

This is a repository copy of *A behaviour change intervention to reduce home exposure to second hand smoke during pregnancy in India and Bangladesh : a theory and evidence-based approach to development.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/171755/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Satyanarayana, Veena A., Jackson, Cath, Siddiqi, Kamran orcid.org/0000-0003-1529-7778 et al. (6 more authors) (2021) A behaviour change intervention to reduce home exposure to second hand smoke during pregnancy in India and Bangladesh : a theory and evidence-based approach to development. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies*. 74. ISSN 2055-5784

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-021-00811-5>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 **A Behaviour Change Intervention to reduce home exposure to second hand smoke**
2 **during pregnancy in India and Bangladesh: a theory and evidence-based approach to**
3 **development**

4
5 Veena A. Satyanarayana PhD*, Associate Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology,
6 National Institute of Mental Health And Neuro Sciences (NIMHANS), Bangalore, India
7 560029.veena.a.s@gmail.com. +919686862686

8
9 Cath Jackson PhD, Valid Research Limited, Sandown House, Sandbeck Way, Wetherby,
10 West Yorkshire LS22 7DN, United Kingdom.cath@validresearch.co.uk. +44 (0) 6
11 7792295493

12
13 Kamran Siddiqi PhD, Professor in Public Health, Department of Health Sciences, University
14 of York, Seebohm Rowntree Building, Heslington, York, Y010 5DD, UK.
15 Kamran.siddiqi@york.ac.uk. +44 (0) 1904 321 335

16
17 Prabha S. Chandra MD, FRCPsych, Professor, Department of Psychiatry, National Institute
18 of Mental Health And Neuro Sciences (NIMHANS), Bangalore, India
19 560029.chandra@nimhans.ac.in. +91-80-26995272

20
21 Rumana Huque PhD, Professor, Department of Economics, University of Dhaka and ARK
22 Foundation, House No 6, Road NO 109, Gulshan 2, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
23 rumana@arkfoundationbd.org. +88 (0) 2- 10 55069866

24

25 Mukesh Dherani MBBS, PhD, Research Fellow, Department of Psychological Medicine,
26 University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 3BX, UK. m.k.dherani@liverpool.ac.uk. +44 (0)151
27 794 8041

28

29 Shammi Nasreen, BDS, MPH, Project Manager, ARK Foundation, House No 6, Road NO
30 109, Gulshan 2, Dhaka, 16 Bangladesh. shammi@arkfoundationbd.org. +88 (0) 2-55069866

31

32 Pratima Murthy MD, Professor, Department of Psychiatry, National Institute of Mental
33 Health And Neuro Sciences (NIMHANS), Bangalore, India, 560029.
34 pratimamurthy@gmail.com. +91-80-26995240

35

36 Atif Rahman MBBS, DipPsych, MRCPsych, PhD, Professor of Child Psychiatry
37 Psychological Sciences, Department of Psychological Sciences, University of Liverpool,
38 Liverpool, L69 3BX, UK. atif.rahman@liverpool.ac.uk. +44 (0)151 794 8041

39

40 * Corresponding author

41

42 **ABSTRACT**

43 **Background:** Home exposure to second hand smoke (SHS) is highly prevalent among
44 pregnant women in low- and middle-income countries like India and Bangladesh. Literature
45 on the efficacy of behaviour change interventions to reduce home exposure to SHS in
46 pregnancy is scarce.

47

48 **Methods:** We employed a theory and evidence-based approach to develop an intervention
49 using pregnant women as agents of change for their husband's smoking behaviours at home.
50 A systematic review of SHS behaviour change interventions led us to focus on developing a
51 multi-component intervention and informed selection of behaviour change techniques (BCTs)
52 for review in a modified Delphi survey. The modified Delphi survey provided expert
53 consensus on the most effective BCTs in reducing home exposure to SHS. Finally, a
54 qualitative interview study provided context and detailed understanding of knowledge,
55 attitudes and practices around SHS. This insight informed the content and delivery of the
56 proposed intervention components.

57

58 **Results:** The final intervention consisted of four components: A report on saliva cotinine
59 levels of the pregnant woman; a picture booklet containing information about SHS and its
60 impact on health as well strategies to negotiate a smoke-free home; a letter from the future
61 baby to their father encouraging him to provide a smoke free home, and automated voice
62 reminder and motivational messages delivered to husbands on their mobile phone.
63 Intervention delivery was in a single face-to-face session with a research assistant who
64 explained the cotinine report; discussed key strategies for ensuring a smoke-free environment
65 at home; and practiced with pregnant women how they would share the booklet and letter
66 with their husband and supportive family members.

67

68 **Conclusion:** A theory and evidence-based approach informed the development of a
69 multicomponent behaviour change intervention, described here. The acceptability and
70 feasibility of the intervention which was subsequently tested in a pilot RCT in India and
71 Bangladesh, will be published later.

