ and $<50\%$, and HF with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), defined as an ejection fraction $\geq 50\%$.⁸ Patients in these subgroups often have distinct underlying etiologies, demographics, comorbidities and response to therapies.^{9,10} Additionally, the presence and severity of symptoms and exercise intolerance of patients with HF is usually categorized following the New York Heart Association (NYHA) classification into four functional classes (I-IV), being class IV the worst.¹¹

HF can severely affect the quality of life (QoL) of the patient by reducing their independence and ability to undertake daily living activities, and can also disturb their mental health and psychosocial well-being.^{12,13} Prior studies have shown that patients with HF had an even higher incidence of limitations than patients with chronic diseases such as diabetes, cancer, or Alzheimer's disease.¹³ Several patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) have been used to quantify health status in patients with HF, such as the generic EuroQoL 5D-5L (EQ-5D-5L) and the disease-specific Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ).¹³⁻¹⁷ PROMs such as the KCCQ have a good correlation with prognosis and their use has been encouraged by the American Heart Association in both routine clinical practice and clinical trials of new therapies.^{18,19} However, although these PROMs can be useful indicators of health status and how HF

1
2
3 impacts patients' QoL within a 2-week recall period, they have not been designed to
4 reflect some of the patient's and caregiver's perspectives on living with HF, including
5 aspects such as the importance of interactions with family or healthcare providers,
6 feelings related to the course of their disease, or barriers to accessing healthcare
7 resources.²⁰ These unique aspects of culture, preferences, customs, values and
8 attitudes, could have an impact on treatment effectiveness and outcomes.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15 Complementary to PROMs, patient-reported experience measures (PREMs) are useful
16 to evaluate quality of patient care and the interaction between the patient and the
17 healthcare system.^{21,22} However, neglecting the limitations of both PREMs and PROMs
18 could hinder our understanding of the patient's attitudes and real-life disease
19 experiences.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Ethnographic qualitative studies involve observation of the patients and
caregivers in their real-world settings to determine how they behave in specific
contexts. Ethnographic research collects comprehensive information from multiple
sources such as interviews, caregiver perspectives, non-participant observation of
healthcare visits and home tours, among others, and has previously been carried out to
investigate QoL in patients with HF.^{12,23–28} Previous ethnographic studies conducted in
patients from the United Kingdom identified barriers to interventions for HF and critical
points on disease pathways which resulted in an increase in the risk of admission.^{29–31}

Little is known about the patient's and caregiver's perspective of living with HF,
and no study in this context has been performed in Spain. The objective of this study
was to gather insights on the disease experiences of patients with HFrEF and their
caregivers, and the impact on their everyday life. The parallel use of an ethnographic
approach with PROMs for the assessment of health status (EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ)
allowed qualitative comparison of both types of results. The goal was to improve
awareness of healthcare professionals, service providers, policy makers and educators
on the factors that can potentially influence treatment effectiveness, and the existence
of aspects of the patient's experience that are not covered by existing tools. In turn, this

1
2
3 may encourage firstly, a more active participation of healthcare providers, patients and
4
5 caregivers in clinical decisions considering not only the disease state, but also cultural
6
7 factors and individual values and attitudes, and secondly, the development of
8
9 instruments for the evaluation of healthcare interventions.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

METHODS

This was an observational, descriptive, multicenter, cross-sectional, qualitative study to obtain insights regarding HFrEF patients' perception and attitudes towards their disease. The patients in the study were recruited at the Departments of Cardiology of 2 large tertiary-level hospitals, namely, the Puerta del Hierro University Hospital (Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain) and the Bellvitge University Hospital (Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain). The patient populations attended by these hospitals were socioeconomically very distinct, as the Puerta del Hierro University Hospital is located at a high-income district of Madrid, and the Bellvitge University Hospital covers a suburban area of mostly low or very low-income patients. Due to the qualitative and observational design of the study, there was no masking or randomization. Clinical management of the patients followed routine clinical practice, with no changes in treatment or additional clinical assessments specific for this study. All decisions related to disease management were made at the discretion of the treating physician without interference by the sponsor. Informed consent was obtained from each patient prior to study initiation. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Review Board of the Bellvitge University Hospital on March 12th, 2020 with number PR062/20.

Patients

Patients were assessed for eligibility by local clinical staff according to selection criteria at each participating center. Patients were classified by NYHA class and could be belong to any of the 4 classes I to IV. The inclusion criteria were ≥ 18 years at the time of consent, established documented diagnosis of HFrEF (LVEF $\leq 40\%$), and signed consent to participate. Patients unable to complete the PROMs because of any psychological or physical condition and patients hospitalized at inclusion were excluded.

Data collection

The patient's demographic information and medical history were collected from medical records at the selection visit. On the day of the home visit the patients first completed two health status questionnaires and then a multidisciplinary team composed of social scientists conducted a semi-structured interview following a topic guide to allow respondents to express their experiences and feelings related to HF. The topic guide was organized in 6 domains: 1, personal life account and current context; 2, life experience with previous diseases and current comorbidities; 3, living and personal experience with HF; 4, perception of QoL before and after diagnosis of the disease; 5, relationship with the caregiver and its environment; and 6, relationship with healthcare providers. The interview conducted at the patient's home lasted approximately 90 minutes. In some instances, with the consent of the patient, his/her closest caregivers were interviewed at the patient's home on the same day for about 30 min. The interview with the caregivers aimed at understanding their perception of the patient's status and evaluating their social and emotional relationship with the patient.

Selected patients were accompanied to the first healthcare appointment after the interview. In the interaction with healthcare providers researchers focused on the initial and main topics of conversation with healthcare provider, questions by patients and caregivers, and general attitude of patients. Also patients and caregivers were asked to evaluate the medical visit. Researchers added analytical and reflexive comments to field notes immediately after conducting interviews and observations.

The in-depth interview aimed to capture the patients' experience with the disease from their own point of view, whereas the non-participant observation during the medical visits allowed to investigate the relationship with the healthcare practitioners for both of patients and family members.

Data were collected by audio recording and notes, taking into consideration all aspects of the patient's life and in all cases protecting the patient's data privacy. Subsequently, data triangulation was used to integrate quantitative and qualitative

1
2
3 information by ethnographers, individually and in joint sessions. The analytical process
4
5 aimed to reach theoretical saturation.
6
7
8

9 ***Outcomes and assessments***

10
11 The following primary variables were assessed: the patient's profile; the patient's
12
13 emotional perception (values, attitude, frustration, fear) during the HFrEF journey,
14
15 including the role of the caregiver; key relationships and communication processes
16
17 during the patient HFrEF journey (patient-doctor, patient-carer/family); main barriers to
18
19 accessing healthcare services experienced by patients during the HFrEF journey; and
20
21 the patient's unmet needs (cognitive, emotional and functional) associated with HF.
22
23

24
25 Secondary variables assessed included PROMs by using the EQ-5D-5L and
26
27 KCCQ. The EQ-5D-5L is a self-reported questionnaire used to derive a standardized
28
29 measure of health status, also referred to as a utility score.³² The KCCQ is a self-
30
31 administered HF-specific instrument and has shown to be a valid, reliable and
32
33 responsive measure for patients with HF.¹⁴ Spanish validated versions of these
34
35 questionnaires were used.^{33,34} For the EQ-5D-5L, the number and percentage of
36
37 patients reporting any type of limitation for each questionnaire dimension, the number
38
39 and percentage of patients reporting "severe" or "extreme" responses for each
40
41 questionnaire dimension, as well as the index value and the visual analogue scale
42
43 (VAS) score, were assessed; for the KCCQ, the score for each domain/subdomain,
44
45 and a summary score for the total symptom score, clinical symptom score and overall
46
47 summary score were assessed.
48
49
50

51 ***Statistical methods***

52
53 Observational data, interviews and documentary materials were analyzed at three
54
55 levels: individual patient cases, across cases within research centers, and across
56
57 research centers to synthesis. The PROMs were analyzed descriptively.
58
59
60

RESULTS

Patient characteristics

A total of 20 patients with HFrEF participated in the study (Table 1). The mean (SD) age of the patients was 72.5 (11.4) years (range, 38-85 years), and 13 (65.0%) were male. The study included 4, 7 and 9 patients in NYHA functional classes I-III, respectively. Although the study protocol was designed to include class IV patients, their frailty, and the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in the patients' self-caring strategies, hindered the participation of any patients in this class. Twelve patients were being treated at the Bellvitge University Hospital and 8 patients were being treated at the Puerta del Hierro University Hospital.

Understanding of QoL by patients with HF

During the in-depth interviews, the participants described how living with HFrEF impacted their lives, including how they experienced the symptoms of HF and their effects on daily routines (summarized in Table 3). Their responses provided relevant insights on what QoL meant to them. For many patients, QoL was "being able to do what they did before" and missed being independent, their everyday life and maintaining an active lifestyle.

Patients tended to self-limit and isolate to limit symptomatology due to progression-related fears or even fear to a sudden death, despite a more sedentary lifestyle being detrimental to the recovery and to their own QoL.

Impact of demographic factors in perception of QoL

1
2
3 Attitudes and perceptions towards HFrEF seemed to strongly depend on age and
4 education. Young patients tend to be more informed about the disease and challenge
5 the healthcare practitioners' opinions.
6
7

8
9 In contrast, older patients had a difficult time differentiating between HFrEF
10 symptoms and those associated with the normal process of ageing. Often caregivers
11 had to help them understand the information provided by healthcare workers.
12
13

14
15 The interviews also revealed that male patients showed more dependency towards
16 caregivers than their female counterparts. Female caregivers tended to strongly
17 challenge male patients' perception of QoL. In one case, the wife of a 63-year old
18 NYHA III patient was very critical of her husband's attitude and thought that part of his
19 evolution strongly depended on his will, and asked him to exercise more, read, get on
20 the computer, and go out for a ride on the motorcycle. They even consulted with a
21 psychologist friend to help them handle the situation.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 ***PROMs and health status***

33
34 The results of the EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ showed a high correlation with the NYHA
35 functional classes, and also between the two PROMs (Table 2). No differences were
36 observed in scores with respect to gender, or between the patients from the two
37 hospitals.
38
39
40
41
42

43 Some patients with lower NYHAs, despite having visible constraints in health
44 status, indicated high scores in the EQ-5D-5L VAS score. For example, a 76-year-old
45 female with major comorbidities [patient 1-10] with NYHA I indicated a EQ-5D-5L VAS
46 score of 90 and emphasized that her QoL was good. This contrasted with the views
47 expressed by her caregiver.
48
49
50
51
52

53 Regardless of the NYHA, some patients seemed to minimize and relativize the
54 impact of HFrEF on their QoL. Caregivers, in contrast, could emphasize the limitations
55 imposed by HFrEF. For example, the wife and caregiver of a 79-year-old, NYHA II
56 male patient [1-11] indicated that in the consultation with the cardiologist the patient
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 usually underestimated his condition. In another case, the wife of a 74-year-old NYHA
4
5 III male patient commented that she must be “present with the doctors, because when
6
7 they ask him something, he usually answers that he is fine and does not really say
8
9 what is wrong with him.”
10

11 Patients with advanced NYHAs, who experienced one or several hospital
12
13 admissions, compared their current experience with the disease to those acute periods
14
15 of fear and greater uncertainty. Patients showed a limited portrait of their QoL due to
16
17 the required reference to the last 2-weeks in the questionnaire. For example, a NYHA
18
19 III male patient [2-8] had doubts when filling out the questionnaires since he related his
20
21 mobility limitations to a problem with his legs (a consequence of an aortic dissection)
22
23 but he did not relate it to HF. Also, he mentioned that his physical and emotional
24
25 situation was much better now compared to the initial moments where he was more
26
27 affected. He had a hard time taking the prior two weeks as a reference point, therefore
28
29 his responses showed a feeling of improvement compared to the most critical
30
31 moments.
32
33

34 Another NYHA III patient [2-6] had doubts when filling the questionnaires, since
35
36 his symptoms varied from day to day and between morning, afternoon and night. He
37
38 also had moments of crises where he considered his symptoms to be worse, so limiting
39
40 to the last two weeks seemed difficult. Likewise, he stated that shortness of breath or
41
42 air was something he thought he got from lying down for a long time and not that it was
43
44 a symptom of HFrEF.
45
46

47 Caregivers could overestimate and present a dramatic view of the patient's day-
48
49 to-day life with HFrEF. Family caregivers showed more distress when discussing their
50
51 relatives with HFrEF compared to that showed by remunerated caregivers:
52
53
54

55 *“she is concerned about his low spirits and his anguish. She says that the*
56
57 *symptoms she develops from anxiety can “mask” the symptoms of HF,*
58
59
60

1
2
3 *such as pressure and pain in the chest, agitation, a feeling of suffocation.”*

4
5 [caregiver of patient 1-8, NYHA III]

6
7
8
9 *“As cardiologists told us that little can be done to improve his condition, we*
10
11 *live these years ‘as a gift’.”* [caregiver of patient 1-6]

12 13 14 15 **Caregivers’ roles and needs**

16
17 In this study, only five patients were able to live without a caregiver. Generally, strong
18 family bonds were apparent and important for the patient. Caregivers were often in
19 charge of organizing visits to the healthcare providers, keeping track of parameters
20 such as weight and blood pressure, and administering medication. Caregivers acted
21 also as interpreters of the disease status on behalf of their patients.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 **Relationships with healthcare providers**

32 The interactions between patients and caregivers with healthcare workers at
33 hospitals were investigated by the social scientists by accompanying them to a
34 medical appointment. The study showed that patients are usually highly positive
35 about their experience with cardiologists and nurses. A 58-year-old male patient
36 [1-9] explained that the nurse called him weekly to ask about how he was
37 coping, and to discuss data such as weight and blood pressure changes. He
38 generally felt very accompanied by the hospital staff, both cardiologists and
39 nurses. Other patients also expressed a high opinion of the healthcare
40 personnel. Often patients highly value their relationship with the nurse, as they
41 probably feel more confident to express their experiences to his/her.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

DISCUSSION

In this study we used ethnographic methods with HFREF patients and their caregivers, complemented with general and disease-specific health status assessments, to obtain insights regarding patients' disease perception and attitudes towards their disease.

Ethnographic methods adopt a phenomenological perspective, aiming to understand individuals' life experiences to acquire relevant knowledge. The results of this study suggest that the patient's perspectives of their QoL were dependent on their memories of what they could do before, and often were better than reality. Caregivers, in contrast, offered a distinct view of the patient's status and QoL, often substantially worse and emphasizing the severity of their life-limiting condition.

As healthcare systems aim to become more 'patient-centered', there is a recognized need to capture accurately the patient's experience of the disease, in an effort to improve it. The use of various forms of PREMs and PROMs have therefore become common in assessing current treatments and new therapies and medical interventions, although their application in clinical practice is still very limited. Despite their widespread use by cardiologists, an awareness of the limitations of PROMs when evaluating the experience of the patient with HF is critical for their interpretation. For example, the effects of comorbid conditions could add confounding factors to the evaluation of HF through a single PROM instrument. Likewise, patients often relate their overall QoL experience to the moments of crisis, such as hospitalizations, 'anchoring' all subsequent experiences to those events and distorting their responses in the questionnaires.

In the general population the understanding of HF and its outcome is low, contributing to anxiety about the evolution of the disease in both patients and caregivers. In contrast, other life-limiting diseases, such as cancer, often have better-defined pathways of care and psychosocial support.³¹ In this regard, patient associations and support groups could play a role by helping the patient understand

1
2
3 the disease, the treatments, and the expectations. Patient associations promote social
4 integration and help patient share their experiences, providing the necessary
5 encouragement to cope with their disease and go on with daily activities. Also, as
6 reflected in some of the interviews described in this study, it is important for the patient
7 to feel that he/she can have rapid access to medical services. In this regard, the study
8 reflected that that while some patients were reluctant to discuss aspects of daily life or
9 to express their feelings and fears to the cardiologist, they were more open and felt
10 closer to the nurse, a relationship that was highly valued by many patients. Generally,
11 an efficient and fluid communication with all the healthcare providers involved in the
12 treatment is essential.^{12,30}

23
24 The study revealed that the fear to losing independence and the uncertainty
25 about the progress of their disease could be factors that motivate some HF patients to
26 downplay their limitations. Conversely, caregivers could overemphasize the poor QoL
27 of the patients, also motivated by concerns of the progress of the disease, its
28 unpredictable trajectory, and lack of proper knowledge and training. Also, it is possible
29 that, since these caregivers were very often family members, their views could be
30 overstated due to emotional attachment to the patient. In any case, these results
31 suggest that instruments should be developed to help caregivers in their daily work with
32 patients with HF, so that they are better informed on the course of the disease and
33 expectations.²⁶ In this regard, numerous recent studies have highlighted challenges
34 experienced by caregivers of patients with HF.³⁵⁻³⁸ Some initiatives along these lines,
35 such as caregiver-specific QoL questionnaires,³⁹ and video coaching,^{40,41} are currently
36 being developed and tested.

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 The results of our study suggest recommendations for future PROM design or
52 questionnaire selection. In patients with HF the PROM instruments should aim to truly
53 mirror patients' experience, using language that the patient associates with their
54 cultural views of QoL. To provide insights on relevant changes in QoL, the PROMs
55 should be constructed to capture specific timepoints related to the patient experience
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (e.g., healthcare status before the diagnosis, and before and after hospitalizations). In
4
5 this way, reference points in the patient's lives could be established that favored
6
7 meaningful QoL before/after comparisons. Instruments should allow an alternative
8
9 stratification based on these clinical events and patients' perceived QoL along them.
10
11 Also, as self-care behaviors can greatly affect symptoms in patients with HF,⁴² the
12
13 patient's self-caring strategies, perception of autonomy, level of empowerment, and the
14
15 perception of past and present experiences with the disease should be taken into
16
17 consideration when developing and introducing future PRO instruments.⁴³ Finally,
18
19 additional instruments should be developed to evaluate the key aspects of the patient'
20
21 support system, and explore caregivers' needs.
22
23

24
25 Given the lack of studies assessing the patient's and caregiver's perspective on
26
27 the HFrEF pathway in Spain, this study aimed to fill this gap to better understand
28
29 possible cultural differences. The ethnographic approach, which involved in-depth
30
31 interviews with patients at their homes and with their caregivers, made it possible to
32
33 collect relevant data not normally discussed or shared in healthcare facilities. Both
34
35 patients and caregivers could talk freely and explain the aspects of the disease that
36
37 they considered under control and those where change was deemed necessary.
38
39 However, a limitation of this study is that the small sample size, although not unusual in
40
41 qualitative research that requires extensive and detailed analysis of each patient, may
42
43 not fully represent the diversity of people with HFrEF in Spain. Also, as it is the case in
44
45 other ethnographic studies, interviewing patients and caregivers together may have
46
47 resulted in individual perspectives being altered or withheld. Finally, since this study
48
49 was carried out during the COVID-19 pandemic, it is possible that the disruption
50
51 imposed by the social restrictions could have some effect in the results described here.
52
53

54
55 In conclusion, this study analyzed, by the use of PROMs and in-depth
56
57 interviews, the complexity of the actual experiences of the patients with HFrEF. The
58
59 lack of knowledge about the disease generates confusion and anxiety about
60
symptoms, and patients could tend to minimize the impact of HF in QoL. Patients tend

1
2
3 to maintain a closer relationship with their nurses, compared with the cardiologist,
4 favoring a more open discussion of feelings and experiences related to the disease
5 with them. In order to provide personalized care to HF_rEF patients, QoL could be
6 assessed by comparing two points in time, thus helping the healthcare practitioner
7 understand the patient's point of view of specific interventions. Since QoL is a
8 multidimensional, subjective concept that is affected by a variety of factors, its
9 evaluation should be carefully designed to capture specific moments and changes in
10 the trajectory of the disease. The study suggests that tools and training should be
11 made available to caregivers to alleviate the burden of care and anxiety derived from
12 uncertainty in the progression of the disease. Further work is needed to fully integrate
13 the use of well-designed and useful PROMs and PREMs into clinical practice.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Acknowledgements**

33 Medical writing assistance was provided by Francisco López de Saro, PhD (Trialance).
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Contributors**

40 RR, LV, SCC, JCC and BP conceived and designed the study. JCC, EC, EH, ECB,
41 PGC, NJ, MRM, CE, SY, SJM, LAT, AGM, PMB, LYF, JSC, SVL, and MSG contributed
42 to patient recruitment and data collection. JCC, JSC, BP, LV, SCC, MFE, and RR
43 compiled and analyzed the data. JCC, BP, LV, SCC, and RR drafted the manuscript,
44 which was revised by the other authors. All authors read and approved the final
45 manuscript.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Funding**

56 This work was supported by AstraZeneca España.
57
58
59
60

Competing interests

JCC received fees from AstraZeneca for the coordination and oversight of the study.

RR, MFE, and SCC received research funding from AstraZeneca. RFdIF, BP, and LV are employees of AstraZeneca. All other authors report no competing interests.

Patient and public involvement

CardioAlianza, a Spanish association of patients with cardiovascular disease and their caregivers, was involved in designing, providing feedback for interpretation of data, and in the dissemination of this research.

Patient consent for publication

Informed consent for participation in the study and publication of the results were obtained from each patient prior to study initiation.

Ethics approval

This study was approved by the Ethics Review Board of the Bellvitge University Hospital on March 12th, 2020 with number PR062/20.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on reasonable request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to their containing information that could compromise the privacy of research participants.

REFERENCES

1. Savarese G, Lund LH. Global Public Health Burden of Heart Failure. *Card Fail Rev*. 2017;3(1):7-11. doi:10.15420/cfr.2016:25:2
2. Crespo-Leiro MG, Metra M, Lund LH, et al. Advanced heart failure: a position statement of the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2018;20(11):1505-1535. doi:10.1002/ejhf.1236
3. Hollingworth W, Biswas M, Maishman RL, et al. The healthcare costs of heart failure during the last five years of life: A retrospective cohort study. *Int J Cardiol*. 2016;224:132-138. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2016.09.021
4. Agbor VN, Ntusi NAB, Noubiap JJ. An overview of heart failure in low- and middle-income countries. *Cardiovasc Diagn Ther*. 2020;10(2):244-251. doi:10.21037/cdt.2019.08.03
5. Farré N, Vela E, Clèries M, et al. Medical resource use and expenditure in patients with chronic heart failure: a population-based analysis of 88 195 patients. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2016;18(9):1132-1140. doi:10.1002/ejhf.549
6. Farré N, Vela E, Clèries M, et al. Real world heart failure epidemiology and outcome: A population-based analysis of 88,195 patients. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(2):e0172745. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0172745
7. Méndez-Bailón M, Jiménez-García R, Hernández-Barrera V, et al. Significant and constant increase in hospitalization due to heart failure in Spain over 15 year period. *Eur J Intern Med*. 2019;64:48-56. doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2019.02.019
8. Ponikowski P, Voors AA, Anker SD, et al. 2016 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure: The Task Force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) Developed with the special contribution of the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur Heart J*. 2016;37(27):2129-2200. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehw128
9. Bhatt AS, Abraham WT, Lindenfeld J, et al. Treatment of HF in an Era of Multiple Therapies: Statement From the HF Collaboratory. *JACC Heart Fail*. 2021;9(1):1-12. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2020.10.014
10. Upadhyya B, Kitzman DW. Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: New approaches to diagnosis and management. *Clin Cardiol*. 2020;43(2):145-155. doi:10.1002/clc.23321
11. Criteria Committee, New York Heart Association. *Diseases of the Heart and Blood Vessels. Nomenclature and Criteria for Diagnosis*. 6th ed. Little, Brown; 1964.
12. Fry M, McLachlan S, Purdy S, Sanders T, Kadam UT, Chew-Graham CA. The implications of living with heart failure; the impact on everyday life, family support, co-morbidities and access to healthcare: a secondary qualitative analysis. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2016;17(1):139. doi:10.1186/s12875-016-0537-5
13. Comín-Colet J, Anguita M, Formiga F, et al. Health-related Quality of Life of Patients With Chronic Systolic Heart Failure in Spain: Results of the VIDA-IC

- 1
2
3 Study. *Revista Española de Cardiología*. 2016;69(3):256-271.
4 doi:10.1016/j.recesp.2015.07.034
5
- 6 14. Green CP, Porter CB, Bresnahan DR, Spertus JA. Development and evaluation of
7 the Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire: a new health status measure for
8 heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2000;35(5):1245-1255. doi:10.1016/s0735-
9 1097(00)00531-3
10
- 11 15. Garin O, Herdman M, Vilagut G, et al. Assessing health-related quality of life in
12 patients with heart failure: a systematic, standardized comparison of available
13 measures. *Heart Fail Rev*. 2014;19(3):359-367. doi:10.1007/s10741-013-9394-7
14
- 15 16. Burns DJP, Arora J, Okunade O, et al. International Consortium for Health
16 Outcomes Measurement (ICHOM): Standardized Patient-Centered Outcomes
17 Measurement Set for Heart Failure Patients. *JACC: Heart Failure*. 2020;8(3):212-
18 222. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2019.09.007
19
- 20 17. Kelkar AA, Spertus J, Pang P, et al. Utility of Patient-Reported Outcome
21 Instruments in Heart Failure. *JACC Heart Fail*. 2016;4(3):165-175.
22 doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2015.10.015
23
- 24 18. Rumsfeld JS, Alexander KP, Goff DC, et al. Cardiovascular health: the importance
25 of measuring patient-reported health status: a scientific statement from the
26 American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2013;127(22):2233-2249.
27 doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e3182949a2e
28
- 29 19. Psozka MA, von Maltzahn R, Anatchkova M, et al. Patient-Reported Outcomes in
30 Chronic Heart Failure: Applicability for Regulatory Approval. *JACC Heart Fail*.
31 2016;4(10):791-804. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2016.04.010
32
- 33 20. Nieminen MS, Dickstein K, Fonseca C, et al. The patient perspective: Quality of life
34 in advanced heart failure with frequent hospitalisations. *International Journal of*
35 *Cardiology*. 2015;191:256-264. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2015.04.235
36
- 37 21. Lagha E, Noble A, Smith A, Denvir MA, Leslie SJ. Patient Reported Experience
38 Measures (PREMs) in chronic heart failure. *J R Coll Physicians Edinb*.
39 2012;42(4):301-305. doi:10.4997/JRCPE.2012.404
40
- 41 22. Pennucci F, De Rosis S, Passino C. Piloting a web-based systematic collection and
42 reporting of patient-reported outcome measures and patient-reported experience
43 measures in chronic heart failure. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(10):e037754.
44 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-037754
45
- 46 23. Heo S, Lennie TA, Okoli C, Moser DK. Quality of life in patients with heart failure:
47 ask the patients. *Heart Lung*. 2009;38(2):100-108. doi:10.1016/j.hrtlng.2008.04.002
48
- 49 24. Gwaltney. Hearing the voice of the heart failure patient: key experiences identified
50 in qualitative interviews. *Br J Cardiol*. 2012;19(1). doi:10.5837/bjc.2012.004
51
- 52 25. Etemadifar S, Bahrami M, Shahriari M, Farsani AK. Family caregivers' experiences
53 of caring for patients with heart failure: a descriptive, exploratory qualitative study. *J*
54 *Nurs Res*. 2015;23(2):153-161. doi:10.1097/JNR.0000000000000076
55
- 56 26. Grant JS, Graven LJ. Problems experienced by informal caregivers of individuals
57 with heart failure: An integrative review. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2018;80:41-66.
58 doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.12.016
59
60

- 1
2
3 27. Bjornsdottir K, Ketilsdottir A, Gudnadottir M, Kristinsdottir IV, Ingadottir B.
4 Integration of nursing services provided to patients with heart failure living at home:
5 A longitudinal ethnographic study. *J Clin Nurs*. Published online January 12, 2021.
6 doi:10.1111/jocn.15658
7
- 8 28. Kim EY, Oh S, Son Y-J. Caring experiences of family caregivers of patients with
9 heart failure: A meta-ethnographic review of the past 10 years. *Eur J Cardiovasc*
10 *Nurs*. 2020;19(6):473-485. doi:10.1177/1474515120915040
11
- 12 29. Simmonds R, Glogowska M, McLachlan S, et al. Unplanned admissions and the
13 organisational management of heart failure: a multicentre ethnographic, qualitative
14 study. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(10):e007522. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007522
15
- 16 30. Glogowska M, Simmonds R, McLachlan S, et al. Managing patients with heart
17 failure: a qualitative study of multidisciplinary teams with specialist heart failure
18 nurses. *Ann Fam Med*. 2015;13(5):466-471. doi:10.1370/afm.1845
19
- 20 31. Glogowska M, Simmonds R, McLachlan S, et al. "Sometimes we can't fix things": a
21 qualitative study of health care professionals' perceptions of end of life care for
22 patients with heart failure. *BMC Palliat Care*. 2016;15:3. doi:10.1186/s12904-016-
23 0074-y
24
- 25 32. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, et al. Development and preliminary testing of the
26 new five-level version of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L). *Qual Life Res*. 2011;20(10):1727-
27 1736. doi:10.1007/s11136-011-9903-x
28
- 29 33. Hernandez G, Garin O, Pardo Y, et al. Validity of the EQ-5D-5L and reference
30 norms for the Spanish population. *Qual Life Res*. 2018;27(9):2337-2348.
31 doi:10.1007/s11136-018-1877-5
32
- 33 34. Comín-Colet J, Garin O, Lupón J, et al. Validación de la versión española del
34 Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire. *Revista Española de Cardiología*.
35 2011;64(1):51-58. doi:10.1016/j.recesp.2010.10.003
36
- 37 35. Wingham J, Frost J, Britten N. Behind the smile: qualitative study of caregivers'
38 anguish and management responses while caring for someone living with heart
39 failure. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(7):e014126. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014126
40
- 41 36. Östman M, Bäck-Pettersson S, Sandvik A-H, Sundler AJ. "Being in good hands":
42 next of kin's perceptions of continuity of care in patients with heart failure. *BMC*
43 *Geriatr*. 2019;19(1):375. doi:10.1186/s12877-019-1390-x
44
- 45 37. Al-Rawashdeh S, Ashour A, Alshraifeen A, Rababa M. Experiences on Providing
46 Home Care for A Relative with Heart Failure: A Qualitative Study. *J Community*
47 *Health Nurs*. 2020;37(3):129-140. doi:10.1080/07370016.2020.1780043
48
- 49 38. Barnes S, Whittingham K. Informal carers' experiences of caring for a person with
50 heart failure in a community setting. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2020;28(3):883-
51 890. doi:10.1111/hsc.12919
52
- 53 39. Wingham J, Frost J, Britten N, et al. Caregiver outcomes of the REACH-HF
54 multicentre randomized controlled trial of home-based rehabilitation for heart failure
55 with reduced ejection fraction. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2019;18(7):611-620.
56 doi:10.1177/1474515119850011
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 40. Riegel B, Hanlon AL, Coe NB, et al. Health coaching to improve self-care of
4 informal caregivers of adults with chronic heart failure - iCare4Me: Study protocol
5 for a randomized controlled trial. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2019;85:105845.
6 doi:10.1016/j.cct.2019.105845
7
- 8 41. Hirschman KB, Bowles KH, Garcia-Gonzalez L, et al. Lessons learned from the
9 implementation of a video health coaching technology intervention to improve self-
10 care of family caregivers of adults with heart failure. *Res Nurs Health*.
11 2021;44(1):250-259. doi:10.1002/nur.22100
12
- 13 42. Auld JP, Mudd JO, Gelow JM, Hiatt SO, Lee CS. Self-care Moderates the
14 Relationship Between Symptoms and Health-Related Quality of Life in Heart
15 Failure. *J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2018;33(3):217-224.
16 doi:10.1097/JCN.0000000000000447
17
- 18 43. Sedlar N, Lainscak M, Mårtensson J, Strömberg A, Jaarsma T, Farkas J. Factors
19 related to self-care behaviours in heart failure: A systematic review of European
20 Heart Failure Self-Care Behaviour Scale studies. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*.
21 2017;16(4):272-282. doi:10.1177/1474515117691644
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **TABLES**
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Table 1.** Demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients.
16

| Variable | N=20 |
|--|-------------|
| Age, years, mean (SD) | 72.5 (11.4) |
| Range (minimum-maximum) | 38-85 |
| Gender, male, N (%) | 13 (65.0) |
| Time since diagnosis, years, mean (SD) | 2.35 (2.9) |
| Recent diagnosis (less than 2 months), N (%) | 2 (10.0) |
| NYHA, N (%) | |
| I | 4 (20.0) |
| II | 7 (35.0) |
| III | 9 (45.0) |
| LVEF, %, mean (SD) | 31.1 (6.0) |
| Diabetes, type 2, N (%) | 9 (45.0) |

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 *LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; NYHA, New York Heart Association; SD, standard*
33 *deviation.*
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Evaluation of health status by PROMs. Scores for EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ.

| | NYHA I-II (N=11) | NYHA III (N=9) | All NYHA (N=20) |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| EQ-5D-5L, patients reporting any limitation ¹ , N (%) | | | |
| Mobility | 5 (40.5) | 9 (100) | 14 (70.0) |
| Self-care | 0 | 7 (77.8) | 7 (35.0) |
| Usual activities | 4 (36.4) | 8 (88.9) | 12 (60.0) |
| Pain/Discomfort | 4 (36.4) | 6 (66.7) | 10 (50.0) |
| Anxiety/Depression | 4 (36.4) | 8 (88.9) | 12 (60.0) |
| EQ-5D-5L, patients reporting severe or extreme limitations ² , N (%) | | | |
| Mobility | 0 | 5 (55.6) | 5 (25.0) |
| Self-care | 0 | 2 (22.2) | 2 (10.0) |
| Usual activities | 0 | 3 (33.3) | 3 (15.0) |
| Pain/Discomfort | 1 (9.1) | 2 (22.2) | 3 (15.0) |
| Anxiety/Depression | 0 | 2 (22.2) | 2 (10.0) |
| EQ-5D-5L global, mean (SD) | | | |
| Index value | 0.85 (0.17) | 0.37 (0.36) | 0.64 (0.36) |
| VAS score | 74.55 (23.50) | 45.56 (14.46) | 61.50 (24.45) |
| KCCQ, mean (SD) | | | |
| Physical limitation | 81.06 (19.04) | 39.72 (26.59) | 62.46 (30.56) |
| Symptom stability | 59.10 (12.61) | 66.67 (30.62) | 62.50 (22.21) |
| Symptom frequency | 84.66 (17.14) | 57.64 (27.14) | 72.50 (25.59) |
| Symptom burden | 91.67 (11.18) | 61.11 (24.30) | 77.92 (23.61) |
| Self-efficacy | 94.32 (10.25) | 85.94 (18.22) | 90.79 (14.34) |
| Quality of life | 82.58 (13.15) | 33.33 (20.83) | 60.42 (30.09) |
| Social limitation | 85.61 (14.02) | 31.94 (26.62) | 61.46 (33.94) |
| KCCQ global scores, mean (SD) | | | |
| Overall summary | 82.69 (9.81) | 41.09 (20.55) | 63.97 (26.06) |
| Clinical summary | 81.30 (10.82) | 49.55 (22.31) | 67.01 (23.10) |
| Total symptom | 81.54 (10.85) | 59.37 (23.50) | 71.56 (20.55) |

¹Any score but 1 (no problems).

² Only patients scoring 4 or 5 in each domain.

EQ-5D-5L, EuroQoL 5D-5L questionnaire; KCCQ, Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire; NYHA, New York Heart Association; PRO, patient-reported outcome; SD, standard deviation; VAS, visual analogue scale.

Table 3. Domains and main perceptions among HFrEF patients.

| Domains | Patients and caregivers' quotes |
|--|---|
| Domain 1. Meanings related to QoL | |
| <i>Attachment to previous routines</i> | <p>"This has split my old age in two, having many things to do and not being able to do them because you get very tired. I miss that freedom that I had. Now I feel tied." [1-1]</p> <p>"What I have missed the most is driving, I spent 20 years as a taxi driver." [2-1]</p> <p>"For me quality of life means to go wherever you want, to do strange things." [2-4]</p> <p>"I have always solved the problems that arised, but now I feel impotence because I can't do this anymore." [2-8]</p> |
| <i>Fears of progression</i> | <p>"The symptoms depend on the day, they are not permanent, some days you are tired, others not." [2-2]</p> <p>"Before I went out to the country with my dog, and I liked to go out with the bike but I can't anymore, I have to depend on a cane." [2-4]</p> <p>"I was in a good, well-paid job and I liked it, but when this happened, I completely disconnected." [2-8]</p> |
| <i>Impact of demographic factors</i> | <p>"It has been tough. Especially emotionally when you listen to the doctor who gives you a serious diagnosis and you do not know what you are facing, you think what my life expectancy will be or how you are going to live from now on. This news is not the same for an 86-year-old than for a 38-year-old." [2-6, 38-year-old woman]</p> <p>"They have always been clear about what is happening to me, the question is why, since I am not a patient with a family history of disease." [2-5, female, age 62 years]</p> |
| Domain 2. Caregivers' roles | |
| <i>Tracking at home</i> | "I keep track of pressure, weight, urine. Every day. I have it written down here in the notebook and I also send it through the hospital's APP. But I really don't know if it is of much use. When I had to call the ambulance everything seemed normal, I kept a similar record in recent days." [caregiver of 78-year-old, NYHA III patient 1-6] |
| <i>Medical appointments</i> | "When we go to the hospital the doctors ask him if he sleeps well or if he is drowning and he always answers that he is fine, but he is not. The last time he had been sleeping on the couch because he couldn't sleep in bed even with 3 pillows. That's why I always go to the controls with him." [caregiver of 74-year-old NYHA III patient 2-4] |
| Domain 3. Relationships with healthcare providers | |
| <i>Commitment</i> | "I come to the very dedicated medical consultations and with the certainty that I am more closely watched than a Ferrari" [2-5, female, age 62 years] |
| <i>Trustworthiness</i> | <p>"I sit in a consultation where they take their time, and they answer all my doubts. The big difference is that now I feel more secure, I know that I must deal with weight, urine, food. Having the possibility of calling them 24 hours a day gives you more peace of mind." [2-6, female, age 38 years]</p> <p>"The nurse is better than any cardiologist, everyone loves her." [2-5, female, age 62 years]</p> <p>"The nurse is very close, I think they have chosen a person with a character and attitude that is just what a patient needs." [2-6]</p> |

BMJ Open

Quality of life and disease experience in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in Spain: a mixed methods approach to go beyond standardized data

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID | bmjopen-2021-053216.R1 |
| Article Type: | Original research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 12-Oct-2021 |
| Complete List of Authors: | <p>Rubio, Raül; A Piece of Pie SL Palacios, Beatriz; AstraZeneca Farmaceutica Spain SA, Medical Varela, Luis; AstraZeneca Farmaceutica Spain SA, Medical Fernández de la Fundación, Raquel; AstraZeneca Farmaceutica Spain SA, Medical Camargo Correa, Selene; A Piece of Pie SL Estupiñan, María Fernanda; A Piece of Pie SL Calvo, Elena; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group José, Nuria; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Ruiz Muñoz, Marta; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Yun, Sergi; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Jiménez-Marrero, Santiago; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Alcoberro, Lidia; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Garay, Alberto; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardio-Oncology Unit Moliner, Pedro; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardio-Oncology Unit Sánchez-Fernández, Lydia; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardio-Oncology Unit Soria Gómez, María Teresa; Puerta de Hierro University Hospital of Majadahonda, Heart Failure Unit Hidalgo, Encarna; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Enjuanes, C; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| | Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Calero-Molina, Esther; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Rueda, Yolanda; CardioAlianza San Saturnino, Maite; CardioAlianza Garcimartín, Paloma; Hospital del Mar, Outpatients Clinics; Hospital del Mar Institute for Medical Research, Biomedical Research in Heart Diseases López-Ibor, Jorge; Puerta de Hierro University Hospital of Majadahonda, Cardiology Segovia-Cubero, Javier; Puerta de Hierro University Hospital of Majadahonda, Cardiology; Carlos III Health Institute, CIBER of Cardiovascular Diseases Comin-Colet, Josep; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group |
| Primary Subject Heading : | Qualitative research |
| Secondary Subject Heading : | Research methods, Cardiovascular medicine |
| Keywords : | Heart failure < CARDIOLOGY, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 1 *Original research*
4 2
5 3
6
7 4

8
9 5 **Quality of life and disease experience in patients with**
10
11 6 **heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in Spain: a**
12
13
14 7 **mixed methods approach to go beyond standardized**
15
16
17 8 **data**
18
19
20
21 9

22
23 10 Raúl Rubio,¹ Beatriz Palacios,² Luis Varela,² Raquel Fernández de la Fundación,²
24
25 11 Selene Camargo Correa,¹ María Fernanda Estupiñan,¹ Elena Calvo,^{3,4} Nuria José,^{3,4}
26
27 12 Marta Ruiz Muñoz,^{3,4} Sergi Yun,^{3,4} Santiago Jiménez-Marrero,^{3,4} Lidia Alcoberro^{3,4}
28
29 13 Alberto Garay,^{3,5} Pedro Moliner,^{3,5} Lydia Sánchez-Fernández,^{3,5} María Teresa Soria
30
31 14 Gómez,⁶ Encarna Hidalgo,^{3,4} Cristina Enjuanes,^{3,4} Esther Calero-Molina,^{3,4} Yolanda
32
33 15 Rueda,⁷ Maite San Saturnino,⁷ Paloma Garcimartín,^{8,9} Jorge V. López-Ibor,¹⁰ Javier
34
35 16 Segovia-Cubero,^{11,12} Josep Comin-Colet^{3,4,13}
36
37
38

39 18 1. A Piece of Pie SL, Barcelona, Spain

40 19 2. Medical Department, AstraZeneca Farmacéutica Spain SA, Madrid, Spain

41
42
43 20 3. Cardiology Department and Heart Failure Program, Bellvitge University Hospital,
44
45 Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain

46
47
48 22 4. BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group, Bellvitge Biomedical
49
50 23 Research Institute (IDIBELL), Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain

51
52 24 5. Cardio-Oncology Unit, Bellvitge University Hospital, Catalan Institute of Oncology,
53
54 25 L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Spain

55
56 26 6. Heart Failure Unit, Puerta de Hierro University Hospital, Majadahonda, Madrid,
57
58 27 Spain
59
60

- 1
2
3 28 7. CardioAlianza, Barcelona, Spain
4
5 29 8. Outpatient Clinics, Hospital del Mar, Parc de Salut Mar, Barcelona, Spain
6
7 30 9. Biomedical Research in Heart Diseases, Hospital del Mar, Medical Research
8
9 31 Institute (IMIM), Barcelona, Spain
10
11 32 10. Outpatient Heart Failure Clinic, Department of Cardiology, Puerta de Hierro
12
13 33 University Hospital, Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain
14
15 34 11. Department of Cardiology, Puerta de Hierro University Hospital, Majadahonda,
16
17 35 Madrid, Spain
18
19 36 12. CIBER of Cardiovascular Diseases, Carlos III Institute, Madrid, Spain
20
21 37 13. Department of Clinical Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Barcelona,
22
23 38 Barcelona, Spain
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Correspondence to: Dr. Josep Comin-Colet, Department of Cardiology and Heart
42 Failure Program, Bellvitge University Hospital, 08907 L'Hospitalet de Llobregat,
43 Barcelona, Spain

44
45 Email: josepcomin@gmail.com
46
47
48
49
50

51 Word count: 4,140
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 54 **ABSTRACT**
4
5 55
6

7 56 **Objectives:** To gather insights on the disease experience of patients with heart failure
8 with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), and assess how patients' experiences and
9 57 narratives related to the disease complement data collected through standardized
10 58 narratives related to the disease complement data collected through standardized
11 59 patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs). Also, to explore new ways of evaluating
12 60 the burden experienced by patients and caregivers.

13 61 **Design:** Observational, descriptive, multicenter, cross-sectional, qualitative study.

14 62 **Setting:** Secondary care, patient's homes.

15 63 **Participants:** Twenty patients with HFrEF (NYHAs I-III) aged 38-85 years.

16 64 **Measures:** PROMs EuroQoL 5D-5L and Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire
17 65 and patient interview and observation.

18 66 **Results:** A total of 20 patients with HFrEF participated in the study. The patients' mean
19 67 (SD) age was 72.5 (11.4) years, 65% were male, and were classified in NYHA
20 68 functional classes I (N=4), II (N=7) and III (N=9). The study showed a strong impact of
21 69 HF in the patients' quality of life (QoL) and disease experience, as revealed by the
22 70 standardized PROMs (EQ-5D-5L global index=0.64 [0.36]; KCCQ total symptom
23 71 score=71.56 [20.55]) and the in-depth interviews. Patients and caregivers often
24 72 disagreed describing and evaluating perceived QoL, as patients downplayed their
25 73 limitations and caregivers overemphasized the poor QoL of the patients. Patients
26 74 related current QoL to distant life experiences or to critical moments in their disease,
27 75 such as hospitalizations. Anxiety over the disease progression is apparent in both
28 76 patients and caregivers, suggesting that caregiver-specific tools should be developed.

29 77 **Conclusions:** PROMs are an effective way of assessing symptoms over the most
30 78 recent time period. However, especially in chronic diseases such as HFrEF, PROM
31 79 scores could be complemented with additional tools to gain a better understanding of
32 80 the patient's status. New PROMs designed to evaluate and compare specific points in
33 81 the life of the patient could be clinically more useful to assess changes in health status.