72

73 **Keywords:** Behaviour change intervention, second hand smoke, smoke exposure at home,
74 pregnancy, LAMI

75

76 **Key messages regarding feasibility:**

- 77 • We developed a theory and evidence-based behavior change intervention to reduce
78 home exposure to second hand smoke in pregnant women
- 79 • Findings from a systematic review, a modified Delphi survey and qualitative
80 interviews with key informants, informed the development of our multicomponent
81 behavior change intervention
- 82 • The next step is to test the feasibility and acceptability of the intervention in a pilot
83 RCT in India and Bangladesh.

84

85 **BACKGROUND**

86 Over one-third of all women, globally, are exposed to second hand smoke (SHS) [1-3]. In
87 low- and middle-income (LAMI) countries, most SHS exposure among women in the
88 reproductive age group, occurs at home, where women spend most of their time [4,5].
89 Estimates of home exposure to SHS have ranged from 17.8% in Mexico to 72.3% in Vietnam
90 [6]. A more recent study [7] using the Demographic and Health Survey data (2008 and 2013)
91 from 30 LAMI countries (N=37,427 pregnant women) found that the weighted country-

92 specific prevalence of SHS exposure ranged from 7% (6% - 9%) in Nigeria to 81% (72% -
93 88%) in Armenia. More than 50% of pregnant women reported some (daily, weekly, monthly
94 or less than monthly) SHS exposure in five countries (Jordan, Armenia, Bangladesh,
95 Indonesia and Nepal), and more than 50% of pregnant women reported daily SHS exposure
96 in three countries (Jordan, Armenia and Indonesia). Pregnant women in the South East Asian
97 countries had the highest probability of exposure. Those in urban areas had a higher
98 probability for household SHS exposure than pregnant women in rural areas. Exposure to
99 SHS during pregnancy is associated with a range of adverse maternal and infant health
100 outcomes such as pregnancy complications, low birth weight, still birth, small for gestational
101 age infants and sudden infant death syndrome [8-13].

102

103 Studies have speculated that women in China, Cambodia and India, may often be unable to
104 negotiate a smoke free home with their husbands possibly due to patriarchy, gender inequity
105 and gendered power interactions [9, 14,15]. Additional factors include low literacy levels,
106 lack of awareness about the possible dangers of home exposure to SHS, and culturally held
107 beliefs about men's smoking behaviours. A typical example of such beliefs is that smoking
108 helps them unwind after a long day's work, which prevents negotiation for a smoke free
109 home [8-10, 16, 17, 18]. For example, a study from China demonstrated that despite women
110 holding negative attitudes towards smoking, they either rationalized men's smoking or chose
111 not to assert their views for fear of causing conflict at home [19]. The World Health
112 Organization (WHO) provides guidelines recommending antenatal care providers to routinely
113 screen pregnant women for tobacco use and home exposure to SHS and suggests strategies
114 for smoking cessation and prevention of home exposure to SHS [20]. Intervention studies on
115 reducing home exposure to SHS have included a range of education and counselling/brief
116 advice strategies delivered by health workers to create awareness, enhance knowledge about

117 its harms, attempt attitudinal change and suggest practical methods of ensuring a smoke free
118 home [21]. Very few studies have, however, included strategies that allow the woman to
119 negotiate a smoke free home with significant male family members [22]. Our work aimed to
120 develop a multicomponent intervention that incorporated this strategy (focusing particularly
121 on the pregnant women’s husbands) alongside other established Behaviour Change
122 Techniques (BCTs) [23] to allow a comprehensive approach to reducing exposure to SHS in
123 the home environment during pregnancy.

124

125 **METHODS**

126 We adopted a theory and evidence-based approach to intervention development [24,25]. We
127 conducted a systematic review to obtain a critical understanding of the evidence base, a
128 modified Delphi survey to obtain expert consensus on effective BCTs and qualitative
129 interviews for contextual understanding of knowledge, attitudes and SHS practices. The key
130 findings from each of these three complementary studies informed the development of the
131 **IMPRESS (Intervention for Mothers during Pregnancy to Reduce Exposure to Second hand**
132 **Smoke)** intervention at a workshop held in Dhaka, Bangladesh. (see Figure 1).

133

134 Figure 1 here

135

136 **(i) Systematic Review (detailed methods described elsewhere [22])**

137 The systematic review, (a) reported the behaviour change interventions for reduction in home
138 exposure to SHS in pregnant women; and (b) critically appraised intervention reporting, as
139 well as generalisability, feasibility, and scalability of these interventions. It identified six
140 studies for inclusion. These studies evaluated interventions targeting pregnant women,
141 delivered in antenatal clinics, at home, by telephone or a mix of these. They focused on

142 education about SHS and/or developing skills in women to avoid SHS exposure or negotiate
143 with a family member, usually the husband. Five interventions were underpinned by a
144 behaviour change framework, for example the Transtheoretical Model of Change [26] and the
145 Health Belief Model [27].

146

147 We present below the contribution of (a) to our intervention development. An important
148 observation was that the evidence was insufficient to provide guidance on the essential
149 components of the IMPRESS intervention indicating the need for a modified Delphi Survey
150 to obtain expert consensus on effective BCTs in reducing home exposure to SHS.