1
2
3 82
4
5 83
6
7 84
8
9 85
10
11 86
12
13 87
14
15 88
16
17 89
18
19 90
20
21 91
22
23 92
24
25 93
26
27 94
28
29 95
30
31 96
32
33 97
34
35 98
36
37 99
38
39 100
40
41 101
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study followed an ethnographic approach to collect data on patient's experiences and narratives related to heart failure, a type of study not before carried out in Spain and with scarce reports worldwide.
- Both patients and caregivers could discuss freely and explain in detail the aspects of the disease that they considered under control and those where change was deemed necessary.
- The often-contrasting views of patients and caregivers highlighted the difficulties in obtaining accurate and objective evaluations of quality of life.
- Although the selection of patients aimed for inclusiveness and diversity, the limited number of HF_rEF patients selected for in-depth analysis may not be fully representative of the population of HF_rEF patients in Spain.
- The ethnographic interviews took place in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, which transformed the daily routines of patients and caregivers and may have to a certain extent altered their perspective of living with HF_rEF.

102 INTRODUCTION

103
104 Despite advances in treatment, heart failure (HF) remains one of the leading causes of
105 hospitalization and readmissions, death and disability worldwide.^{1,2} The economic
106 burden of HF, mainly driven by recurrent hospitalizations, consumes an estimated 1-
107 2% of healthcare budgets.^{3,4} The progressive aging of the population in some Western
108 countries, such as Spain, and increasing HF prevalence, have positioned this disease
109 as a major public health problem.⁵⁻⁷

110 Clinically, HF can be classified based on the left ventricular ejection fraction
111 (LVEF) into HF with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), defined as an EF $\leq 40\%$, mildly-
112 reduced ejection fraction (HFmrEF), defined as EF $>40\%$ and $<50\%$, and HF with
113 preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), defined as an ejection fraction $\geq 50\%$.⁸ Patients in
114 these subgroups often have distinct underlying etiologies, demographics, co-
115 morbidities and response to therapies.^{9,10} Additionally, the presence and severity of
116 symptoms and exercise intolerance of patients with HF is usually categorized following
117 the New York Heart Association (NYHA) classification into four functional classes (I-IV),
118 being class IV the worst.¹¹

119 HF can severely affect the quality of life (QoL) of the patient by reducing their
120 independence and ability to undertake daily living activities, and can also disturb their
121 mental health and psychosocial well-being.^{12,13} Prior studies have shown that patients
122 with HF had an even higher incidence of limitations than patients with chronic diseases
123 such as diabetes, cancer, or Alzheimer's disease.¹³ Several patient-reported outcome
124 measures (PROMs) have been used to quantify health status in patients with HF, such
125 as the generic EuroQoL 5D-5L (EQ-5D-5L) and the disease-specific Kansas City
126 Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ).¹³⁻¹⁷ PROMs such as the KCCQ have a good
127 correlation with prognosis and their use has been encouraged by the American Heart
128 Association in both routine clinical practice and clinical trials of new therapies.^{18,19}
129 However, although these PROMs can be useful indicators of health status and how HF

1
2
3 130 impacts patients' QoL within a 2-week recall period, they have not been designed to
4
5 131 reflect some of the patient's and caregiver's perspectives on living with HF, including
6
7 132 aspects such as the importance of interactions with family or healthcare providers,
8
9 133 feelings related to the course of their disease, or barriers to accessing healthcare
10
11 134 resources.²⁰ These unique aspects of culture, preferences, customs, values and
12
13 135 attitudes, could have an impact on treatment effectiveness and outcomes.
14
15 136 Complementary to PROMs, in-depth interviews with patients and caregivers are useful
16
17 137 to evaluate quality of patient care and the interaction between the patient and the
18
19 138 healthcare system.²¹ However, neglecting the limitations PROMs could hinder our
20
21 139 understanding of the patient's attitudes and real-life disease experiences.
22
23

24 140 Ethnographic qualitative studies involve observation of the patients and
25
26 141 caregivers in their real-world settings to determine how they behave in specific
27
28 142 contexts. Ethnographic research collects comprehensive information from multiple
29
30 143 sources such as interviews, caregiver perspectives, non-participant observation of
31
32 144 healthcare visits and home tours, among others, and has previously been carried out to
33
34 145 investigate QoL in patients with HF.^{12,22-27} Previous ethnographic studies conducted in
35
36 146 patients from the United Kingdom identified barriers to interventions for HF and critical
37
38 147 points on disease pathways which resulted in an increase in the risk of admission.²⁸⁻³⁰
39
40

41 148 Little is known about the patient's and caregiver's perspective of living with HF
42
43 149 in Spain, and previous studies did not evaluate patients by LVEF.³¹ The objective of
44
45 150 this study was to gather insights on the disease experiences of patients with HFrEF
46
47 151 and their caregivers, and the impact on their everyday life. We used a mixed methods
48
49 152 approach involving the parallel use of an ethnographic approach with PROMs for the
50
51 153 assessment of health status (EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ). Rather than seeking corroboration
52
53 154 of results from different data sources, the mixed methods approach intended to
54
55 155 highlight the complementarity of ethnographic data and PROMs.^{32,33} The goal was to
56
57 156 improve awareness of healthcare professionals, service providers, policy makers and
58
59 157 educators on the factors that can potentially influence treatment effectiveness, and the
60

1
2
3 158 existence of aspects of the patient's experience that are not covered by existing tools.
4
5 159 In turn, this may encourage firstly, a more active participation of healthcare providers,
6
7 160 patients and caregivers in clinical decisions considering not only the disease state, but
8
9 161 also cultural factors and individual values and attitudes, and secondly, the development
10
11 162 of instruments for the evaluation of healthcare interventions.
12
13
14 163
15
16 164
17
18 165

19 20 166 **METHODS**

21
22 167
23
24 168 We conducted an observational, cross-sectional, descriptive, multicenter, and mixed
25
26 169 methods study to obtain insights regarding HFREF patients' perception and attitudes
27
28 170 towards their disease. The patients in the study were recruited at the Departments of
29
30 171 Cardiology of 2 large tertiary-level hospitals, namely, the Puerta del Hierro University
31
32 172 Hospital (Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain) and the Bellvitge University Hospital (Hospitalet
33
34 173 de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain). The patient populations attended by these hospitals
35
36 174 were socioeconomically very distinct, as the Puerta del Hierro University Hospital is
37
38 175 located at a high-income district of Madrid, and the Bellvitge University Hospital covers
39
40 176 a suburban area of mostly low or very low-income patients. Due to the qualitative and
41
42 177 observational design of the study, there was no masking or randomization. Clinical
43
44 178 management of the patients followed routine clinical practice, with no changes in
45
46 179 treatment or additional clinical assessments specific for this study. All decisions related
47
48 180 to disease management were made at the discretion of the treating physician without
49
50 181 interference by the sponsor. Informed consent was obtained from each patient prior to
51
52 182 study initiation. The patients authorized the interview with their main caregiver as part
53
54 183 of the informed consent process. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics
55
56 184 Review Board of the Bellvitge University Hospital on March 12th, 2020 with number
57
58 185 PR062/20.
59
60

186

187 Patient selection

188 Patients were assessed for eligibility by local clinical staff according to selection criteria
189 at each participating center. Patients were classified by NYHA class and could be
190 belong to any of the 4 classes I to IV. The inclusion criteria were ≥ 18 years at the time
191 of consent, established documented diagnosis of HFrEF (LVEF $\leq 40\%$), and signed
192 consent to participate. Patients unable to complete the PROMs because of any
193 psychological or physical condition and patients hospitalized at inclusion were
194 excluded.

195 A sample size of 20 patients was selected to have sufficient representation of
196 the 3 major NYHA classes. Purposeful sampling was based on the characteristics of
197 potential participants extracted from medical records to obtain optimal variety.

198

199 Data collection

200 The patient's demographic information and medical history were collected from medical
201 records at the selection visit. On the day of the home visit the patients first completed
202 two health status questionnaires and then two female senior researchers (SCC, MFE)
203 with >5 years of experience in medical sociology and medical anthropology conducted
204 a semi-structured interview following a topic guide (See Supplementary Materials).

205 There was no prior relationship between the interviewer and the patient, who was
206 informed about the research goals prior to starting the interview. The interview
207 conducted at the patient's home lasted approximately 90 minutes. In some instances,
208 with the consent of the patient, his/her closest caregivers were interviewed at the
209 patient's home on the same day for about 30 min. The interview with the caregivers
210 aimed at understanding their perception of the patient's status and evaluating their
211 social and emotional relationship with the patient.

212 In order to gather observational data to complement participants' accounts of
213 their medical experience, 6 out of 20 patients (two per NYHA class) consented that the

1
2
3 214 same researcher carrying out the interview would observe their first healthcare
4
5 215 appointment after the home interview. Direct observation allowed researchers to gather
6
7 216 information regarding patients' objective and subjective experiences during medical
8
9 217 encounters, about how patients and caregivers conveyed concerns and needs, and
10
11 218 provided clues about incongruent behaviour. A single appointed researcher observed
12
13 219 the initial and main focus of conversations with healthcare providers, questions by
14
15 220 patients and caregivers, and patients' use of verbal and non-verbal communication
16
17 221 (e.g., behaviour that suggested passive, nervous, impatient, caring, or expectant
18
19 222 attitudes). Immediately after the appointment, patients and caregivers, if present, were
20
21 223 asked to evaluate the medical visit (clinical encounters last 20 minutes on average).
22
23
24 224 Researchers took field notes and added reflexive comments about the encounter and
25
26 225 about participants' experience.

27
28 226 The in-depth interview aimed to capture the patients' experience with the
29
30 227 disease from their own point of view, whereas the non-participant observation during
31
32 228 the medical visits allowed to investigate the relationship with the healthcare
33
34 229 practitioners for both of patients and family members.

35
36 230 Data from in-depth interviews were collected by audio recording and field notes,
37
38 231 whereas data from direct observation of medical encounters were collected by field
39
40 232 notes only, taking into consideration all aspects of the patient's life and in all cases
41
42 233 protecting the patient's data privacy.
43
44

45 234

47 235 **Quantitative outcomes and analyses**

48
49 236 Secondary variables assessed included PROMs by using the EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ.
50
51 237 The EQ-5D-5L is a self-reported questionnaire used to derive a standardized measure
52
53 238 of health status, also referred to as a utility score.³⁴ The KCCQ is a self-administered
54
55 239 HF-specific instrument and has shown to be a valid, reliable and responsive measure
56
57 240 for patients with HF.¹⁴ Spanish validated versions of these questionnaires were
58
59 241 used.^{35,36} For the EQ-5D-5L, the number and percentage of patients reporting any type

1
2
3 242 of limitation for each questionnaire dimension, the number and percentage of patients
4
5 243 reporting “severe” or “extreme” responses for each questionnaire dimension, as well as
6
7 244 the index value and the visual analogue scale (VAS, where 100 equals the best health
8
9 245 HF patients can imagine), were assessed; for the KCCQ, the score for each
10
11 246 domain/subdomain, and a summary score for the total symptom score, clinical
12
13 247 symptom score and overall summary score were assessed (scores range from 0 to
14
15 248 100; were higher scores indicate a better health status). The PROMs were analyzed
16
17 249 descriptively.
18
19
20
21

22 251 ***Qualitative outcomes and analyses***

23
24 252 The following primary variables were assessed: the patient’s profile; the patient’s
25
26 253 emotional perception (values, attitude, frustration, fear) during the HFREF journey,
27
28 254 including the role of the caregiver; key relationships and communication processes
29
30 255 during the patient HFREF journey (patient-doctor, patient-carer/family); main barriers to
31
32 256 accessing healthcare services experienced by patients during the HFREF journey; and
33
34 257 the patient’s unmet needs (cognitive, emotional and functional) associated with HF.
35
36 258 Observational data, interviews and documentary materials were analyzed at three
37
38 259 levels: individual patient cases, across cases within research centers, and across
39
40 260 research centers to synthesis.
41
42

43 261 Thematic content analysis was used to analyse the data gathered from
44
45 262 interviews and direct observation of clinical encounters. The analysis was carried out
46
47 263 by field researchers in six steps: 1) read and re-read of interview and medical
48
49 264 encounters’ fieldnotes; 2) identification of main topics per interview domain; 3) text
50
51 265 codification to identify current and new domains; 4) review of PROM scores per
52
53 266 interviewer and NYHA class; 5) comparison of PROM scores and fieldwork data; and
54
55 267 6) and synthesis of repetitive patterns.
56
57

58 268 Subsequently, data triangulation was used to integrate quantitative and
59
60 269 qualitative information by the researchers, individually and in joint sessions. Three

1
2
3 270 types of triangulation were used: investigator, data and methodological triangulation.
4
5 271 Two investigators were involved in the data collection and analysis. Findings from each
6
7 272 investigator were compared to develop a deeper understanding of how the different
8
9 273 investigators view the issue. Preliminary conclusions were discussed with the broader
10
11 274 team of authors in further analysis sessions. Regarding data triangulation, investigators
12
13 275 compared the answers from patients and caregivers (information sources) separately
14
15 276 to identify areas of agreement and disagreement over the main topics. Regarding
16
17 277 methodological triangulation, findings from interviews, direct observations of medical
18
19 278 appointments, and PROM scores were compared to identify incongruences and
20
21 279 disparities in patients' responses (e.g., patients reporting mild limitations in PROMs but
22
23 280 highlighting severe limitations during the interview and/or medical appointment).

26 281 The analytical process aimed to reach theoretical saturation where no new
27
28 282 dimensions emerged during joint sessions.
29
30
31 283
32
33 284

34 285 **RESULTS**

37 286 38 287 ***Patient characteristics***

40 288 A total of 20 patients with HF_rEF participated in the study (Table 1). The mean (SD)
41
42 289 age of the patients was 72.5 (11.4) years (range, 38-85 years), and 13 (65.0%) were
43
44 290 male. The study included 4, 7 and 9 patients in NYHA functional classes I-III,
45
46 291 respectively. Although the study protocol was designed to include class IV patients,
47
48 292 their frailty, and the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in the patients' self-caring
49
50 293 strategies, hindered the participation of any patients in this class. Twelve patients were
51
52 294 being treated at the Bellvitge University Hospital and 8 patients were being treated at
53
54 295 the Puerta del Hierro University Hospital.
55
56 296

57 297 ***Understanding of QoL by patients with HF***

1
2
3 298 During the in-depth interviews, the participants described how living with HFrEF
4
5 299 impacted their lives, including how they experienced the symptoms of HF and their
6
7 300 effects on daily routines (summarized in Table 2). Their responses provided relevant
8
9 301 insights on what QoL meant to them. For many patients, QoL was "being able to do
10
11 302 what they did before" and missed being independent, their everyday life and
12
13 303 maintaining an active lifestyle.

14
15 304 Patients tended to self-limit and isolate to limit symptomatology due to
16
17 305 progression-related fears or even fear to a sudden death, despite a more sedentary
18
19 306 lifestyle being detrimental to the recovery and to their own QoL.
20
21

22 307

23 308 ***Impact of demographic factors in perception of QoL***

24
25 309 Attitudes and perceptions towards HFrEF seemed to strongly depend on age and
26
27 310 education. Young patients tend to be more informed about the disease and challenge
28
29 311 the healthcare practitioners' opinions.
30
31

32 312 In contrast, older patients had a difficult time differentiating between HFrEF
33
34 313 symptoms and those associated with the normal process of ageing. Often caregivers
35
36 314 had to help them understand the information provided by healthcare workers.
37
38

39 315 The interviews also revealed that male patients showed more dependency towards
40
41 316 caregivers than their female counterparts. Female caregivers tended to strongly
42
43 317 challenge male patients' perception of QoL. In one case, the wife of a NYHA III patient
44
45 318 was very critical of her husband's attitude and thought that part of his evolution strongly
46
47 319 depended on his will, and asked him to exercise more, read, get on the computer, and
48
49 320 go out for a ride on the motorcycle. They even consulted with a psychologist friend to
50
51 321 help them handle the situation.
52

53 322

54 323 ***PROMs and health status***

55
56 324 The results of the EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ showed a strong correspondence with the
57
58 325 NYHA functional classes, and also between the two PROMs (Table 3). We found that
59
60

1
2
3 326 scores from PROMs dropped as the NYHA increased (i.e., the higher the NYHA class
4
5 327 and the HF symptoms, the worse their perceived health status was). No differences
6
7 328 were observed in scores with respect to gender, or between the patients from the two
8
9 329 hospitals.

10
11 330 Some patients with lower NYHAs, despite having visible constraints in health
12
13 331 status, indicated high scores in the EQ-5D-5L VAS score. For example, a patient with
14
15 332 major comorbidities [1-10] with NYHA I indicated a EQ-5D-5L VAS score of 90 and
16
17 333 emphasized that her QoL was good. This contrasted with the views expressed by her
18
19 334 caregiver (Table 2).

20
21
22 335 Regardless of the NYHA, some patients seemed to minimize and relativize the
23
24 336 impact of HFrEF on their QoL. Caregivers, in contrast, could emphasize the limitations
25
26 337 imposed by HFrEF. For example, the wife and caregiver of a NYHA II patient [1-11]
27
28 338 indicated that in the consultation with the cardiologist the patient usually
29
30 339 underestimated his condition. In another case, the wife of a NYHA III patient
31
32 340 commented that she must be “present with the doctors, because when they ask him
33
34 341 something, he usually answers that he is fine and does not really say what is wrong
35
36 342 with him.”

37
38
39 343 Patients with advanced NYHAs, who experienced one or several hospital
40
41 344 admissions, compared their current experience with the disease to those acute periods
42
43 345 of fear and greater uncertainty. Patients showed a limited portrait of their QoL due to
44
45 346 the required reference to the last 2-weeks in the questionnaire. For example, a NYHA
46
47 347 III patient [2-8] had doubts when filling out the questionnaires since he related his
48
49 348 mobility limitations to a problem with his legs (a consequence of an aortic dissection)
50
51 349 but he did not relate it to HF. Also, he mentioned that his physical and emotional
52
53 350 situation was much better now compared to the initial moments where he was more
54
55 351 affected. He had a hard time taking the prior two weeks as a reference point, therefore
56
57 352 his responses showed a feeling of improvement compared to the most critical
58
59 353 moments.
60

1
2
3 354 Another NYHA III patient [2-6] had doubts when filling the questionnaires, since
4
5 355 his symptoms varied from day to day and between morning, afternoon and night. He
6
7 356 also had moments of crises where he considered his symptoms to be worse, so limiting
8
9 357 to the last two weeks seemed difficult. Likewise, he stated that shortness of breath or
10
11 358 air was something he thought he got from lying down for a long time and not that it was
12
13 359 a symptom of HFrEF.

14
15 360 Caregivers could overestimate and present a dramatic view of the patient's day-
16
17 361 to-day life with HFrEF. Family caregivers showed more distress when discussing their
18
19 362 relatives with HFrEF compared to that showed by remunerated caregivers:
20
21

22 363

23
24 364 *“she is concerned about his low spirits and his anguish. She says that the*
25
26 365 *symptoms she develops from anxiety can “mask” the symptoms of HF,*
27
28 366 *such as pressure and pain in the chest, agitation, a feeling of suffocation.”*

29
30 367 [caregiver of patient 1-8, NYHA III]
31

32 368

33
34 369 *“As cardiologists told us that little can be done to improve his condition, we*
35
36 370 *live these years ‘as a gift’.”* [caregiver of patient 1-6]
37

38
39 371

40 41 372 **Caregivers' roles and needs**

42
43 373 In this study, only five patients were able to live without a caregiver. Generally, strong
44
45 374 family bonds were apparent and important for the patient. Caregivers were often in
46
47 375 charge of organizing visits to the healthcare providers, keeping track of parameters
48
49 376 such as weight and blood pressure, and administering medication (Table 2).

50
51 377 Caregivers acted also as interpreters of the disease status on behalf of their patients.
52

53 378

54 55 379 **Relationships with healthcare providers**

56
57 380 The interactions between patients and caregivers with healthcare workers at
58
59 381 hospitals were investigated by the social scientists by accompanying them to a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

382 medical appointment. The study showed that patients are usually highly positive
383 about their experience with cardiologists and nurses (Table 2). A patient [1-9]
384 explained that the nurse called him weekly to ask about how he was coping,
385 and to discuss data such as weight and blood pressure changes. He generally
386 felt very accompanied by the hospital staff, both cardiologists and nurses. Other
387 patients also expressed a high opinion of the healthcare personnel. Often
388 patients highly value their relationship with the nurse, as they probably feel
389 more confident to express their experiences to his/her.

390
391
392

For peer review only

1
2
3 393 **DISCUSSION**
4
5 394

6
7 395 In this study we used ethnographic methods with HFREF patients and their caregivers,
8
9 396 complemented with general and disease-specific health status assessments, to obtain
10
11 397 insights regarding patients' disease perception and attitudes towards their disease.

12
13 398 Ethnographic methods adopt a phenomenological perspective, aiming to understand
14
15 399 individuals' life experiences to acquire relevant knowledge. The results of this study
16
17 400 suggest that the patient's perspectives of their QoL were dependent on their memories
18
19 401 of what they could do before, and often were better than reality. Caregivers, in contrast,
20
21 402 offered a distinct view of the patient's status and QoL, often substantially worse and
22
23 403 emphasizing the severity of their life-limiting condition.

24
25
26 404 As healthcare systems aim to become more 'patient-centered', there is a
27
28 405 recognized need to capture accurately the patient's experience of the disease, in an
29
30 406 effort to improve it. The use of PROMs have therefore become common in assessing
31
32 407 current treatments and new therapies and medical interventions, although their
33
34 408 application in clinical practice is still very limited. Despite their widespread use by
35
36 409 cardiologists, an awareness of the limitations of PROMs when evaluating the
37
38 410 experience of the patient with HF is critical for their interpretation. For example, the
39
40 411 effects of comorbid conditions could add confounding factors to the evaluation of HF
41
42 412 through a single PROM instrument. Likewise, patients often relate their overall QoL
43
44 413 experience to the moments of crisis, such as hospitalizations, 'anchoring' all
45
46 414 subsequent experiences to those events and distorting their responses in the
47
48 415 questionnaires.

49
50
51 416 In the general population the understanding of HF and its outcome is low,
52
53 417 contributing to anxiety about the evolution of the disease in both patients and
54
55 418 caregivers. In contrast, other life-limiting diseases, such as cancer, often have better-
56
57 419 defined pathways of care and psychosocial support.³⁰ In this regard, patient
58
59 420 associations and support groups could play a role by helping the patient understand

1
2
3 421 the disease, the treatments, and the expectations. Patient associations promote social
4
5 422 integration and help patient share their experiences, providing the necessary
6
7 423 encouragement to cope with their disease and go on with daily activities. Also, as
8
9 424 reflected in some of the interviews described in this study, it is important for the patient
10
11 425 to feel that he/she can have rapid access to medical services. In this regard, the study
12
13 426 reflected that that while some patients were reluctant to discuss aspects of daily life or
14
15 427 to express their feelings and fears to the cardiologist, they were more open and felt
16
17 428 closer to the nurse, a relationship that was highly valued by many patients. Generally,
18
19 429 an efficient and fluid communication with all the healthcare providers involved in the
20
21 430 treatment is essential.^{12,29}

22
23
24 431 The study revealed that the fear to losing independence and the uncertainty
25
26 432 about the progress of their disease could be factors that motivate some HF patients to
27
28 433 downplay their limitations. Conversely, caregivers could overemphasize the poor QoL
29
30 434 of the patients, also motivated by concerns of the progress of the disease, its
31
32 435 unpredictable trajectory, and lack of proper knowledge and training. Also, it is possible
33
34 436 that, since these caregivers were very often family members, their views could be
35
36 437 overstated due to emotional attachment to the patient. In any case, these results
37
38 438 suggest that instruments should be developed to help caregivers in their daily work with
39
40 439 patients with HF, so that they are better informed on the course of the disease and
41
42 440 expectations.²⁵ In this regard, numerous recent studies have highlighted challenges
43
44 441 experienced by caregivers of patients with HF.³⁷⁻⁴⁰ Some initiatives along these lines,
45
46 442 such caregiver-specific QoL questionnaires,⁴¹ and video coaching,^{42,43} are currently
47
48 443 being developed and tested.

49
50
51 444 The results of our study suggest recommendations for future PROM design or
52
53 445 questionnaire selection. In patients with HF the PROM instruments should aim to truly
54
55 446 mirror patients' experience, using language that the patient associates with their
56
57 447 cultural views of QoL. To provide insights on relevant changes in QoL, the PROMs
58
59 448 should be constructed to capture specific timepoints related to the patient experience
60

1
2
3 449 (e.g., healthcare status before the diagnosis, and before and after hospitalizations). In
4
5 450 this way, reference points in the patient's lives could be established that favored
6
7 451 meaningful QoL before/after comparisons. Instruments should allow an alternative
8
9 452 stratification based on these clinical events and patients' perceived QoL along them.
10
11 453 Also, as self-care behaviors can greatly affect symptoms in patients with HF,⁴⁴ the
12
13 454 patient's self-caring strategies, perception of autonomy, level of empowerment, and the
14
15 455 perception of past and present experiences with the disease should be taken into
16
17 456 consideration when developing and introducing future PROM instruments.⁴⁵ Finally,
18
19 457 additional instruments should be developed to evaluate the key aspects of the patient'
20
21 458 support system, and explore caregivers' needs.

22
23
24 459 Given the lack of studies assessing the patient's and caregiver's perspective on
25
26 460 the HFrEF pathway in Spain, this study aimed to fill this gap to better understand
27
28 461 possible cultural differences. The ethnographic approach, which involved in-depth
29
30 462 interviews with patients at their homes and with their caregivers, made it possible to
31
32 463 collect relevant data not normally discussed or shared in healthcare facilities. Both
33
34 464 patients and caregivers could talk freely and explain the aspects of the disease that
35
36 465 they considered under control and those where change was deemed necessary.
37
38 466 However, a limitation of this study is that the small sample size, although not unusual in
39
40 467 qualitative research that requires extensive and detailed analysis of each patient, may
41
42 468 not fully represent the diversity of people with HFrEF in Spain. Also, as it is the case in
43
44 469 other ethnographic studies, interviewing patients and caregivers together may have
45
46 470 resulted in individual perspectives being altered or withheld. Finally, since this study
47
48 471 was carried out during the COVID-19 pandemic, it is possible that the disruption
49
50 472 imposed by the social restrictions could have some effect in the results described here.

51
52
53 473 In conclusion, this study analyzed, by the use of PROMs and in-depth
54
55 474 interviews, the complexity of the actual experiences of the patients with HFrEF. The
56
57 475 lack of knowledge about the disease generates confusion and anxiety about
58
59 476 symptoms, and patients could tend to minimize the impact of HF in QoL. Patients tend

1
2
3 477 to maintain a closer relationship with their nurses, compared with the cardiologist,
4
5 478 favoring a more open discussion of feelings and experiences related to the disease
6
7 479 with them. In order to provide personalized care to HFREF patients, QoL could be
8
9 480 assessed by comparing two points in time, thus helping the healthcare practitioner
10
11 481 understand the patient's point of view of specific interventions. Since QoL is a
12
13 482 multidimensional, subjective concept that is affected by a variety of factors, its
14
15 483 evaluation should be carefully designed to capture specific moments and changes in
16
17 484 the trajectory of the disease. The study suggests that tools and training should be
18
19 485 made available to caregivers to alleviate the burden of care and anxiety derived from
20
21 486 uncertainty in the progression of the disease. Further work is needed to fully integrate
22
23 487 the use of well-designed and useful PROMs into clinical practice.
24
25
26 488
27
28 489
29
30 490
31

32 491 **Acknowledgements**

33
34 492 Medical writing assistance was provided by Francisco López de Saro, PhD (Trialance).
35
36 493

37 494 **Contributors**

38
39 495 RR, LV, SCC, JCC and BP conceived and designed the study. JCC, EC, EH, ECB,
40
41 496 PGC, NJ, MRM, CE, SY, SJM, LAT, AGM, PMB, LYF, JSC, SVL, and MSG contributed
42
43 497 to patient recruitment and data collection. JCC, JSC, BP, LV, SCC, MFE, and RR
44
45 498 compiled and analyzed the data. JCC, BP, LV, SCC, and RR drafted the manuscript,
46
47 499 which was revised by the other authors. All authors read and approved the final
48
49 500 manuscript.
50
51 501

52 502 **Funding**

53
54 503 This work was supported by AstraZeneca España. Grant number does not apply.
55
56 504

1
2
3 505 **Competing interests**
4

5 506 JCC received fees from AstraZeneca for the coordination and oversight of the study.
6

7 507 RR, MFE, and SCC received research funding from AstraZeneca. RFdIF, BP, and LV
8

9 508 are employees of AstraZeneca. All other authors report no competing interests.
10

11 509
12

13 510 **Patient and public involvement**
14

15 511 CardioAlianza, a Spanish association of patients with cardiovascular disease and their
16

17 512 caregivers, was involved in designing, providing feedback for interpretation of data, and
18

19 513 in the dissemination of this research.
20

21 514
22

23 515 **Patient consent for publication**
24

25 516 Informed consent for participation in the study and publication of the results were
26

27 517 obtained from each patient prior to study initiation.
28

29 518
30

31 519 **Ethics approval**
32

33 520 This study was approved by the Ethics Review Board of the Bellvitge University
34

35 521 Hospital on March 12th, 2020 with number PR062/20.
36

37 522
38

39 523 **Data availability statement**
40

41 524 The data that support the findings of this study are available on reasonable request
42

43 525 from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to their
44

45 526 containing information that could compromise the privacy of research participants.
46

47 527
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

1. Savarese G, Lund LH. Global Public Health Burden of Heart Failure. *Card Fail Rev.* 2017;3(1):7-11. doi:10.15420/cfr.2016:25:2
2. Crespo-Leiro MG, Metra M, Lund LH, et al. Advanced heart failure: a position statement of the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur J Heart Fail.* 2018;20(11):1505-1535. doi:10.1002/ejhf.1236
3. Hollingworth W, Biswas M, Maishman RL, et al. The healthcare costs of heart failure during the last five years of life: A retrospective cohort study. *Int J Cardiol.* 2016;224:132-138. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2016.09.021
4. Agbor VN, Ntusi NAB, Noubiap JJ. An overview of heart failure in low- and middle-income countries. *Cardiovasc Diagn Ther.* 2020;10(2):244-251. doi:10.21037/cdt.2019.08.03
5. Farré N, Vela E, Clèries M, et al. Medical resource use and expenditure in patients with chronic heart failure: a population-based analysis of 88 195 patients. *Eur J Heart Fail.* 2016;18(9):1132-1140. doi:10.1002/ejhf.549
6. Farré N, Vela E, Clèries M, et al. Real world heart failure epidemiology and outcome: A population-based analysis of 88,195 patients. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(2):e0172745. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0172745
7. Méndez-Bailón M, Jiménez-García R, Hernández-Barrera V, et al. Significant and constant increase in hospitalization due to heart failure in Spain over 15 year period. *Eur J Intern Med.* 2019;64:48-56. doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2019.02.019
8. McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, et al. 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. *European Heart Journal.* 2021;42(36):3599-3726. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehab368
9. Bhatt AS, Abraham WT, Lindenfeld J, et al. Treatment of HF in an Era of Multiple Therapies: Statement From the HF Collaboratory. *JACC Heart Fail.* 2021;9(1):1-12. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2020.10.014
10. Upadhyaya B, Kitzman DW. Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: New approaches to diagnosis and management. *Clin Cardiol.* 2020;43(2):145-155. doi:10.1002/clc.23321
11. Criteria Committee, New York Heart Association. *Diseases of the Heart and Blood Vessels. Nomenclature and Criteria for Diagnosis.* 6th ed. Little, Brown; 1964.
12. Fry M, McLachlan S, Purdy S, Sanders T, Kadam UT, Chew-Graham CA. The implications of living with heart failure; the impact on everyday life, family support, co-morbidities and access to healthcare: a secondary qualitative analysis. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2016;17(1):139. doi:10.1186/s12875-016-0537-5
13. Comín-Colet J, Anguita M, Formiga F, et al. Health-related Quality of Life of Patients With Chronic Systolic Heart Failure in Spain: Results of the VIDA-IC Study. *Revista Española de Cardiología.* 2016;69(3):256-271. doi:10.1016/j.recesp.2015.07.034
14. Green CP, Porter CB, Bresnahan DR, Spertus JA. Development and evaluation of the Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire: a new health status measure for

- 1
2
3 571 heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2000;35(5):1245-1255. doi:10.1016/s0735-
4 572 1097(00)00531-3
- 5
6 573 15. Garin O, Herdman M, Vilagut G, et al. Assessing health-related quality of life in
7 574 patients with heart failure: a systematic, standardized comparison of available
8 575 measures. *Heart Fail Rev*. 2014;19(3):359-367. doi:10.1007/s10741-013-9394-7
- 9
10 576 16. Burns DJP, Arora J, Okunade O, et al. International Consortium for Health
11 577 Outcomes Measurement (ICHOM): Standardized Patient-Centered Outcomes
12 578 Measurement Set for Heart Failure Patients. *JACC: Heart Failure*. 2020;8(3):212-
13 579 222. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2019.09.007
- 14
15 580 17. Kelkar AA, Spertus J, Pang P, et al. Utility of Patient-Reported Outcome
16 581 Instruments in Heart Failure. *JACC Heart Fail*. 2016;4(3):165-175.
17 582 doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2015.10.015
- 18
19 583 18. Rumsfeld JS, Alexander KP, Goff DC, et al. Cardiovascular health: the importance
20 584 of measuring patient-reported health status: a scientific statement from the
21 585 American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2013;127(22):2233-2249.
22 586 doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e3182949a2e
- 23
24 587 19. Psotka MA, von Maltzahn R, Anatchkova M, et al. Patient-Reported Outcomes in
25 588 Chronic Heart Failure: Applicability for Regulatory Approval. *JACC Heart Fail*.
26 589 2016;4(10):791-804. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2016.04.010
- 27
28 590 20. Nieminen MS, Dickstein K, Fonseca C, et al. The patient perspective: Quality of life
29 591 in advanced heart failure with frequent hospitalisations. *International Journal of*
30 592 *Cardiology*. 2015;191:256-264. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2015.04.235
- 31
32 593 21. Pennucci F, De Rosis S, Passino C. Piloting a web-based systematic collection and
33 594 reporting of patient-reported outcome measures and patient-reported experience
34 595 measures in chronic heart failure. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(10):e037754.
35 596 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-037754
- 36
37 597 22. Heo S, Lennie TA, Okoli C, Moser DK. Quality of life in patients with heart failure:
38 598 ask the patients. *Heart Lung*. 2009;38(2):100-108. doi:10.1016/j.hrtlng.2008.04.002
- 39
40 599 23. Gwaltney. Hearing the voice of the heart failure patient: key experiences identified
41 600 in qualitative interviews. *Br J Cardiol*. 2012;19(1). doi:10.5837/bjc.2012.004
- 42
43 601 24. Etemadifar S, Bahrami M, Shahriari M, Farsani AK. Family caregivers' experiences
44 602 of caring for patients with heart failure: a descriptive, exploratory qualitative study. *J*
45 603 *Nurs Res*. 2015;23(2):153-161. doi:10.1097/JNR.0000000000000076
- 46
47 604 25. Grant JS, Graven LJ. Problems experienced by informal caregivers of individuals
48 605 with heart failure: An integrative review. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2018;80:41-66.
49 606 doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.12.016
- 50
51 607 26. Bjornsdottir K, Ketilsdottir A, Gudnadottir M, Kristinsdottir IV, Ingadottir B.
52 608 Integration of nursing services provided to patients with heart failure living at home:
53 609 A longitudinal ethnographic study. *J Clin Nurs*. Published online January 12, 2021.
54 610 doi:10.1111/jocn.15658
- 55
56 611 27. Kim EY, Oh S, Son Y-J. Caring experiences of family caregivers of patients with
57 612 heart failure: A meta-ethnographic review of the past 10 years. *Eur J Cardiovasc*
58 613 *Nurs*. 2020;19(6):473-485. doi:10.1177/1474515120915040

- 1
2
3 614 28. Simmonds R, Glogowska M, McLachlan S, et al. Unplanned admissions and the
4 615 organisational management of heart failure: a multicentre ethnographic, qualitative
5 616 study. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(10):e007522. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007522
- 7 617 29. Glogowska M, Simmonds R, McLachlan S, et al. Managing patients with heart
8 618 failure: a qualitative study of multidisciplinary teams with specialist heart failure
9 619 nurses. *Ann Fam Med*. 2015;13(5):466-471. doi:10.1370/afm.1845
- 11 620 30. Glogowska M, Simmonds R, McLachlan S, et al. "Sometimes we can't fix things": a
12 621 qualitative study of health care professionals' perceptions of end of life care for
13 622 patients with heart failure. *BMC Palliat Care*. 2016;15:3. doi:10.1186/s12904-016-
14 623 0074-y
- 16 624 31. Checa C, Medina-Perucha L, Muñoz M-Á, Verdú-Rotellar JM, Berenguera A. Living
17 625 with advanced heart failure: A qualitative study. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(12):e0243974.
18 626 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0243974
- 21 627 32. Greene JC, Caracelli VJ, Graham WF. Toward a Conceptual Framework for Mixed-
22 628 Method Evaluation Designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*.
23 629 1989;11(3):255-274. doi:10.3102/01623737011003255
- 25 630 33. Kane PM, Daveson BA, Ryan K, et al. Feasibility and acceptability of a patient-
26 631 reported outcome intervention in chronic heart failure. *BMJ Support Palliat Care*.
27 632 2017;7(4):470-479. doi:10.1136/bmjspcare-2017-001355
- 29 633 34. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, et al. Development and preliminary testing of the
30 634 new five-level version of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L). *Qual Life Res*. 2011;20(10):1727-
31 635 1736. doi:10.1007/s11136-011-9903-x
- 33 636 35. Hernandez G, Garin O, Pardo Y, et al. Validity of the EQ-5D-5L and reference
34 637 norms for the Spanish population. *Qual Life Res*. 2018;27(9):2337-2348.
35 638 doi:10.1007/s11136-018-1877-5
- 37 639 36. Comín-Colet J, Garin O, Lupón J, et al. Validación de la versión española del
38 640 Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire. *Revista Española de Cardiología*.
39 641 2011;64(1):51-58. doi:10.1016/j.recesp.2010.10.003
- 41 642 37. Wingham J, Frost J, Britten N. Behind the smile: qualitative study of caregivers'
42 643 anguish and management responses while caring for someone living with heart
43 644 failure. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(7):e014126. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014126
- 45 645 38. Östman M, Bäck-Pettersson S, Sandvik A-H, Sundler AJ. "Being in good hands":
46 646 next of kin's perceptions of continuity of care in patients with heart failure. *BMC*
47 647 *Geriatr*. 2019;19(1):375. doi:10.1186/s12877-019-1390-x
- 49 648 39. Al-Rawashdeh S, Ashour A, Alshraifeen A, Rababa M. Experiences on Providing
50 649 Home Care for A Relative with Heart Failure: A Qualitative Study. *J Community*
51 650 *Health Nurs*. 2020;37(3):129-140. doi:10.1080/07370016.2020.1780043
- 53 651 40. Barnes S, Whittingham K. Informal carers' experiences of caring for a person with
54 652 heart failure in a community setting. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2020;28(3):883-
55 653 890. doi:10.1111/hsc.12919
- 57 654 41. Wingham J, Frost J, Britten N, et al. Caregiver outcomes of the REACH-HF
58 655 multicentre randomized controlled trial of home-based rehabilitation for heart failure
- 60

- 1
2
3 656 with reduced ejection fraction. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2019;18(7):611-620.
4 657 doi:10.1177/1474515119850011
5
6 658 42. Riegel B, Hanlon AL, Coe NB, et al. Health coaching to improve self-care of
7 659 informal caregivers of adults with chronic heart failure - iCare4Me: Study protocol
8 660 for a randomized controlled trial. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2019;85:105845.
9 661 doi:10.1016/j.cct.2019.105845
10
11 662 43. Hirschman KB, Bowles KH, Garcia-Gonzalez L, et al. Lessons learned from the
12 663 implementation of a video health coaching technology intervention to improve self-
13 664 care of family caregivers of adults with heart failure. *Res Nurs Health*.
14 665 2021;44(1):250-259. doi:10.1002/nur.22100
15
16 666 44. Auld JP, Mudd JO, Gelow JM, Hiatt SO, Lee CS. Self-care Moderates the
17 667 Relationship Between Symptoms and Health-Related Quality of Life in Heart
18 668 Failure. *J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2018;33(3):217-224.
19 669 doi:10.1097/JCN.0000000000000447
20
21 670 45. Sedlar N, Lainscak M, Mårtensson J, Strömberg A, Jaarsma T, Farkas J. Factors
22 671 related to self-care behaviours in heart failure: A systematic review of European
23 672 Heart Failure Self-Care Behaviour Scale studies. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*.
24 673 2017;16(4):272-282. doi:10.1177/1474515117691644
25
26
27 674
28 675
29 676
30 677
31 678
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

679 **TABLES**

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689 **Table 1.** Demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients.

| Variable | N=20 |
|--|-------------|
| Age, years, mean (SD) | 72.5 (11.4) |
| Range (minimum-maximum) | 38-85 |
| Gender, male, N (%) | 13 (65.0) |
| Time since diagnosis, years, mean (SD) | 2.35 (2.9) |
| Recent diagnosis (less than 2 months), N (%) | 2 (10.0) |
| NYHA, N (%) | |
| I | 4 (20.0) |
| II | 7 (35.0) |
| III | 9 (45.0) |
| LVEF, %, mean (SD) | 31.1 (6.0) |
| Diabetes, type 2, N (%) | 9 (45.0) |

690

691 *LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; NYHA, New York Heart Association; SD, standard*
692 *deviation.*

693

694 **Table 2.** Domains and main perceptions among HFrEF patients.

| Domains | Patients and caregivers' quotes |
|--|---|
| Domain 1. Meanings related to QoL | |
| <i>Attachment to previous routines</i> | <p>"This has split my old age in two, having many things to do and not being able to do them because you get very tired. I miss that freedom that I had. Now I feel tied." [1-1]</p> <p>"What I have missed the most is driving, I spent 20 years as a taxi driver." [2-1]</p> <p>"For me quality of life means to go wherever you want, to do strange things." [2-4]</p> <p>"I have always solved the problems that arised, but now I feel impotence because I can't do this anymore." [2-8]</p> |
| <i>Fears of progression</i> | <p>"The symptoms depend on the day, they are not permanent, some days you are tired, others not." [2-2]</p> <p>"Before I went out to the country with my dog, and I liked to go out with the bike but I can't anymore, I have to depend on a cane." [2-4]</p> <p>"I was in a good, well-paid job and I liked it, but when this happened, I completely disconnected." [2-8]</p> |
| <i>Filling out PROM questionnaires</i> | <p>"Are you sure of the answer? You barely can walk without taking a break after a few minutes... Are you sure about "rarely"? You feel down quite often" [caregiver of NYHA III patient 2-4].</p> <p>"I will help you, mom, you must answer within the suggested scale, from mild to severe... Mild is not what you have here, you have moderate problems to get up or go for a long walk... this other one is not mild either, I've noticed that you frequently feel anxious and sadder than before... Are you sure about this number on the scale? Why do you say 80 out of 100? You are not that OK, mom; I wish you would be that OK" [caregiver of NYHA I patient 1-10]</p> |
| Domain 2. Caregivers' roles | |
| <i>Tracking at home</i> | "I keep track of pressure, weight, urine. Every day. I have it written down here in the notebook and I also send it through the hospital's APP. But I really don't know if it is of much use. When I had to call the ambulance everything seemed normal, I kept a similar record in recent days." [caregiver of NYHA III patient 1-6] |
| <i>Medical appointments</i> | <p>"When we go to the hospital the doctors ask him if he sleeps well or if he is drowning and he always answers that he is fine, but he is not. The last time he had been sleeping on the couch because he couldn't sleep in bed even with 3 pillows. That's why I always go to the controls with him." [caregiver of NYHA III patient 2-4]</p> <p>"Doctor, he says that he feels OK, but I noticed that he is more anxious, more obsessed about how many times he goes to pee per day. Most days he gets up and cannot sleep worrying about his condition" [caregiver of NYHA III patient 1-6]</p> |
| Domain 3. Relationships with healthcare providers | |
| <i>Commitment</i> | "I come to the very dedicated medical consultations and with the certainty that I am more closely watched than a Ferrari" [2-5] |
| <i>Trustworthiness</i> | <p>"I sit in a consultation where they take their time, and they answer all my doubts. The big difference is that now I feel more secure, I know that I must deal with weight, urine, food. Having the possibility of calling them 24 hours a day gives you more peace of mind." [2-6]</p> <p>"The nurse is better than any cardiologist, everyone loves her." [2-5]</p> <p>"The nurse is very close, I think they have chosen a person with a character and attitude that is just what a patient needs." [2-6]</p> |

695

696

697

698 **Table 3.** Evaluation of health status by PROMs. Scores for EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ.

| | NYHA I-II (N=11) | NYHA III (N=9) | All NYHA (N=20) |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| EQ-5D-5L, patients reporting any limitation ¹ , N (%) | | | |
| Mobility | 5 (40.5) | 9 (100) | 14 (70.0) |
| Self-care | 0 | 7 (77.8) | 7 (35.0) |
| Usual activities | 4 (36.4) | 8 (88.9) | 12 (60.0) |
| Pain/Discomfort | 4 (36.4) | 6 (66.7) | 10 (50.0) |
| Anxiety/Depression | 4 (36.4) | 8 (88.9) | 12 (60.0) |
| EQ-5D-5L, patients reporting severe or extreme limitations ² , N (%) | | | |
| Mobility | 0 | 5 (55.6) | 5 (25.0) |
| Self-care | 0 | 2 (22.2) | 2 (10.0) |
| Usual activities | 0 | 3 (33.3) | 3 (15.0) |
| Pain/Discomfort | 1 (9.1) | 2 (22.2) | 3 (15.0) |
| Anxiety/Depression | 0 | 2 (22.2) | 2 (10.0) |
| EQ-5D-5L global, mean (SD) | | | |
| Index value | 0.85 (0.17) | 0.37 (0.36) | 0.64 (0.36) |
| VAS score | 74.55 (23.50) | 45.56 (14.46) | 61.50 (24.45) |
| KCCQ, mean (SD) | | | |
| Physical limitation | 81.06 (19.04) | 39.72 (26.59) | 62.46 (30.56) |
| Symptom stability | 59.10 (12.61) | 66.67 (30.62) | 62.50 (22.21) |
| Symptom frequency | 84.66 (17.14) | 57.64 (27.14) | 72.50 (25.59) |
| Symptom burden | 91.67 (11.18) | 61.11 (24.30) | 77.92 (23.61) |
| Self-efficacy | 94.32 (10.25) | 85.94 (18.22) | 90.79 (14.34) |
| Quality of life | 82.58 (13.15) | 33.33 (20.83) | 60.42 (30.09) |
| Social limitation | 85.61 (14.02) | 31.94 (26.62) | 61.46 (33.94) |
| KCCQ global scores, mean (SD) | | | |
| Overall summary | 82.69 (9.81) | 41.09 (20.55) | 63.97 (26.06) |
| Clinical summary | 81.30 (10.82) | 49.55 (22.31) | 67.01 (23.10) |
| Total symptom | 81.54 (10.85) | 59.37 (23.50) | 71.56 (20.55) |

699 ¹Any score but 1 (no problems).700 ² Only patients scoring 4 or 5 in each domain.

701 EQ-5D-5L, EuroQoL 5D-5L questionnaire; KCCQ, Kansas City Cardiomyopathy
 702 Questionnaire; NYHA, New York Heart Association; PRO, patient-reported outcome;
 703 SD, standard deviation; VAS, visual analogue scale.

704

705

706

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

for

**Quality of life and disease experience in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in Spain:
a mixed methods approach to go beyond standardized data**

by Raúl Rubio et al.

1. Semi-structured interview guideline (p. 2)**2. Observation guideline for medical visits (p. 9)**

For peer review only

1. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDELINE [Notes for RESEARCHER in blue].

Presentation

Thank you for taking part in this interview.

Please note that:

- Your responses are confidential and anonymous. Under no circumstances will your personal data be shared when the results are published. All answers will be treated in aggregate form.
- A Piece of Pie complies with all European and North American data protection laws and complies with the guidelines set by the EphMRA (European Pharmaceutical Market Research Association) codes of conduct for market research.
- You may discontinue your participation in this research at any time and, as well as the right not to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

With your permission, we will audio record your responses to facilitate our analysis.

[RESEARCHER: Start recording audio.]

I will now introduce myself. My name is [XXX], I work for A Piece of Pie, an innovation consulting firm.

We are currently conducting a study on behalf of a pharmaceutical company, which would like to better understand the experience of patients suffering from Heart Failure.

We would be very grateful if you could share with us your personal experience and help us identify areas for improvement throughout your experience, from the moment of the first symptoms to the present.

Please note that there are no right or wrong answers, as we are interested in your opinions and your personal experience with the condition.

The interview (90 min.)

RESEARCHER: Tailor the questions to the way the patient refers to the disease and use the term provided by the patient to make him/her feel more comfortable. Whenever you believe that the caregiver could provide us with additional information on any of the topics discussed, please direct questions to him/her as well. If, on the other hand, you have the impression that it will be more valuable to ask certain questions only to the caregiver, do so after the interview with the patient. Always ask the patient for permission before talking to the caregiver.

| Exploration area | 1. KNOW THE PATIENT (15 min) |
|--------------------------|---|
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate a relationship with the patient • Better understand the person and their context • Understand your daily habits and routines |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>To begin with, I would like to get to know you as a person and familiarize myself with your personal situation...</i> |

1. **Person:** I would like you to introduce yourself and explain to me:
 - a) How old are you? Who do you live with?
 - b) Tell me a little more about yourself, what do you like to do? What are your hobbies? What do you do? What do you value most now in your life? Why?
2. **Self-description:** If you were to describe yourself, what 3 words would you use? What comes to mind when you think of yourself?
3. **The patient's day-to-day life:** Tell me what a "typical" day looks like. What do you do from the time you wake up until you go to sleep? Differentiate weekday from weekends (i.e., hobbies). *RESEARCHER: be sure they explain their day to day routines to be able to refer to them later when exploring the impact of the disease. Write down on post-its moments with the greatest impact.*
 - a) What time of day would you say you like best? When do you feel most at ease? Why?
 - b) And what moment do you like the least? Why?
 - c) What things do you have the hardest time doing?
 - d) Is there anything you've had to give up in recent times? What do you miss?
4. **Outside view:** What do you think a good friend of yours or family member would say to me if I asked them what [patient's name] is like?
5. **Values:** If you were to tell a young family member what is most important in life, what would you say to them? Do you have any kind of personal "maxim"? Why do you think it's important? *[RESEARCHER: If health-related issues arise, ask when it became important to have a healthy life in your family and/or social environment]*

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exploration area | 2. MEANING OF QUALITY OF LIFE (15 min) |
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand what they associate to quality of life • Understand the impact of different HF symptoms on their quality of life |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>Now I would like us to talk about those things that for you represent quality of life.</i> |

6. **Quality of Life.** Definition: Now that you have completed this map, how would you define quality of life?
- What things allow you to have quality of life? How do you feel about them?
 - What other things keep you from having a better quality of life? How do you feel about them?
7. **Current feeling:** How do you feel at this moment in your life? Do you have any small rituals that help you in your day to day? *RESEARCHER: Ask about eating habits, physical activity, cultural activities, etc.*
- Is there anything that particularly bothers you? Could you give me an example?
 - What makes you happy?
 - If you could improve 3 things from your day to day, what things would you choose? What would you give up?

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exploration area | 3. HEART FAILURE (15 min) |
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the impact of HF on the patient's life • Understand the patient's perception of HF |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>Now I would like you to tell me specifically about the disease you suffer...</i> |

8. **HF:** I would like you to explain to me in your own words how do you see heart failure.
9. **Explanation of the disease:** Do you remember how they explained to you what HF was? What words did they use? Who did so? Could it have been done better? What did they miss?
10. **Living with HF:** What is it like to live with HF? When do you feel it becomes more "uphill"? What helps you overcome it?
11. **Other diagnoses:** Are you diagnosed with other diseases? Were they prior to HF? Are they related in any way?

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exploration area | 4. LIFE JOURNEY (15 min) |
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the impact of HF on the patient's life • Understand the patient's perception of HF |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>To continue I would like us to briefly talk about the most important moments with the disease ...</i> |

12. **Significant moments with the disease:** Now I would like you to think about 5-6 significant moments since you were diagnosed with the disease. *RESEARCHER: Write down every moment in a post-it. Pay attention to whether hospitalization, transplant or heart attack arise spontaneously and if not, ask if you have experienced any of these moments and if so write them down next to the other moments.*
- Why have you precisely chosen these moments?
 - How did you experience each of these moments?
 - Which one of them was the best moment for you? *RESEARCHER: Ask what "the best" means to this patient*
 - Which one of them was the worst moment for you? *RESEARCHER: Ask what "the worst" means and, if it is related to the patient's illness, ask: → Is there anything that could have better helped you cope during those times?*
 - Which of these moments changed your life the most? Why?
13. **Life before HF:** What was your life like before you were diagnosed with HF? What things have changed the most? What do you miss?
- Since you were diagnosed... how has your lifestyle changed? How do you feel about it? What could help you?
 - At the beginning of the interview, you explained to me what a day in your life looks like. How would this change if life were the way it used to be?
 - Could you specify how you think the disease changed your life? *[RESEARCHER: dig into issues such as new interpretations of reality, changes in values, etc.]*

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exploration area | 5. CARE AND EMOTIONAL PROCESS (20 min.) |
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the HF Patient Journey • Identify unmet needs • Understand the perception of the different treatments that the patient has gone through |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>Now I would like us to delve into the journey you have followed since the beginning of the risk factors until now...</i> |

Let's assume that you meet a person who has just been diagnosed with heart failure and does not know what it means to suffer from this condition. If you asked him to tell you about your experience, from the first symptoms until today

14. **Life without the disease:** What was your life like before the disease? If you look back, what do you miss the most?
15. **Previous diseases:** What diseases have you been diagnosed with? Who diagnosed you?
 - a) Were you warned of the risk of developing heart failure?
 - b) What did they explain to you?
 - c) Were you advised to make lifestyle changes? *RESEARCHER, ask about exercise, diet, tobacco, or alcohol consumption...*
 - d) Were you given any preventive treatment?
16. **First symptoms:**
 - a) What changes did you experience that made you think something was wrong? For how long?
 - b) What did you think might be going on?
17. **Diagnosis:**
 - a) Do you remember what was explained to you?
 - b) What tests have you done? Was the process burdensome?
 - c) What doubts did you have?
 - d) What did you think was going to happen at the time?
 - e) Did you search for information on the internet?
 - f) Did you contact any patient associations?
 - g) Have you met anyone with this condition during the process? How has it affected you?
18. **First treatment:**
 - a) Do you remember the name of your treatment?
 - b) How was the first medication taken?
 - c) Did you have any routines to do so?
 - d) Did you stop taking the treatment at some point?
19. **Follow-up visits:**
 - a) What were the routines of the visits like?

- b) Was it hard for you to make them? Currently, how do you feel when you must go to the doctor?
20. **Evolution of the disease:**
- a) How did you find out that the disease was changing? Were there any significant moments?
21. **Hospital admission (if applies):**
- a) What was the process like? How many days last the hospital admission?
- b) How was the experience in the emergency room?
- c) Have you had more than one hospital admission?
22. **Surgery (if applies):**
- a) What kind of device was implanted? Would you be able to explain how it works?
- b) What things does it allow you to do that you couldn't do before? How does this make you feel?
- c) What things can't you do now? How does this make you feel?
23. **Experience PROM questionnaires:** before the interview you answered a set of questionnaires about your symptoms and quality of life.
- a) From what we talked about during the interview, what things do you think should be included in these questionnaires?
- b) What things should your cardiologist know to make decisions?

| Exploration area | 6. HOME TOUR (10 min.) |
|--------------------------|---|
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complement and contrast the information obtained during the interview with the patient's environment. • Understand the immediate context in which patients live (routines, rituals, and concessions to the HF) |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>For us it would be very useful to be able to understand how the disease affects your day to day. If you could show us your house, please, I'm sure it would help us understand...</i> |

RESEARCHER: The home visit should be made at the appropriate time during the interview. It should be done naturally as a continuation of the conversation: asking for places and things inside the house (medicines, refrigerator, sofa, bedroom) that are important in terms of the impact that HF has on your life be shown.

For instance, ask whether there has been any home reform since they have had HF diagnosed. As you walk around, ask the patient about their daily routines and their life under treatment. Try to understand how the patient has adapted his/her life to the disease and his/her level of activity.

If the participant does not mention anything spontaneously, focus on:

- Evidence that signals his/her 'lifestyle', hobbies.
- Written information about HF.
- Evidence of contact with HCPs.

- *Rooms where she/he takes treatment or workout.*
- *Rooms where medicines are stored.*

Please, contrast the information mentioned during the interview with what you observe in the house. If allowed by the participant, take pictures of everything the patient deems relevant to treatment and their life with HF.

With this we would conclude the interview. Thank you very much for your time and participation. Do you have any comments or questions you want to share?

[END RECORDING]

For peer review only

2. OBSERVATION GUIDE OF MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS WITH HCPS

This guide is intended to guide the observation before, during and after the medical visit of selected patients. During the appointment, neither the patient nor the doctor will be asked questions by the researcher.

The objectives of the visit are:

1. Observe whether which topics are discussed during the medical appointment, and whether any of them is directly related to quality of life with the condition.
2. Understand the language that is used by both parties when talking about the condition.

RESEARCHER, prior to the visit, make sure that the patient understands the purpose of the observation within the study.

I – PRE-VISIT: Observation of the hospital environment

RESEARCHER, indicate the center, scheduled time of the visit and the start time of the observation.

*Begin by observing the **hospitals environment**. What surprises you the most? Why?*

Focus on:

- Occupancy of the center: number of patients in the waiting room, number of health workers.
- Space: design, decoration, lighting, colors, atmosphere.
- Organization: Allocation and ease of access.

*Observe the **interviewee**. What does he/she look like? (For example, tired, relaxed, irritated, etc.) Is there anything that stands out? Inquire about your expectations before the visit.*

Focus on:

- Arrival time, ease of access, companions (if applies).
- Body posture and non-verbal signs (facial expression, comfort level with the accompanying situation).
- Preparation for the visit: if the patient brings documents, medical tests, notebooks or tracking applications.
- Waiting times for the visit.
- If applies: Interaction with other health agents (residents, reception, nursing).

II – DURING THE VISIT: Observation of the patient medical interaction

RESEARCHER: Describe the physical space, organization, and arrangement of furniture. Also write down the exact time of the start of the visit.

Focus on:

- Initial time of the visit.
- Initial greeting, use of gestures and non-verbal cues.
- Initial conversation. How general are they? How specific?
 - Questions from the doctor, order, and type.

- On quality of life and/or impact of HF on a day-to-day basis.
 - Type of assessment and use of questionnaires.
 - Types of recommendations (functional, social, quality of life).
 - How the patient responds.
 - Questions from the patient, order, and type.
 - On quality of life and/or impact of HF on a day-to-day basis.
 - How your doctor responds
- Central conversation:
 - Topics of conversation that arouse greater patient attention (e.g., quality of life, impact on daily activity).
 - Topics of conversation that arouse greater attention from the doctor (e.g., clinical, psychological, or social, quality of life or other aspects).
 - Dominant language; use of colloquial language vs medical language.
- Body posture, proxemics and physical distance from the patient and the doctor during the visit.
- Use of silences and non-verbal gestures (gestures of approval, doubt, or confusion).
- Closing of the visit
 - Time and language used for the closing of the visit.
 - Approach of next steps by the doctor and the patient.
 - Farewell, use of gestures and non-verbal cues.
- If applies: interaction with other health agents (residents, receptionist, nursing).

III – AFTER THE VISIT: Observation of the patient

*RESEARCHER: Write down the exact **time of the end** of the visit. Accompany the patient at the exit of the visit and / or another instance of contact related to the visit (reception desks). If possible, know your perception about the results of the visit.*

Focus on:

- End time/duration of the visit.
- The patient's body posture and non-verbal gestures.
- Language used to assess the visit.
- If applies: interaction with other health agents (residents, reception, nursing).

End of observation.***

ETHNOQOL – COREQ CHECKLIST

5 October 2021

| No. | Item | Description | Section # |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity | | | |
| Personal characteristics | | | |
| 1. | Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? SCC MFE | Line 201 |
| 2. | Credentials | What were the researcher's credentials? <i>E.g.</i> <i>PhD, MD</i> SCC, PhD MFE, BA | NA |
| 3. | Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? Senior researchers | Line 201 |
| 4. | Gender | Was the researcher male or female? Female | Line 201 |
| 5. | Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? >5 years of experience in medical sociology and medical anthropology | Line 202 |
| Relationship with participants | | | |
| 6. | Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? No. | Line 204 |
| 7. | Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? <i>E.g. Personal goals, reasons for doing the research</i> Research goals | Line 205 |
| 8. | Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? <i>E.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i> None. | NA |
| Domain 2: Study design | | | |
| Theoretical framework | | | |
| 9. | Methodological orientation and theory | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? <i>E.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</i> Thematic analysis Phenomenological perspective | Lines 150-161, and section on Methods |
| Participant selection | | | |
| 10. | Sampling | How were participants selected? <i>E.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</i> Purposeful | Line 194 |
| 11. | Method of approach | How were participants approached? <i>E.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i> | Lines 186-196 |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | <i>face-to-face</i> | |
| 12. | Sample size | How many participants were in the study? 20 | Line 194 and 287 |
| 13. | Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? What were the reasons for this? None | Lines 186- 294 |
| Setting | | | |
| 14. | Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? <i>E.g. home, clinic, Workplace</i> <i>Patients' home</i> | Lines 198- 232 |
| 15. | Presence of non-participants | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? No. | Lines 198- 232 |
| 16. | Description of sample | What are the important characteristics of the sample? <i>E.g. demographic data, date</i> <i>demographic data and clinic characteristics</i> | Lines 286- 294 and Table 1 |
| Data collection | | | |
| 17. | Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? Yes. No pilot tested. | See Suppleme ntary Materials |
| 18. | Repeat interviews | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? No. | NA |
| 19. | Audio/visual recording | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? Yes, audio recording. | Lines 229- 232 |
| 20. | Field notes | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? During interviews and after direct observations of medical appointments. | Lines 229- 232 |
| 21. | Duration | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? 90 min for interviews and 20 min for clinical encounters. | Line 206, 222 |
| 22. | Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? Yes, in joint analysis sessions with authors. | Line 280 |
| 23. | Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? No. | NA |
| Domain 3: analysis and findings | | | |
| Data analysis | | | |
| 24. | Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? The two field researchers | Line 270 |
| 25. | Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? Authors provided the description of domains, no coding tree. | Lines 267- 279 |
| 26. | Derivation of themes | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? Derived from data. | Lines 267- 279 |

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 27. | Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? No. | NA |
| 28. | Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the findings? No. | NA |
| Reporting | | | |
| 29. | Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? <i>E.g. Participant number</i> Yes. | Table 2 |
| 30. | Data and findings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? Yes, in joint analysis sessions. | Lines 267-279 |
| 31. | Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? Yes, in joint analysis sessions. | See Results section |
| 32. | Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? Yes. | Yes, Table 2 and Results section |

BMJ Open

Quality of life and disease experience in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in Spain: a mixed-methods study

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>BMJ Open</i> |
| Manuscript ID | bmjopen-2021-053216.R2 |
| Article Type: | Original research |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 27-Oct-2021 |
| Complete List of Authors: | <p>Rubio, Raül; A Piece of Pie SL Palacios, Beatriz; AstraZeneca Farmaceutica Spain SA, Medical Varela, Luis; AstraZeneca Farmaceutica Spain SA, Medical Fernández de la Fundación, Raquel; AstraZeneca Farmaceutica Spain SA, Medical Camargo Correa, Selene; A Piece of Pie SL Estupiñan, María Fernanda; A Piece of Pie SL Calvo, Elena; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group José, Nuria; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Ruiz Muñoz, Marta; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Yun, Sergi; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Jiménez-Marrero, Santiago; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Alcoberro, Lidia; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Garay, Alberto; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardio-Oncology Unit Moliner, Pedro; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardio-Oncology Unit Sánchez-Fernández, Lydia; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardio-Oncology Unit Soria Gómez, María Teresa; Puerta de Hierro University Hospital of Majadahonda, Heart Failure Unit Hidalgo, Encarna; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Enjuanes, C; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| | Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Calero-Molina, Esther; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group Rueda, Yolanda; CardioAlianza San Saturnino, Maite; CardioAlianza Garcimartín, Paloma; Hospital del Mar, Outpatients Clinics; Hospital del Mar Institute for Medical Research, Biomedical Research in Heart Diseases López-Ibor, Jorge; Puerta de Hierro University Hospital of Majadahonda, Cardiology Segovia-Cubero, Javier; Puerta de Hierro University Hospital of Majadahonda, Cardiology; Carlos III Health Institute, CIBER of Cardiovascular Diseases Comin-Colet, Josep; Bellvitge University Hospital, Cardiology and Heart Failure Program; Bellvitge Institute for Biomedical Research, BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group |
| Primary Subject Heading : | Qualitative research |
| Secondary Subject Heading : | Research methods, Cardiovascular medicine |
| Keywords : | Heart failure < CARDIOLOGY, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 1 *Original research*
4 2
5 3
6
7 4

8
9 **Quality of life and disease experience in patients with**
10 **heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in Spain: a**
11 **mixed-methods study**
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Raül Rubio,¹ Beatriz Palacios,² Luis Varela,² Raquel Fernández,² Selene Camargo
20 Correa,¹ María Fernanda Estupiñan,¹ Elena Calvo,^{3,4} Nuria José,^{3,4} Marta Ruiz
21 Muñoz,^{3,4} Sergi Yun,^{3,4} Santiago Jiménez-Marrero,^{3,4} Lidia Alcoberro^{3,4} Alberto
22 Garay,^{3,5} Pedro Moliner,^{3,5} Lydia Sánchez-Fernández,^{3,5} María Teresa Soria Gómez,⁶
23 Encarna Hidalgo,^{3,4} Cristina Enjuanes,^{3,4} Esther Calero-Molina,^{3,4} Yolanda Rueda,⁷
24 Maite San Saturnino,⁷ Paloma Garcimartín,^{8,9} Jorge V. López-Ibor,¹⁰ Javier Segovia-
25 Cubero,^{11,12} Josep Comin-Colet^{3,4,13}
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 1. A Piece of Pie SL, Barcelona, Spain

37 2. Medical Department, AstraZeneca Farmacéutica Spain SA, Madrid, Spain

38 3. Cardiology Department and Heart Failure Program, Bellvitge University Hospital,
39 Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain

40 4. BIO-HEART Cardiovascular Diseases Research Group, Bellvitge Biomedical
41 Research Institute (IDIBELL), Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain

42 5. Cardio-Oncology Unit, Bellvitge University Hospital, Catalan Institute of Oncology,
43 L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Spain

44 6. Heart Failure Unit, Puerta de Hierro University Hospital, Majadahonda, Madrid,
45 Spain

46 7. CardioAlianza, Barcelona, Spain

47 8. Outpatient Clinics, Hospital del Mar, Parc de Salut Mar, Barcelona, Spain
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 29 9. Biomedical Research in Heart Diseases, Hospital del Mar, Medical Research
4
5 30 Institute (IMIM), Barcelona, Spain
6
7 31 10. Outpatient Heart Failure Clinic, Department of Cardiology, Puerta de Hierro
8
9 32 University Hospital, Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain
10
11 33 11. Department of Cardiology, Puerta de Hierro University Hospital, Majadahonda,
12
13 34 Madrid, Spain
14
15 35 12. CIBER of Cardiovascular Diseases, Carlos III Institute, Madrid, Spain
16
17 36 13. Department of Clinical Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Barcelona,
18
19 37 Barcelona, Spain
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 40 Correspondence to: Dr. Josep Comin-Colet, Department of Cardiology and Heart
27
28 41 Failure Program, Bellvitge University Hospital, 08907 L'Hospitalet de Llobregat,
29
30 42 Barcelona, Spain
31
32
33
34

35 44 Email: josepcomin@gmail.com
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 50 Word count: 4,140
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 53 **ABSTRACT**
4
5
6

7 55 **Objectives:** To gather insights on the disease experience of patients with heart failure
8 with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), and assess how patients' experiences and
9
10 56 narratives related to the disease complement data collected through standardized
11
12 57 patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs). Also, to explore new ways of evaluating
13
14 58 the burden experienced by patients and caregivers.
15
16 59

17
18 60 **Design:** Observational, descriptive, multicenter, cross-sectional, mixed-methods study.
19

20 61 **Setting:** Secondary care, patient's homes.
21

22 62 **Participants:** Twenty patients with HFrEF (NYHAs I-III) aged 38-85 years.
23

24 63 **Measures:** PROMs EuroQoL 5D-5L and Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire
25 and patient interview and observation.
26
27 64

28 65 **Results:** A total of 20 patients with HFrEF participated in the study. The patients' mean
29 (SD) age was 72.5 (11.4) years, 65% were male, and were classified in NYHA
30
31 66 functional classes I (N=4), II (N=7) and III (N=9). The study showed a strong impact of
32
33 67 HF in the patients' quality of life (QoL) and disease experience, as revealed by the
34
35 68 standardized PROMs (EQ-5D-5L global index=0.64 [0.36]; KCCQ total symptom
36
37 69 score=71.56 [20.55]) and the in-depth interviews. Patients and caregivers often
38
39 70 disagreed describing and evaluating perceived QoL, as patients downplayed their
40
41 71 limitations and caregivers overemphasized the poor QoL of the patients. Patients
42
43 72 related current QoL to distant life experiences or to critical moments in their disease,
44
45 73 such as hospitalizations. Anxiety over the disease progression is apparent in both
46
47 74 patients and caregivers, suggesting that caregiver-specific tools should be developed.
48
49 75

50
51 76 **Conclusions:** PROMs are an effective way of assessing symptoms over the most
52 recent time period. However, especially in chronic diseases such as HFrEF, PROM
53
54 77 scores could be complemented with additional tools to gain a better understanding of
55
56 78 the patient's status. New PROMs designed to evaluate and compare specific points in
57
58 79 the life of the patient could be clinically more useful to assess changes in health status.
59
60 80

1
2
3 81
45 82 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 7 83 • This study followed an ethnographic approach to collect data on patient's
8
9 84 experiences and narratives related to heart failure, a type of study not before
10
11 85 carried out in Spain and with scarce reports worldwide.
12
13 86 • Both patients and caregivers could discuss freely and explain in detail the
14
15 87 aspects of the disease that they considered under control and those where
16
17 88 change was deemed necessary.
18
19
20 89 • The often-contrasting views of patients and caregivers highlighted the
21
22 90 difficulties in obtaining accurate and objective evaluations of quality of life.
23
24 91 • Although the selection of patients aimed for inclusiveness and diversity, the
25
26 92 limited number of HFREF patients selected for in-depth analysis may not be fully
27
28 93 representative of the population of HFREF patients in Spain.
29
30 94 • The ethnographic interviews took place in the context of the COVID-19
31
32 95 pandemic, which transformed the daily routines of patients and caregivers and
33
34 96 may have to a certain extent altered their perspective of living with HFREF.
35
36
37 97
38
39 98
40
41 99
42
43 100

101 INTRODUCTION

102
103 Despite advances in treatment, heart failure (HF) remains one of the leading causes of
104 hospitalization and readmissions, death and disability worldwide.^{1,2} The economic
105 burden of HF, mainly driven by recurrent hospitalizations, consumes an estimated 1-
106 2% of healthcare budgets.^{3,4} The progressive aging of the population in some Western
107 countries, such as Spain, and increasing HF prevalence, have positioned this disease
108 as a major public health problem.⁵⁻⁷

109 Clinically, HF can be classified based on the left ventricular ejection fraction
110 (LVEF) into HF with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF), defined as an EF $\leq 40\%$, mildly-
111 reduced ejection fraction (HFmrEF), defined as EF $>40\%$ and $<50\%$, and HF with
112 preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), defined as an ejection fraction $\geq 50\%$.⁸ Patients in
113 these subgroups often have distinct underlying etiologies, demographics, co-
114 morbidities and response to therapies.^{9,10} Additionally, the presence and severity of
115 symptoms and exercise intolerance of patients with HF is usually categorized following
116 the New York Heart Association (NYHA) classification into four functional classes (I-IV),
117 being class IV the worst.¹¹

118 HF can severely affect the quality of life (QoL) of the patient by reducing their
119 independence and ability to undertake daily living activities, and can also disturb their
120 mental health and psychosocial well-being.^{12,13} Prior studies have shown that patients
121 with HF had an even higher incidence of limitations than patients with chronic diseases
122 such as diabetes, cancer, or Alzheimer's disease.¹³ Several patient-reported outcome
123 measures (PROMs) have been used to quantify health status in patients with HF, such
124 as the generic EuroQoL 5D-5L (EQ-5D-5L) and the disease-specific Kansas City
125 Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire (KCCQ).¹³⁻¹⁷ PROMs such as the KCCQ have a good
126 correlation with prognosis and their use has been encouraged by the American Heart
127 Association in both routine clinical practice and clinical trials of new therapies.^{18,19}
128 However, although these PROMs can be useful indicators of health status and how HF

1
2
3 129 impacts patients' QoL within a 2-week recall period, they have not been designed to
4
5 130 reflect some of the patient's and caregiver's perspectives on living with HF, including
6
7 131 aspects such as the importance of interactions with family or healthcare providers,
8
9 132 feelings related to the course of their disease, or barriers to accessing healthcare
10
11 133 resources.²⁰ These unique aspects of culture, preferences, customs, values and
12
13 134 attitudes, could have an impact on treatment effectiveness and outcomes.
14
15 135 Complementary to PROMs, in-depth interviews with patients and caregivers are useful
16
17 136 to evaluate quality of patient care and the interaction between the patient and the
18
19 137 healthcare system.²¹ However, neglecting the limitations PROMs could hinder our
20
21 138 understanding of the patient's attitudes and real-life disease experiences.
22
23

24 139 Ethnographic qualitative studies involve observation of the patients and
25
26 140 caregivers in their real-world settings to determine how they behave in specific
27
28 141 contexts. Ethnographic research collects comprehensive information from multiple
29
30 142 sources such as interviews, caregiver perspectives, non-participant observation of
31
32 143 healthcare visits and home tours, among others, and has previously been carried out to
33
34 144 investigate QoL in patients with HF.^{12,22-27} Previous ethnographic studies conducted in
35
36 145 patients from the United Kingdom identified barriers to interventions for HF and critical
37
38 146 points on disease pathways which resulted in an increase in the risk of admission.²⁸⁻³⁰
39
40

41 147 Little is known about the patient's and caregiver's perspective of living with HF
42
43 148 in Spain, and previous studies did not evaluate patients by LVEF.³¹ The objective of
44
45 149 this study was to gather insights on the disease experiences of patients with HFrEF
46
47 150 and their caregivers, and the impact on their everyday life. We used a mixed methods
48
49 151 approach involving the parallel use of an ethnographic approach with PROMs for the
50
51 152 assessment of health status (EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ). Rather than seeking corroboration
52
53 153 of results from different data sources, the mixed methods approach intended to
54
55 154 highlight the complementarity of ethnographic data and PROMs.^{32,33} The goal was to
56
57 155 improve awareness of healthcare professionals, service providers, policy makers and
58
59 156 educators on the factors that can potentially influence treatment effectiveness, and the
60

1
2
3 157 existence of aspects of the patient's experience that are not covered by existing tools.
4
5 158 In turn, this may encourage firstly, a more active participation of healthcare providers,
6
7 159 patients and caregivers in clinical decisions considering not only the disease state, but
8
9 160 also cultural factors and individual values and attitudes, and secondly, the development
10
11 161 of instruments for the evaluation of healthcare interventions.
12
13
14 162
15
16 163
17
18 164

19 20 165 **METHODS**

21
22 166
23
24 167 We conducted an observational, cross-sectional, descriptive, multicenter, and mixed
25
26 168 methods study to obtain insights regarding HFREF patients' perception and attitudes
27
28 169 towards their disease. The patients in the study were recruited at the Departments of
29
30 170 Cardiology of 2 large tertiary-level hospitals, namely, the Puerta del Hierro University
31
32 171 Hospital (Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain) and the Bellvitge University Hospital (Hospitalet
33
34 172 de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain). The patient populations attended by these hospitals
35
36 173 were socioeconomically very distinct, as the Puerta del Hierro University Hospital is
37
38 174 located at a high-income district of Madrid, and the Bellvitge University Hospital covers
39
40 175 a suburban area of mostly low or very low-income patients. Due to the qualitative and
41
42 176 observational design of the study, there was no masking or randomization. Clinical
43
44 177 management of the patients followed routine clinical practice, with no changes in
45
46 178 treatment or additional clinical assessments specific for this study. All decisions related
47
48 179 to disease management were made at the discretion of the treating physician without
49
50 180 interference by the sponsor. Informed consent was obtained from each patient prior to
51
52 181 study initiation. The patients authorized the interview with their main caregiver as part
53
54 182 of the informed consent process. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics
55
56 183 Review Board of the Bellvitge University Hospital on March 12th, 2020 with number
57
58 184 PR062/20.
59
60

1
2
3 1854
5 186 ***Patient selection***

6
7 187 Patients were assessed for eligibility by local clinical staff according to selection criteria
8
9 188 at each participating center. Patients were classified by NYHA class and could be
10
11 189 belong to any of the 4 classes I to IV. The inclusion criteria were ≥ 18 years at the time
12
13 190 of consent, established documented diagnosis of HFrEF (LVEF $\leq 40\%$), and signed
14
15 191 consent to participate. Patients unable to complete the PROMs because of any
16
17 192 psychological or physical condition and patients hospitalized at inclusion were
18
19 193 excluded.

20
21
22 194 A sample size of 20 patients was selected to have sufficient representation of
23
24 195 the 3 major NYHA classes. Purposeful sampling was based on the characteristics of
25
26 196 potential participants extracted from medical records to obtain optimal variety.

27
28 19729
30 198 ***Data collection***

31
32 199 The patient's demographic information and medical history were collected from medical
33
34 200 records at the selection visit. On the day of the home visit the patients first completed
35
36 201 two health status questionnaires and then two female senior researchers (SCC, MFE)
37
38 202 with >5 years of experience in medical sociology and medical anthropology conducted
39
40 203 a semi-structured interview following a topic guide (See Supplementary Materials).
41
42 204 There was no prior relationship between the interviewer and the patient, who was
43
44 205 informed about the research goals prior to starting the interview. The interview
45
46 206 conducted at the patient's home lasted approximately 90 minutes. In some instances,
47
48 207 with the consent of the patient, his/her closest caregivers were interviewed at the
49
50 208 patient's home on the same day for about 30 min. The interview with the caregivers
51
52 209 aimed at understanding their perception of the patient's status and evaluating their
53
54 210 social and emotional relationship with the patient.

55
56
57 211 In order to gather observational data to complement participants' accounts of
58
59 212 their medical experience, 6 out of 20 patients (two per NYHA class) consented that the

1
2
3 213 same researcher carrying out the interview would observe their first healthcare
4
5 214 appointment after the home interview. Direct observation allowed researchers to gather
6
7 215 information regarding patients' objective and subjective experiences during medical
8
9 216 encounters, about how patients and caregivers conveyed concerns and needs, and
10
11 217 provided clues about incongruent behaviour. A single appointed researcher observed
12
13 218 the initial and main focus of conversations with healthcare providers, questions by
14
15 219 patients and caregivers, and patients' use of verbal and non-verbal communication
16
17 220 (e.g., behaviour that suggested passive, nervous, impatient, caring, or expectant
18
19 221 attitudes). Immediately after the appointment, patients and caregivers, if present, were
20
21 222 asked to evaluate the medical visit (clinical encounters last 20 minutes on average).
22
23 223 Researchers took field notes and added reflexive comments about the encounter and
24
25 224 about participants' experience.

26
27
28 225 The in-depth interview aimed to capture the patients' experience with the
29
30 226 disease from their own point of view, whereas the non-participant observation during
31
32 227 the medical visits allowed to investigate the relationship with the healthcare
33
34 228 practitioners for both of patients and family members.

35
36
37 229 Data from in-depth interviews were collected by audio recording and field notes,
38
39 230 whereas data from direct observation of medical encounters were collected by field
40
41 231 notes only, taking into consideration all aspects of the patient's life and in all cases
42
43 232 protecting the patient's data privacy.

44
45 233

46 47 234 **Quantitative outcomes and analyses**

48
49 235 Secondary variables assessed included PROMs by using the EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ.
50
51 236 The EQ-5D-5L is a self-reported questionnaire used to derive a standardized measure
52
53 237 of health status, also referred to as a utility score.³⁴ The KCCQ is a self-administered
54
55 238 HF-specific instrument and has shown to be a valid, reliable and responsive measure
56
57 239 for patients with HF.¹⁴ Spanish validated versions of these questionnaires were
58
59 240 used.^{35,36} For the EQ-5D-5L, the number and percentage of patients reporting any type

1
2
3 241 of limitation for each questionnaire dimension, the number and percentage of patients
4
5 242 reporting “severe” or “extreme” responses for each questionnaire dimension, as well as
6
7 243 the index value and the visual analogue scale (VAS, where 100 equals the best health
8
9 244 HF patients can imagine), were assessed; for the KCCQ, the score for each
10
11 245 domain/subdomain, and a summary score for the total symptom score, clinical
12
13 246 symptom score and overall summary score were assessed (scores range from 0 to
14
15 247 100; were higher scores indicate a better health status). The PROMs were analyzed
16
17 248 descriptively.
18
19
20
21

22 250 ***Qualitative outcomes and analyses***

23
24 251 The following primary variables were assessed: the patient’s profile; the patient’s
25
26 252 emotional perception (values, attitude, frustration, fear) during the HFrEF journey,
27
28 253 including the role of the caregiver; key relationships and communication processes
29
30 254 during the patient HFrEF journey (patient-doctor, patient-carer/family); main barriers to
31
32 255 accessing healthcare services experienced by patients during the HFrEF journey; and
33
34 256 the patient’s unmet needs (cognitive, emotional and functional) associated with HF.
35
36 257 Observational data, interviews and documentary materials were analyzed at three
37
38 258 levels: individual patient cases, across cases within research centers, and across
39
40 259 research centers to synthesis.
41
42

43 260 Thematic content analysis was used to analyse the data gathered from
44
45 261 interviews and direct observation of clinical encounters. The analysis was carried out
46
47 262 by field researchers in six steps: 1) read and re-read of interview and medical
48
49 263 encounters’ fieldnotes; 2) identification of main topics per interview domain; 3) text
50
51 264 codification to identify current and new domains; 4) review of PROM scores per
52
53 265 interviewer and NYHA class; 5) comparison of PROM scores and fieldwork data; and
54
55 266 6) and synthesis of repetitive patterns.
56
57

58 267 Subsequently, data triangulation was used to integrate quantitative and
59
60 268 qualitative information by the researchers, individually and in joint sessions. Three

1
2
3 269 types of triangulation were used: investigator, data and methodological triangulation.
4
5 270 Two investigators were involved in the data collection and analysis. Findings from each
6
7 271 investigator were compared to develop a deeper understanding of how the different
8
9 272 investigators view the issue. Preliminary conclusions were discussed with the broader
10
11 273 team of authors in further analysis sessions. Regarding data triangulation, investigators
12
13 274 compared the answers from patients and caregivers (information sources) separately
14
15 275 to identify areas of agreement and disagreement over the main topics. Regarding
16
17 276 methodological triangulation, findings from interviews, direct observations of medical
18
19 277 appointments, and PROM scores were compared to identify incongruences and
20
21 278 disparities in patients' responses (e.g., patients reporting mild limitations in PROMs but
22
23 279 highlighting severe limitations during the interview and/or medical appointment).

26 280 The analytical process aimed to reach theoretical saturation where no new
27
28 281 dimensions emerged during joint sessions.
29
30
31 282
32
33 283

34 284 **RESULTS**

38 286 ***Patient characteristics***

40 287 A total of 20 patients with HF_rEF participated in the study (Table 1). The mean (SD)
41
42 288 age of the patients was 72.5 (11.4) years (range, 38-85 years), and 13 (65.0%) were
43
44 289 male. The study included 4, 7 and 9 patients in NYHA functional classes I-III,
45
46 290 respectively. Although the study protocol was designed to include class IV patients,
47
48 291 their frailty, and the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in the patients' self-caring
49
50 292 strategies, hindered the participation of any patients in this class. Twelve patients were
51
52 293 being treated at the Bellvitge University Hospital and 8 patients were being treated at
53
54 294 the Puerta del Hierro University Hospital.
55
56
57
58
59
60

296 296 ***Understanding of QoL by patients with HF***

1
2
3 297 During the in-depth interviews, the participants described how living with HFrEF
4
5 298 impacted their lives, including how they experienced the symptoms of HF and their
6
7 299 effects on daily routines (summarized in Table 2). Their responses provided relevant
8
9 300 insights on what QoL meant to them. For many patients, QoL was "being able to do
10
11 301 what they did before" and missed being independent, their everyday life and
12
13 302 maintaining an active lifestyle.

14
15 303 Patients tended to self-limit and isolate to limit symptomatology due to
16
17 304 progression-related fears or even fear to a sudden death, despite a more sedentary
18
19 305 lifestyle being detrimental to the recovery and to their own QoL.
20
21

22 306

23 24 307 ***Impact of demographic factors in perception of QoL***

25
26 308 Attitudes and perceptions towards HFrEF seemed to strongly depend on age and
27
28 309 education. Young patients tend to be more informed about the disease and challenge
29
30 310 the healthcare practitioners' opinions.
31

32
33 311 In contrast, older patients had a difficult time differentiating between HFrEF
34
35 312 symptoms and those associated with the normal process of ageing. Often caregivers
36
37 313 had to help them understand the information provided by healthcare workers.
38

39 314 The interviews also revealed that male patients showed more dependency towards
40
41 315 caregivers than their female counterparts. Female caregivers tended to strongly
42
43 316 challenge male patients' perception of QoL. In one case, the wife of a NYHA III patient
44
45 317 was very critical of her husband's attitude and thought that part of his evolution strongly
46
47 318 depended on his will, and asked him to exercise more, read, get on the computer, and
48
49 319 go out for a ride on the motorcycle. They even consulted with a psychologist friend to
50
51 320 help them handle the situation.
52

53 321

54 55 322 ***PROMs and health status***

56
57 323 The results of the EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ showed a strong correspondence with the
58
59 324 NYHA functional classes, and also between the two PROMs (Table 3). We found that

1
2
3 325 scores from PROMs dropped as the NYHA increased (i.e., the higher the NYHA class
4
5 326 and the HF symptoms, the worse their perceived health status was). No differences
6
7 327 were observed in scores with respect to gender, or between the patients from the two
8
9 328 hospitals.

10
11 329 Some patients with lower NYHAs, despite having visible constraints in health
12
13 330 status, indicated high scores in the EQ-5D-5L VAS score. For example, a patient with
14
15 331 major comorbidities [1-10] with NYHA I indicated a EQ-5D-5L VAS score of 90 and
16
17 332 emphasized that her QoL was good. This contrasted with the views expressed by her
18
19 333 caregiver (Table 2).

20
21
22 334 Regardless of the NYHA, some patients seemed to minimize and relativize the
23
24 335 impact of HFrEF on their QoL. Caregivers, in contrast, could emphasize the limitations
25
26 336 imposed by HFrEF. For example, the wife and caregiver of a NYHA II patient [1-11]
27
28 337 indicated that in the consultation with the cardiologist the patient usually
29
30 338 underestimated his condition. In another case, the wife of a NYHA III patient
31
32 339 commented that she must be “present with the doctors, because when they ask him
33
34 340 something, he usually answers that he is fine and does not really say what is wrong
35
36 341 with him.”

37
38
39 342 Patients with advanced NYHAs, who experienced one or several hospital
40
41 343 admissions, compared their current experience with the disease to those acute periods
42
43 344 of fear and greater uncertainty. Patients showed a limited portrait of their QoL due to
44
45 345 the required reference to the last 2-weeks in the questionnaire. For example, a NYHA
46
47 346 III patient [2-8] had doubts when filling out the questionnaires since he related his
48
49 347 mobility limitations to a problem with his legs (a consequence of an aortic dissection)
50
51 348 but he did not relate it to HF. Also, he mentioned that his physical and emotional
52
53 349 situation was much better now compared to the initial moments where he was more
54
55 350 affected. He had a hard time taking the prior two weeks as a reference point, therefore
56
57 351 his responses showed a feeling of improvement compared to the most critical
58
59 352 moments.
60

1
2
3 353 Another NYHA III patient [2-6] had doubts when filling the questionnaires, since
4
5 354 his symptoms varied from day to day and between morning, afternoon and night. He
6
7 355 also had moments of crises where he considered his symptoms to be worse, so limiting
8
9 356 to the last two weeks seemed difficult. Likewise, he stated that shortness of breath or
10
11 357 air was something he thought he got from lying down for a long time and not that it was
12
13 358 a symptom of HFrEF.

15 359 Caregivers could overestimate and present a dramatic view of the patient's day-
16
17 360 to-day life with HFrEF. Family caregivers showed more distress when discussing their
18
19 361 relatives with HFrEF compared to that showed by remunerated caregivers:
20
21

22 362

24 363 *“she is concerned about his low spirits and his anguish. She says that the*
25
26 364 *symptoms she develops from anxiety can “mask” the symptoms of HF,*
27
28 365 *such as pressure and pain in the chest, agitation, a feeling of suffocation.”*

30 366 [caregiver of patient 1-8, NYHA III]
31
32

33 367

34 368 *“As cardiologists told us that little can be done to improve his condition, we*
35
36 369 *live these years ‘as a gift’.”* [caregiver of patient 1-6]
37
38

39 370

41 371 **Caregivers' roles and needs**

42
43 372 In this study, only five patients were able to live without a caregiver. Generally, strong
44
45 373 family bonds were apparent and important for the patient. Caregivers were often in
46
47 374 charge of organizing visits to the healthcare providers, keeping track of parameters
48
49 375 such as weight and blood pressure, and administering medication (Table 2).

51 376 Caregivers acted also as interpreters of the disease status on behalf of their patients.
52
53

54 377

56 378 **Relationships with healthcare providers**

57
58 379 The interactions between patients and caregivers with healthcare workers at
59
60 380 hospitals were investigated by the social scientists by accompanying them to a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

381 medical appointment. The study showed that patients are usually highly positive
382 about their experience with cardiologists and nurses (Table 2). A patient [1-9]
383 explained that the nurse called him weekly to ask about how he was coping,
384 and to discuss data such as weight and blood pressure changes. He generally
385 felt very accompanied by the hospital staff, both cardiologists and nurses. Other
386 patients also expressed a high opinion of the healthcare personnel. Often
387 patients highly value their relationship with the nurse, as they probably feel
388 more confident to express their experiences to his/her.
389
390
391

For peer review only

DISCUSSION

In this study we used ethnographic methods with HFREF patients and their caregivers, complemented with general and disease-specific health status assessments, to obtain insights regarding patients' disease perception and attitudes towards their disease.

Ethnographic methods adopt a phenomenological perspective, aiming to understand individuals' life experiences to acquire relevant knowledge. The results of this study suggest that the patient's perspectives of their QoL were dependent on their memories of what they could do before, and often were better than reality. Caregivers, in contrast, offered a distinct view of the patient's status and QoL, often substantially worse and emphasizing the severity of their life-limiting condition.

As healthcare systems aim to become more 'patient-centered', there is a recognized need to capture accurately the patient's experience of the disease, in an effort to improve it. The use of PROMs have therefore become common in assessing current treatments and new therapies and medical interventions, although their application in clinical practice is still very limited. Despite their widespread use by cardiologists, an awareness of the limitations of PROMs when evaluating the experience of the patient with HF is critical for their interpretation. For example, the effects of comorbid conditions could add confounding factors to the evaluation of HF through a single PROM instrument. Likewise, patients often relate their overall QoL experience to the moments of crisis, such as hospitalizations, 'anchoring' all subsequent experiences to those events and distorting their responses in the questionnaires.

In the general population the understanding of HF and its outcome is low, contributing to anxiety about the evolution of the disease in both patients and caregivers. In contrast, other life-limiting diseases, such as cancer, often have better-defined pathways of care and psychosocial support.³⁰ In this regard, patient associations and support groups could play a role by helping the patient understand

1
2
3 420 the disease, the treatments, and the expectations. Patient associations promote social
4
5 421 integration and help patient share their experiences, providing the necessary
6
7 422 encouragement to cope with their disease and go on with daily activities. Also, as
8
9 423 reflected in some of the interviews described in this study, it is important for the patient
10
11 424 to feel that he/she can have rapid access to medical services. In this regard, the study
12
13 425 reflected that that while some patients were reluctant to discuss aspects of daily life or
14
15 426 to express their feelings and fears to the cardiologist, they were more open and felt
16
17 427 closer to the nurse, a relationship that was highly valued by many patients. Generally,
18
19 428 an efficient and fluid communication with all the healthcare providers involved in the
20
21 429 treatment is essential.^{12,29}

22
23
24 430 The study revealed that the fear to losing independence and the uncertainty
25
26 431 about the progress of their disease could be factors that motivate some HF patients to
27
28 432 downplay their limitations. Conversely, caregivers could overemphasize the poor QoL
29
30 433 of the patients, also motivated by concerns of the progress of the disease, its
31
32 434 unpredictable trajectory, and lack of proper knowledge and training. Also, it is possible
33
34 435 that, since these caregivers were very often family members, their views could be
35
36 436 overstated due to emotional attachment to the patient. In any case, these results
37
38 437 suggest that instruments should be developed to help caregivers in their daily work with
39
40 438 patients with HF, so that they are better informed on the course of the disease and
41
42 439 expectations.²⁵ In this regard, numerous recent studies have highlighted challenges
43
44 440 experienced by caregivers of patients with HF.³⁷⁻⁴⁰ Some initiatives along these lines,
45
46 441 such caregiver-specific QoL questionnaires,⁴¹ and video coaching,^{42,43} are currently
47
48 442 being developed and tested.

49
50
51 443 The results of our study suggest recommendations for future PROM design or
52
53 444 questionnaire selection. In patients with HF the PROM instruments should aim to truly
54
55 445 mirror patients' experience, using language that the patient associates with their
56
57 446 cultural views of QoL. To provide insights on relevant changes in QoL, the PROMs
58
59 447 should be constructed to capture specific timepoints related to the patient experience
60

1
2
3 448 (e.g., healthcare status before the diagnosis, and before and after hospitalizations). In
4
5 449 this way, reference points in the patient's lives could be established that favored
6
7 450 meaningful QoL before/after comparisons. Instruments should allow an alternative
8
9 451 stratification based on these clinical events and patients' perceived QoL along them.
10
11 452 Also, as self-care behaviors can greatly affect symptoms in patients with HF,⁴⁴ the
12
13 453 patient's self-caring strategies, perception of autonomy, level of empowerment, and the
14
15 454 perception of past and present experiences with the disease should be taken into
16
17 455 consideration when developing and introducing future PROM instruments.⁴⁵ Finally,
18
19 456 additional instruments should be developed to evaluate the key aspects of the patient'
20
21 457 support system, and explore caregivers' needs.

22
23
24 458 Given the lack of studies assessing the patient's and caregiver's perspective on
25
26 459 the HFrEF pathway in Spain, this study aimed to fill this gap to better understand
27
28 460 possible cultural differences. The ethnographic approach, which involved in-depth
29
30 461 interviews with patients at their homes and with their caregivers, made it possible to
31
32 462 collect relevant data not normally discussed or shared in healthcare facilities. Both
33
34 463 patients and caregivers could talk freely and explain the aspects of the disease that
35
36 464 they considered under control and those where change was deemed necessary.
37
38 465 However, a limitation of this study is that the small sample size, although not unusual in
39
40 466 qualitative research that requires extensive and detailed analysis of each patient, may
41
42 467 not fully represent the diversity of people with HFrEF in Spain. Also, as it is the case in
43
44 468 other ethnographic studies, interviewing patients and caregivers together may have
45
46 469 resulted in individual perspectives being altered or withheld. Finally, since this study
47
48 470 was carried out during the COVID-19 pandemic, it is possible that the disruption
49
50 471 imposed by the social restrictions could have some effect in the results described here.

51
52 472 In conclusion, this study analyzed, by the use of PROMs and in-depth
53
54 473 interviews, the complexity of the actual experiences of the patients with HFrEF. The
55
56 474 lack of knowledge about the disease generates confusion and anxiety about
57
58 475 symptoms, and patients could tend to minimize the impact of HF in QoL. Patients tend

1
2
3 476 to maintain a closer relationship with their nurses, compared with the cardiologist,
4
5 477 favoring a more open discussion of feelings and experiences related to the disease
6
7 478 with them. In order to provide personalized care to HFREF patients, QoL could be
8
9 479 assessed by comparing two points in time, thus helping the healthcare practitioner
10
11 480 understand the patient's point of view of specific interventions. Since QoL is a
12
13 481 multidimensional, subjective concept that is affected by a variety of factors, its
14
15 482 evaluation should be carefully designed to capture specific moments and changes in
16
17 483 the trajectory of the disease. The study suggests that tools and training should be
18
19 484 made available to caregivers to alleviate the burden of care and anxiety derived from
20
21 485 uncertainty in the progression of the disease. Further work is needed to fully integrate
22
23 486 the use of well-designed and useful PROMs into clinical practice.
24
25
26 487
27
28 488
29
30 489
31

32 **Acknowledgements**

33
34 491 Medical writing assistance was provided by Francisco López de Saro, PhD (Trialance).
35
36
37 492

38 **Contributors**

39 493
40
41 494 RR, BP, LV, SCC, and JCC conceived and designed the study. EC, NJ, MRM, SY,
42
43 495 SJM, LA, AG, PM, LSF, MTSG, EH, CE, ECM, JVLI, JSC, and JCC contributed to
44
45 496 patient recruitment and data collection. SCC and MFE conducted the interviews and
46
47 497 collected qualitative data. RR, BP, LV, SCC, MFE, JSC, JCC compiled and analyzed
48
49 498 the data. RF, YR and MSS contributed to data interpretation in coordination with patient
50
51 499 support organizations. RR, BP, LV, SCC, and JCC drafted the manuscript, which was
52
53 500 revised by the other authors. PG provided a critical revision of an earliest version and
54
55 501 contributed to the interpretation of the results. All authors read and approved the final
56
57 502 manuscript.
58
59
60 503

1
2
3 504 **Funding**
4

5 505 This work was supported by AstraZeneca España. Grant number does not apply.
6
7 506

8
9 507 **Competing interests**
10

11 508 JCC received fees from AstraZeneca for the coordination and oversight of the study.
12

13 509 RR, MFE, and SCC received research funding from AstraZeneca. RFdIF, BP, and LV
14

15 510 are employees of AstraZeneca. All other authors report no competing interests.
16
17 511

18
19
20 512 **Patient and public involvement**
21

22 513 CardioAlianza, a Spanish association of patients with cardiovascular disease and their
23

24 514 caregivers, was involved in designing, providing feedback for interpretation of data, and
25

26 515 in the dissemination of this research.
27
28 516

29
30 517 **Patient consent for publication**
31

32 518 Informed consent for participation in the study and publication of the results were
33

34 519 obtained from each patient prior to study initiation.
35
36 520

37
38
39 521 **Ethics approval**
40

41 522 This study was approved by the Ethics Review Board of the Bellvitge University
42

43 523 Hospital on March 12th, 2020 with number PR062/20.
44
45 524

46
47 525 **Data availability statement**
48

49 526 The data that support the findings of this study are available on reasonable request
50

51 527 from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to their
52

53 528 containing information that could compromise the privacy of research participants.
54
55 529

REFERENCES

1. Savarese G, Lund LH. Global Public Health Burden of Heart Failure. *Card Fail Rev.* 2017;3(1):7-11. doi:10.15420/cfr.2016:25:2
2. Crespo-Leiro MG, Metra M, Lund LH, et al. Advanced heart failure: a position statement of the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology. *Eur J Heart Fail.* 2018;20(11):1505-1535. doi:10.1002/ejhf.1236
3. Hollingworth W, Biswas M, Maishman RL, et al. The healthcare costs of heart failure during the last five years of life: A retrospective cohort study. *Int J Cardiol.* 2016;224:132-138. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2016.09.021
4. Agbor VN, Ntusi NAB, Noubiap JJ. An overview of heart failure in low- and middle-income countries. *Cardiovasc Diagn Ther.* 2020;10(2):244-251. doi:10.21037/cdt.2019.08.03
5. Farré N, Vela E, Clèries M, et al. Medical resource use and expenditure in patients with chronic heart failure: a population-based analysis of 88 195 patients. *Eur J Heart Fail.* 2016;18(9):1132-1140. doi:10.1002/ejhf.549
6. Farré N, Vela E, Clèries M, et al. Real world heart failure epidemiology and outcome: A population-based analysis of 88,195 patients. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(2):e0172745. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0172745
7. Méndez-Bailón M, Jiménez-García R, Hernández-Barrera V, et al. Significant and constant increase in hospitalization due to heart failure in Spain over 15 year period. *Eur J Intern Med.* 2019;64:48-56. doi:10.1016/j.ejim.2019.02.019
8. McDonagh TA, Metra M, Adamo M, et al. 2021 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure. *European Heart Journal.* 2021;42(36):3599-3726. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehab368
9. Bhatt AS, Abraham WT, Lindenfeld J, et al. Treatment of HF in an Era of Multiple Therapies: Statement From the HF Collaboratory. *JACC Heart Fail.* 2021;9(1):1-12. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2020.10.014
10. Upadhyya B, Kitzman DW. Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: New approaches to diagnosis and management. *Clin Cardiol.* 2020;43(2):145-155. doi:10.1002/clc.23321
11. Criteria Committee, New York Heart Association. *Diseases of the Heart and Blood Vessels. Nomenclature and Criteria for Diagnosis.* 6th ed. Little, Brown; 1964.
12. Fry M, McLachlan S, Purdy S, Sanders T, Kadam UT, Chew-Graham CA. The implications of living with heart failure; the impact on everyday life, family support, co-morbidities and access to healthcare: a secondary qualitative analysis. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2016;17(1):139. doi:10.1186/s12875-016-0537-5
13. Comín-Colet J, Anguita M, Formiga F, et al. Health-related Quality of Life of Patients With Chronic Systolic Heart Failure in Spain: Results of the VIDA-IC Study. *Revista Española de Cardiología.* 2016;69(3):256-271. doi:10.1016/j.recesp.2015.07.034
14. Green CP, Porter CB, Bresnahan DR, Spertus JA. Development and evaluation of the Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire: a new health status measure for

- 1
2
3 573 heart failure. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2000;35(5):1245-1255. doi:10.1016/s0735-
4 574 1097(00)00531-3
- 5
6 575 15. Garin O, Herdman M, Vilagut G, et al. Assessing health-related quality of life in
7 576 patients with heart failure: a systematic, standardized comparison of available
8 577 measures. *Heart Fail Rev*. 2014;19(3):359-367. doi:10.1007/s10741-013-9394-7
- 9
10 578 16. Burns DJP, Arora J, Okunade O, et al. International Consortium for Health
11 579 Outcomes Measurement (ICHOM): Standardized Patient-Centered Outcomes
12 580 Measurement Set for Heart Failure Patients. *JACC: Heart Failure*. 2020;8(3):212-
13 581 222. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2019.09.007
- 14
15 582 17. Kelkar AA, Spertus J, Pang P, et al. Utility of Patient-Reported Outcome
16 583 Instruments in Heart Failure. *JACC Heart Fail*. 2016;4(3):165-175.
17 584 doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2015.10.015
- 18
19 585 18. Rumsfeld JS, Alexander KP, Goff DC, et al. Cardiovascular health: the importance
20 586 of measuring patient-reported health status: a scientific statement from the
21 587 American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2013;127(22):2233-2249.
22 588 doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e3182949a2e
- 23
24 589 19. Psotka MA, von Maltzahn R, Anatchkova M, et al. Patient-Reported Outcomes in
25 590 Chronic Heart Failure: Applicability for Regulatory Approval. *JACC Heart Fail*.
26 591 2016;4(10):791-804. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2016.04.010
- 27
28 592 20. Nieminen MS, Dickstein K, Fonseca C, et al. The patient perspective: Quality of life
29 593 in advanced heart failure with frequent hospitalisations. *International Journal of*
30 594 *Cardiology*. 2015;191:256-264. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2015.04.235
- 31
32 595 21. Pennucci F, De Rosis S, Passino C. Piloting a web-based systematic collection and
33 596 reporting of patient-reported outcome measures and patient-reported experience
34 597 measures in chronic heart failure. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(10):e037754.
35 598 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-037754
- 36
37 599 22. Heo S, Lennie TA, Okoli C, Moser DK. Quality of life in patients with heart failure:
38 600 ask the patients. *Heart Lung*. 2009;38(2):100-108. doi:10.1016/j.hrtlng.2008.04.002
- 39
40 601 23. Gwaltney. Hearing the voice of the heart failure patient: key experiences identified
41 602 in qualitative interviews. *Br J Cardiol*. 2012;19(1). doi:10.5837/bjc.2012.004
- 42
43 603 24. Etemadifar S, Bahrami M, Shahriari M, Farsani AK. Family caregivers' experiences
44 604 of caring for patients with heart failure: a descriptive, exploratory qualitative study. *J*
45 605 *Nurs Res*. 2015;23(2):153-161. doi:10.1097/JNR.0000000000000076
- 46
47 606 25. Grant JS, Graven LJ. Problems experienced by informal caregivers of individuals
48 607 with heart failure: An integrative review. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2018;80:41-66.
49 608 doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2017.12.016
- 50
51 609 26. Bjornsdottir K, Ketilsdottir A, Gudnadottir M, Kristinsdottir IV, Ingadottir B.
52 610 Integration of nursing services provided to patients with heart failure living at home:
53 611 A longitudinal ethnographic study. *J Clin Nurs*. Published online January 12, 2021.
54 612 doi:10.1111/jocn.15658
- 55
56 613 27. Kim EY, Oh S, Son Y-J. Caring experiences of family caregivers of patients with
57 614 heart failure: A meta-ethnographic review of the past 10 years. *Eur J Cardiovasc*
58 615 *Nurs*. 2020;19(6):473-485. doi:10.1177/1474515120915040

- 1
2
3 616 28. Simmonds R, Glogowska M, McLachlan S, et al. Unplanned admissions and the
4 617 organisational management of heart failure: a multicentre ethnographic, qualitative
5 618 study. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(10):e007522. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007522
6
7 619 29. Glogowska M, Simmonds R, McLachlan S, et al. Managing patients with heart
8 620 failure: a qualitative study of multidisciplinary teams with specialist heart failure
9 621 nurses. *Ann Fam Med*. 2015;13(5):466-471. doi:10.1370/afm.1845
10
11 622 30. Glogowska M, Simmonds R, McLachlan S, et al. "Sometimes we can't fix things": a
12 623 qualitative study of health care professionals' perceptions of end of life care for
13 624 patients with heart failure. *BMC Palliat Care*. 2016;15:3. doi:10.1186/s12904-016-
14 625 0074-y
15
16 626 31. Checa C, Medina-Perucha L, Muñoz M-Á, Verdú-Rotellar JM, Berenguera A. Living
17 627 with advanced heart failure: A qualitative study. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(12):e0243974.
18 628 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0243974
19
20 629 32. Greene JC, Caracelli VJ, Graham WF. Toward a Conceptual Framework for Mixed-
21 630 Method Evaluation Designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*.
22 631 1989;11(3):255-274. doi:10.3102/01623737011003255
23
24 632 33. Kane PM, Daveson BA, Ryan K, et al. Feasibility and acceptability of a patient-
25 633 reported outcome intervention in chronic heart failure. *BMJ Support Palliat Care*.
26 634 2017;7(4):470-479. doi:10.1136/bmjspcare-2017-001355
27
28 635 34. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, et al. Development and preliminary testing of the
29 636 new five-level version of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L). *Qual Life Res*. 2011;20(10):1727-
30 637 1736. doi:10.1007/s11136-011-9903-x
31
32 638 35. Hernandez G, Garin O, Pardo Y, et al. Validity of the EQ-5D-5L and reference
33 639 norms for the Spanish population. *Qual Life Res*. 2018;27(9):2337-2348.
34 640 doi:10.1007/s11136-018-1877-5
35
36 641 36. Comín-Colet J, Garin O, Lupón J, et al. Validación de la versión española del
37 642 Kansas City Cardiomyopathy Questionnaire. *Revista Española de Cardiología*.
38 643 2011;64(1):51-58. doi:10.1016/j.recesp.2010.10.003
39
40 644 37. Wingham J, Frost J, Britten N. Behind the smile: qualitative study of caregivers'
41 645 anguish and management responses while caring for someone living with heart
42 646 failure. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(7):e014126. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014126
43
44 647 38. Östman M, Bäck-Pettersson S, Sandvik A-H, Sundler AJ. "Being in good hands":
45 648 next of kin's perceptions of continuity of care in patients with heart failure. *BMC*
46 649 *Geriatr*. 2019;19(1):375. doi:10.1186/s12877-019-1390-x
47
48 650 39. Al-Rawashdeh S, Ashour A, Alshraifeen A, Rababa M. Experiences on Providing
49 651 Home Care for A Relative with Heart Failure: A Qualitative Study. *J Community*
50 652 *Health Nurs*. 2020;37(3):129-140. doi:10.1080/07370016.2020.1780043
51
52 653 40. Barnes S, Whittingham K. Informal carers' experiences of caring for a person with
53 654 heart failure in a community setting. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2020;28(3):883-
54 655 890. doi:10.1111/hsc.12919
55
56 656 41. Wingham J, Frost J, Britten N, et al. Caregiver outcomes of the REACH-HF
57 657 multicentre randomized controlled trial of home-based rehabilitation for heart failure
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 658 with reduced ejection fraction. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2019;18(7):611-620.
4 659 doi:10.1177/1474515119850011
5
6 660 42. Riegel B, Hanlon AL, Coe NB, et al. Health coaching to improve self-care of
7 661 informal caregivers of adults with chronic heart failure - iCare4Me: Study protocol
8 662 for a randomized controlled trial. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2019;85:105845.
9 663 doi:10.1016/j.cct.2019.105845
10
11 664 43. Hirschman KB, Bowles KH, Garcia-Gonzalez L, et al. Lessons learned from the
12 665 implementation of a video health coaching technology intervention to improve self-
13 666 care of family caregivers of adults with heart failure. *Res Nurs Health*.
14 667 2021;44(1):250-259. doi:10.1002/nur.22100
15
16 668 44. Auld JP, Mudd JO, Gelow JM, Hiatt SO, Lee CS. Self-care Moderates the
17 669 Relationship Between Symptoms and Health-Related Quality of Life in Heart
18 670 Failure. *J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2018;33(3):217-224.
19 671 doi:10.1097/JCN.0000000000000447
20
21 672 45. Sedlar N, Lainscak M, Mårtensson J, Strömberg A, Jaarsma T, Farkas J. Factors
22 673 related to self-care behaviours in heart failure: A systematic review of European
23 674 Heart Failure Self-Care Behaviour Scale studies. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*.
24 675 2017;16(4):272-282. doi:10.1177/1474515117691644
25
26
27 676
28 677
29 678
30 679
31 680
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

681 **TABLES**

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691 **Table 1.** Demographic and clinical characteristics of the patients.

| Variable | N=20 |
|--|-------------|
| Age, years, mean (SD) | 72.5 (11.4) |
| Range (minimum-maximum) | 38-85 |
| Gender, male, N (%) | 13 (65.0) |
| Time since diagnosis, years, mean (SD) | 2.35 (2.9) |
| Recent diagnosis (less than 2 months), N (%) | 2 (10.0) |
| NYHA, N (%) | |
| I | 4 (20.0) |
| II | 7 (35.0) |
| III | 9 (45.0) |
| LVEF, %, mean (SD) | 31.1 (6.0) |
| Diabetes, type 2, N (%) | 9 (45.0) |

692

693 *LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; NYHA, New York Heart Association; SD, standard*
694 *deviation.*

695

696 **Table 2.** Domains and main perceptions among HFrEF patients.

| Domains | Patients and caregivers' quotes |
|--|---|
| Domain 1. Meanings related to QoL | |
| <i>Attachment to previous routines</i> | <p>"This has split my old age in two, having many things to do and not being able to do them because you get very tired. I miss that freedom that I had. Now I feel tied." [1-1]</p> <p>"What I have missed the most is driving, I spent 20 years as a taxi driver." [2-1]</p> <p>"For me quality of life means to go wherever you want, to do strange things." [2-4]</p> <p>"I have always solved the problems that arised, but now I feel impotence because I can't do this anymore." [2-8]</p> |
| <i>Fears of progression</i> | <p>"The symptoms depend on the day, they are not permanent, some days you are tired, others not." [2-2]</p> <p>"Before I went out to the country with my dog, and I liked to go out with the bike but I can't anymore, I have to depend on a cane." [2-4]</p> <p>"I was in a good, well-paid job and I liked it, but when this happened, I completely disconnected." [2-8]</p> |
| <i>Filling out PROM questionnaires</i> | <p>"Are you sure of the answer? You barely can walk without taking a break after a few minutes... Are you sure about "rarely"? You feel down quite often" [caregiver of NYHA III patient 2-4].</p> <p>"Not sure how to stick to the last 15 days when I answer these questions. Some days I feel better than others and I cannot possible say how I have been doing only in the past 15 days. I notice a lot of variation". "It is hard to put a number here... And it is even harder because I can only think about a very a low number... I am not ok right now. It is very sad to realise how low I am, how bad is my health now (referring to the VAS score in the EQ-5D-5L questionnaire)". [2-6]</p> <p>"I will help you, mom, you must answer within the suggested scale, from mild to severe... Mild is not what you have here, you have moderate problems to get up or go for a long walk... this other one is not mild either, I've noticed that you frequently feel anxious and sadder than before... Are you sure about this number on the scale? Why do you say 80 out of 100? You are not that OK, mom; I wish you would be that OK" [caregiver of NYHA I patient 1-10]</p> |
| Domain 2. Caregivers' roles | |
| <i>Tracking at home</i> | "I keep track of pressure, weight, urine. Every day. I have it written down here in the notebook and I also send it through the hospital's APP. But I really don't know if it is of much use. When I had to call the ambulance everything seemed normal, I kept a similar record in recent days." [caregiver of NYHA III patient 1-6] |
| <i>Medical appointments</i> | <p>"When we go to the hospital the doctors ask him if he sleeps well or if he is drowning and he always answers that he is fine, but he is not. The last time he had been sleeping on the couch because he couldn't sleep in bed even with 3 pillows. That's why I always go to the controls with him." [caregiver of NYHA III patient 2-4]</p> <p>"Doctor, he says that he feels OK, but I noticed that he is more anxious, more obsessed about how many times he goes to pee per day. Most days he gets up and cannot sleep worrying about his condition" [caregiver of NYHA III patient 1-6]</p> |
| Domain 3. Relationships with healthcare providers | |
| <i>Commitment</i> | "I come to the very dedicated medical consultations and with the certainty that I am more closely watched than a Ferrari" [2-5] |
| <i>Trustworthiness</i> | "I sit in a consultation where they take their time, and they answer all my doubts. The big difference is that now I feel |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

| | |
|--|---|
| | more secure, I know that I must deal with weight, urine, food. Having the possibility of calling them 24 hours a day gives you more peace of mind." [2-6] |
| | "The nurse is better than any cardiologist, everyone loves her." [2-5] |
| | "The nurse is very close, I think they have chosen a person with a character and attitude that is just what a patient needs." [2-6] |

697

698

For peer review only

1
2
3 699
4 700
5 701
6 702
7 703
8 704
9
10
11
12
13

Table 3. Evaluation of health status by PROMs. Scores for EQ-5D-5L and KCCQ.

| | NYHA I-II (N=11) | NYHA III (N=9) | All NYHA (N=20) |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| EQ-5D-5L, patients reporting any limitation ¹ , N (%) | | | |
| Mobility | 5 (40.5) | 9 (100) | 14 (70.0) |
| Self-care | 0 | 7 (77.8) | 7 (35.0) |
| Usual activities | 4 (36.4) | 8 (88.9) | 12 (60.0) |
| Pain/Discomfort | 4 (36.4) | 6 (66.7) | 10 (50.0) |
| Anxiety/Depression | 4 (36.4) | 8 (88.9) | 12 (60.0) |
| EQ-5D-5L, patients reporting severe or extreme limitations ² , N (%) | | | |
| Mobility | 0 | 5 (55.6) | 5 (25.0) |
| Self-care | 0 | 2 (22.2) | 2 (10.0) |
| Usual activities | 0 | 3 (33.3) | 3 (15.0) |
| Pain/Discomfort | 1 (9.1) | 2 (22.2) | 3 (15.0) |
| Anxiety/Depression | 0 | 2 (22.2) | 2 (10.0) |
| EQ-5D-5L global, mean (SD) | | | |
| Index value | 0.85 (0.17) | 0.37 (0.36) | 0.64 (0.36) |
| VAS score | 74.55 (23.50) | 45.56 (14.46) | 61.50 (24.45) |
| KCCQ, mean (SD) | | | |
| Physical limitation | 81.06 (19.04) | 39.72 (26.59) | 62.46 (30.56) |
| Symptom stability | 59.10 (12.61) | 66.67 (30.62) | 62.50 (22.21) |
| Symptom frequency | 84.66 (17.14) | 57.64 (27.14) | 72.50 (25.59) |
| Symptom burden | 91.67 (11.18) | 61.11 (24.30) | 77.92 (23.61) |
| Self-efficacy | 94.32 (10.25) | 85.94 (18.22) | 90.79 (14.34) |
| Quality of life | 82.58 (13.15) | 33.33 (20.83) | 60.42 (30.09) |
| Social limitation | 85.61 (14.02) | 31.94 (26.62) | 61.46 (33.94) |
| KCCQ global scores, mean (SD) | | | |
| Overall summary | 82.69 (9.81) | 41.09 (20.55) | 63.97 (26.06) |
| Clinical summary | 81.30 (10.82) | 49.55 (22.31) | 67.01 (23.10) |
| Total symptom | 81.54 (10.85) | 59.37 (23.50) | 71.56 (20.55) |

705 ¹Any score but 1 (no problems).

706 ² Only patients scoring 4 or 5 in each domain.

707 EQ-5D-5L, EuroQoL 5D-5L questionnaire; KCCQ, Kansas City Cardiomyopathy
708 Questionnaire; NYHA, New York Heart Association; PRO, patient-reported outcome;
709 SD, standard deviation; VAS, visual analogue scale.

710
711
712

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

for

**Quality of life and disease experience in patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in Spain:
a mixed methods approach to go beyond standardized data**

by Raül Rubio et al.

1. Semi-structured interview guideline (p. 2)

2. Observation guideline for medical visits (p. 9)

For peer review only

1. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDELINE [Notes for RESEARCHER in blue].

Presentation

Thank you for taking part in this interview.

Please note that:

- Your responses are confidential and anonymous. Under no circumstances will your personal data be shared when the results are published. All answers will be treated in aggregate form.
- A Piece of Pie complies with all European and North American data protection laws and complies with the guidelines set by the EphMRA (European Pharmaceutical Market Research Association) codes of conduct for market research.
- You may discontinue your participation in this research at any time and, as well as the right not to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

With your permission, we will audio record your responses to facilitate our analysis.

[RESEARCHER: Start recording audio.]

I will now introduce myself. My name is [XXX], I work for A Piece of Pie, an innovation consulting firm.

We are currently conducting a study on behalf of a pharmaceutical company, which would like to better understand the experience of patients suffering from Heart Failure.

We would be very grateful if you could share with us your personal experience and help us identify areas for improvement throughout your experience, from the moment of the first symptoms to the present.

Please note that there are no right or wrong answers, as we are interested in your opinions and your personal experience with the condition.

The interview (90 min.)

RESEARCHER: Tailor the questions to the way the patient refers to the disease and use the term provided by the patient to make him/her feel more comfortable. Whenever you believe that the caregiver could provide us with additional information on any of the topics discussed, please direct questions to him/her as well. If, on the other hand, you have the impression that it will be more valuable to ask certain questions only to the caregiver, do so after the interview with the patient. Always ask the patient for permission before talking to the caregiver.

| Exploration area | 1. KNOW THE PATIENT (15 min) |
|--------------------------|--|
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate a relationship with the patient • Better understand the person and their context • Understand your daily habits and routines |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>To begin with, I would like to get to know you as a person and familiarize myself with your personal situation...</i> |

1. **Person:** I would like you to introduce yourself and explain to me:
 - a) How old are you? Who do you live with?
 - b) Tell me a little more about yourself, what do you like to do? What are your hobbies? What do you do? What do you value most now in your life? Why?
2. **Self-description:** If you were to describe yourself, what 3 words would you use? What comes to mind when you think of yourself?
3. **The patient's day-to-day life:** Tell me what a "typical" day looks like. What do you do from the time you wake up until you go to sleep? Differentiate weekday from weekends (i.e., hobbies). *RESEARCHER: be sure they explain their day to day routines to be able to refer to them later when exploring the impact of the disease. Write down on post-its moments with the greatest impact.*
 - a) What time of day would you say you like best? When do you feel most at ease? Why?
 - b) And what moment do you like the least? Why?
 - c) What things do you have the hardest time doing?
 - d) Is there anything you've had to give up in recent times? What do you miss?
4. **Outside view:** What do you think a good friend of yours or family member would say to me if I asked them what [patient's name] is like?
5. **Values:** If you were to tell a young family member what is most important in life, what would you say to them? Do you have any kind of personal "maxim"? Why do you think it's important? *[RESEARCHER: If health-related issues arise, ask when it became important to have a healthy life in your family and/or social environment]*

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exploration area | 2. MEANING OF QUALITY OF LIFE (15 min) |
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand what they associate to quality of life • Understand the impact of different HF symptoms on their quality of life |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>Now I would like us to talk about those things that for you represent quality of life.</i> |

6. **Quality of Life.** Definition: Now that you have completed this map, how would you define quality of life?
- What things allow you to have quality of life? How do you feel about them?
 - What other things keep you from having a better quality of life? How do you feel about them?
7. **Current feeling:** How do you feel at this moment in your life? Do you have any small rituals that help you in your day to day? *RESEARCHER: Ask about eating habits, physical activity, cultural activities, etc.*
- Is there anything that particularly bothers you? Could you give me an example?
 - What makes you happy?
 - If you could improve 3 things from your day to day, what things would you choose? What would you give up?

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exploration area | 3. HEART FAILURE (15 min) |
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the impact of HF on the patient's life • Understand the patient's perception of HF |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>Now I would like you to tell me specifically about the disease you suffer...</i> |

8. **HF:** I would like you to explain to me in your own words how do you see heart failure.
9. **Explanation of the disease:** Do you remember how they explained to you what HF was? What words did they use? Who did so? Could it have been done better? What did they miss?
10. **Living with HF:** What is it like to live with HF? When do you feel it becomes more "uphill"? What helps you overcome it?
11. **Other diagnoses:** Are you diagnosed with other diseases? Were they prior to HF? Are they related in any way?

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exploration area | 4. LIFE JOURNEY (15 min) |
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the impact of HF on the patient's life • Understand the patient's perception of HF |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>To continue I would like us to briefly talk about the most important moments with the disease ...</i> |

12. **Significant moments with the disease:** Now I would like you to think about 5-6 significant moments since you were diagnosed with the disease. *RESEARCHER: Write down every moment in a post-it. Pay attention to whether hospitalization, transplant or heart attack arise spontaneously and if not, ask if you have experienced any of these moments and if so write them down next to the other moments.*
- Why have you precisely chosen these moments?
 - How did you experience each of these moments?
 - Which one of them was the best moment for you? *RESEARCHER: Ask what "the best" means to this patient*
 - Which one of them was the worst moment for you? *RESEARCHER: Ask what "the worst" means and, if it is related to the patient's illness, ask: → Is there anything that could have better helped you cope during those times?*
 - Which of these moments changed your life the most? Why?
13. **Life before HF:** What was your life like before you were diagnosed with HF? What things have changed the most? What do you miss?
- Since you were diagnosed... how has your lifestyle changed? How do you feel about it? What could help you?
 - At the beginning of the interview, you explained to me what a day in your life looks like. How would this change if life were the way it used to be?
 - Could you specify how you think the disease changed your life? *[RESEARCHER: dig into issues such as new interpretations of reality, changes in values, etc.]*

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Exploration area | 5. CARE AND EMOTIONAL PROCESS (20 min.) |
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the HF Patient Journey • Identify unmet needs • Understand the perception of the different treatments that the patient has gone through |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>Now I would like us to delve into the journey you have followed since the beginning of the risk factors until now...</i> |

Let's assume that you meet a person who has just been diagnosed with heart failure and does not know what it means to suffer from this condition. If you asked him to tell you about your experience, from the first symptoms until today

14. **Life without the disease:** What was your life like before the disease? If you look back, what do you miss the most?
15. **Previous diseases:** What diseases have you been diagnosed with? Who diagnosed you?
 - a) Were you warned of the risk of developing heart failure?
 - b) What did they explain to you?
 - c) Were you advised to make lifestyle changes? *RESEARCHER, ask about exercise, diet, tobacco, or alcohol consumption...*
 - d) Were you given any preventive treatment?
16. **First symptoms:**
 - a) What changes did you experience that made you think something was wrong? For how long?
 - b) What did you think might be going on?
17. **Diagnosis:**
 - a) Do you remember what was explained to you?
 - b) What tests have you done? Was the process burdensome?
 - c) What doubts did you have?
 - d) What did you think was going to happen at the time?
 - e) Did you search for information on the internet?
 - f) Did you contact any patient associations?
 - g) Have you met anyone with this condition during the process? How has it affected you?
18. **First treatment:**
 - a) Do you remember the name of your treatment?
 - b) How was the first medication taken?
 - c) Did you have any routines to do so?
 - d) Did you stop taking the treatment at some point?
19. **Follow-up visits:**
 - a) What were the routines of the visits like?

- b) Was it hard for you to make them? Currently, how do you feel when you must go to the doctor?
20. **Evolution of the disease:**
- a) How did you find out that the disease was changing? Were there any significant moments?
21. **Hospital admission (if applies):**
- a) What was the process like? How many days last the hospital admission?
- b) How was the experience in the emergency room?
- c) Have you had more than one hospital admission?
22. **Surgery (if applies):**
- a) What kind of device was implanted? Would you be able to explain how it works?
- b) What things does it allow you to do that you couldn't do before? How does this make you feel?
- c) What things can't you do now? How does this make you feel?
23. **Experience PROM questionnaires:** before the interview you answered a set of questionnaires about your symptoms and quality of life.
- a) From what we talked about during the interview, what things do you think should be included in these questionnaires?
- b) What things should your cardiologist know to make decisions?

| Exploration area | 6. HOME TOUR (10 min.) |
|--------------------------|---|
| Goals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complement and contrast the information obtained during the interview with the patient's environment. • Understand the immediate context in which patients live (routines, rituals, and concessions to the HF) |
| Ethnographic explanation | <i>For us it would be very useful to be able to understand how the disease affects your day to day. If you could show us your house, please, I'm sure it would help us understand...</i> |

RESEARCHER: The home visit should be made at the appropriate time during the interview. It should be done naturally as a continuation of the conversation: asking for places and things inside the house (medicines, refrigerator, sofa, bedroom) that are important in terms of the impact that HF has on your life be shown.

For instance, ask whether there has been any home reform since they have had HF diagnosed. As you walk around, ask the patient about their daily routines and their life under treatment. Try to understand how the patient has adapted his/her life to the disease and his/her level of activity.

If the participant does not mention anything spontaneously, focus on:

- Evidence that signals his/her 'lifestyle', hobbies.
- Written information about HF.
- Evidence of contact with HCPs.

- *Rooms where she/he takes treatment or workout.*
- *Rooms where medicines are stored.*

Please, contrast the information mentioned during the interview with what you observe in the house. If allowed by the participant, take pictures of everything the patient deems relevant to treatment and their life with HF.

With this we would conclude the interview. Thank you very much for your time and participation. Do you have any comments or questions you want to share?

[END RECORDING]

For peer review only

2. OBSERVATION GUIDE OF MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS WITH HCPS

This guide is intended to guide the observation before, during and after the medical visit of selected patients. During the appointment, neither the patient nor the doctor will be asked questions by the researcher.

The objectives of the visit are:

1. Observe whether which topics are discussed during the medical appointment, and whether any of them is directly related to quality of life with the condition.
2. Understand the language that is used by both parties when talking about the condition.

RESEARCHER, prior to the visit, make sure that the patient understands the purpose of the observation within the study.

I – PRE-VISIT: Observation of the hospital environment

RESEARCHER, indicate the center, scheduled time of the visit and the start time of the observation.

*Begin by observing the **hospitals environment**. What surprises you the most? Why?*

Focus on:

- Occupancy of the center: number of patients in the waiting room, number of health workers.
- Space: design, decoration, lighting, colors, atmosphere.
- Organization: Allocation and ease of access.

*Observe the **interviewee**. What does he/she look like? (For example, tired, relaxed, irritated, etc.) Is there anything that stands out? Inquire about your expectations before the visit.*

Focus on:

- Arrival time, ease of access, companions (if applies).
- Body posture and non-verbal signs (facial expression, comfort level with the accompanying situation).
- Preparation for the visit: if the patient brings documents, medical tests, notebooks or tracking applications.
- Waiting times for the visit.
- If applies: Interaction with other health agents (residents, reception, nursing).

II – DURING THE VISIT: Observation of the patient medical interaction

RESEARCHER: Describe the physical space, organization, and arrangement of furniture. Also write down the exact time of the start of the visit.

Focus on:

- Initial time of the visit.
- Initial greeting, use of gestures and non-verbal cues.
- Initial conversation. How general are they? How specific?
 - Questions from the doctor, order, and type.

- On quality of life and/or impact of HF on a day-to-day basis.
 - Type of assessment and use of questionnaires.
 - Types of recommendations (functional, social, quality of life).
 - How the patient responds.
 - Questions from the patient, order, and type.
 - On quality of life and/or impact of HF on a day-to-day basis.
 - How your doctor responds
- Central conversation:
 - Topics of conversation that arouse greater patient attention (e.g., quality of life, impact on daily activity).
 - Topics of conversation that arouse greater attention from the doctor (e.g., clinical, psychological, or social, quality of life or other aspects).
 - Dominant language; use of colloquial language vs medical language.
- Body posture, proxemics and physical distance from the patient and the doctor during the visit.
- Use of silences and non-verbal gestures (gestures of approval, doubt, or confusion).
- Closing of the visit
 - Time and language used for the closing of the visit.
 - Approach of next steps by the doctor and the patient.
 - Farewell, use of gestures and non-verbal cues.
- If applies: interaction with other health agents (residents, receptionist, nursing).

III – AFTER THE VISIT: Observation of the patient

*RESEARCHER: Write down the exact **time of the end** of the visit. Accompany the patient at the exit of the visit and / or another instance of contact related to the visit (reception desks). If possible, know your perception about the results of the visit.*

Focus on:

- End time/duration of the visit.
- The patient's body posture and non-verbal gestures.
- Language used to assess the visit.
- If applies: interaction with other health agents (residents, reception, nursing).

End of observation.***

ETHNOQOL – COREQ CHECKLIST

5 October 2021

| No. | Item | Description | Section # |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity | | | |
| Personal characteristics | | | |
| 1. | Interviewer/facilitator | Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group? <i>SCC</i> <i>MFE</i> | Line 201 |
| 2. | Credentials | What were the researcher's credentials? <i>E.g.</i> <i>PhD, MD</i> <i>SCC, PhD</i> <i>MFE, BA</i> | NA |
| 3. | Occupation | What was their occupation at the time of the study? <i>Senior researchers</i> | Line 201 |
| 4. | Gender | Was the researcher male or female? <i>Female</i> | Line 201 |
| 5. | Experience and training | What experience or training did the researcher have? <i>>5 years of experience in medical sociology and medical anthropology</i> | Line 202 |
| Relationship with participants | | | |
| 6. | Relationship established | Was a relationship established prior to study commencement? <i>No.</i> | Line 204 |
| 7. | Participant knowledge of the interviewer | What did the participants know about the researcher? <i>E.g. Personal goals, reasons for doing the research</i> <i>Research goals</i> | Line 205 |
| 8. | Interviewer characteristics | What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? <i>E.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</i> <i>None.</i> | NA |
| Domain 2: Study design | | | |
| Theoretical framework | | | |
| 9. | Methodological orientation and theory | What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? <i>E.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</i> <i>Thematic analysis</i> <i>Phenomenological perspective</i> | Lines 150-161, and section on Methods |
| Participant selection | | | |
| 10. | Sampling | How were participants selected? <i>E.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</i> <i>Purposeful</i> | Line 194 |
| 11. | Method of approach | How were participants approached? <i>E.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</i> | Lines 186-196 |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | <i>face-to-face</i> | |
| 12. | Sample size | How many participants were in the study? 20 | Line 194 and 287 |
| 13. | Non-participation | How many people refused to participate or dropped out? What were the reasons for this? None | Lines 186- 294 |
| Setting | | | |
| 14. | Setting of data collection | Where was the data collected? <i>E.g. home, clinic, Workplace</i> <i>Patients' home</i> | Lines 198- 232 |
| 15. | Presence of non-participants | Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers? No. | Lines 198- 232 |
| 16. | Description of sample | What are the important characteristics of the sample? <i>E.g. demographic data, date</i> <i>demographic data and clinic characteristics</i> | Lines 286- 294 and Table 1 |
| Data collection | | | |
| 17. | Interview guide | Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested? Yes. No pilot tested. | See Suppleme ntary Materials |
| 18. | Repeat interviews | Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many? No. | NA |
| 19. | Audio/visual recording | Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data? Yes, audio recording. | Lines 229- 232 |
| 20. | Field notes | Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group? During interviews and after direct observations of medical appointments. | Lines 229- 232 |
| 21. | Duration | What was the duration of the interviews or focus group? 90 min for interviews and 20 min for clinical encounters. | Line 206, 222 |
| 22. | Data saturation | Was data saturation discussed? Yes, in joint analysis sessions with authors. | Line 280 |
| 23. | Transcripts returned | Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction? No. | NA |
| Domain 3: analysis and findings | | | |
| Data analysis | | | |
| 24. | Number of data coders | How many data coders coded the data? The two field researchers | Line 270 |
| 25. | Description of the coding tree | Did authors provide a description of the coding tree? Authors provided the description of domains, no coding tree. | Lines 267- 279 |
| 26. | Derivation of themes | Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data? Derived from data. | Lines 267- 279 |

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 27. | Software | What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data? No. | NA |
| 28. | Participant checking | Did participants provide feedback on the findings? No. | NA |
| Reporting | | | |
| 29. | Quotations presented | Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes / findings? Was each quotation identified? <i>E.g. Participant number</i> Yes. | Table 2 |
| 30. | Data and findings consistent | Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings? Yes, in joint analysis sessions. | Lines 267-279 |
| 31. | Clarity of major themes | Were major themes clearly presented in the findings? Yes, in joint analysis sessions. | See Results section |
| 32. | Clarity of minor themes | Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes? Yes. | Yes, Table 2 and Results section |