151

152 Regarding (b), reporting of the intervention studies did not meet the Workgroup for
153 Intervention Development and Evaluation Research (WIDER) guidelines for reporting of
154 behaviour change interventions [28] and no studies met all generalizability, feasibility, and
155 scalability criteria. Whilst these findings were not relevant to the development of the
156 IMPRESS intervention, they highlighted the importance of detailed reporting of the
157 development process, its theoretical underpinning and subsequent evaluation.

158

159 **(ii) Modified Delphi Survey**

160 This was conducted to build consensus among international experts and identify the most
161 effective BCTs to reduce home exposure to SHS in pregnant women. Our approach differed
162 from the original Delphi method in that independent opinion was sought via email rather than
163 face to face consultation with a group of experts, and an evidence-based list of BCTs was
164 generated by the investigators and emailed to the experts [25]. This is a time and cost-
165 efficient method of achieving consensus among international experts [29,30].

166

167 **Sample:** The sample comprised of experts who were lead authors of peer reviewed
168 international publications in the areas of smoking cessation, SHS and behaviour change
169 interventions. We attempted to have global representation. Through a process of discussion
170 and elimination, we identified a final group of 30 experts who were contacted via email
171 requesting their participation in the survey. We had experts participate from both LAMI
172 (Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, China) and high-income countries (USA, UK, Canada,
173 Australia).

174

175 **Procedure:** A seminal publication on BCTs [23], our systematic review [22] and a
176 recent paper on BCTs in waterpipe smoking [31] were used to generate a list of BCTs that
177 were most relevant to reduction of home exposure to SHS. Initially 32 BCTs were short listed
178 by VS of which 21 BCTs were rated by two members of the research team (VS, KS
179 $Kappa=0.92$) as most relevant to reduction of SHS at home during pregnancy. The BCTs that
180 were eliminated at this stage focused primarily on smoking cessation rather than reduction of
181 home smoking alone. The 21 BCTs included enhancing knowledge, awareness, making an
182 appraisal of risks and benefits, as well as using specific strategies such as prompts, problem
183 solving, negotiation etc. (see Additional File 1). Three rounds of Delphi were chosen a-priori
184 to reach acceptable consensus.

185

186 In the first round of the Delphi, 30 experts were requested to rank in the order of preference
187 the most effective BCTs that in their opinion were likely to reduce home exposure to SHS.
188 To aid their judgement of importance, they were requested to consider acceptability,
189 deliverability, and efficacy of each BCT. Their responses were anonymous. As background
190 information, experts were informed that our proposed multi-component intervention was
191 likely to include two methods of intervention delivery: communicating with the pregnant

192 woman (non-smoker and the primary participant at the health clinic) and with her husband
193 (smoker and the secondary participant) possibly through digital/mobile phone technology.

194

195 In round 2, experts who participated in round one were given feedback about the opinion of
196 the whole group (e.g., average rank assigned for each BCT) and asked to re-evaluate their
197 original ranking in view of this information. This was repeated in the final round 3. On
198 average, two reminders were sent to the experts requesting them to turn in their ratings of
199 BCTs.

200

201 **(iii) Qualitative Interviews (detailed methods described elsewhere [18])**

202 Key informant interviews (N=64) were carried out with pregnant women, husbands who
203 smoked at home, husbands who did not smoke at home, and family members (parents, in
204 laws etc.) in India and Bangladesh to understand contextual determinants of home exposure
205 to SHS, knowledge attitudes and SHS practices. The focus of the interviews was the smoking
206 behaviour of pregnant women's husbands although details of other family members' smoking
207 in the home also featured in participants' accounts. Interviews were conducted in Comilla
208 (rural Bangladesh) and in Bangalore (urban India) to ensure relevance to both rural and urban
209 settings.

210

211 **RESULTS**

212 The detailed findings of the systematic review and qualitative interviews are published
213 elsewhere [22, 18]. How these two studies informed the IMPRESS intervention development
214 is described below and in Table 1.

215

216 Table 1 here

217

218 **Systematic Review**

219 The review concluded that multi-component behaviour change interventions and their
220 constituent education and skills-based strategies (BCTs) appeared effective in reducing SHS
221 exposure during pregnancy. This informed our decision to use a multicomponent behaviour
222 change intervention using BCTs. However, a small evidence base and weak study
223 methodology (self-reported exposure, lack of objective outcome assessment, short follow-up,
224 absence of control group) prevented firm conclusions about the specific BCTs to employ.
225 Instead, 14 BCTs employed in the six intervention studies were included in the list of 21
226 BCTs presented to experts in round 1 of the Delphi survey (see Additional File 1).

227

228 **Modified Delphi Survey**

229 In round 1 of the Delphi, of the 30 experts contacted, 17 experts (57% response rate) turned
230 in their responses via email. These 17 experts were contacted for round 2, of whom 15
231 experts turned in their rankings (88% response rate). In the final round the same 15 experts
232 turned in their rankings (100% response rate). Consensus was assessed using Kendall's W
233 statistics where <0.5 indicated poor consensus, 0.6-0.8 indicated moderate consensus and
234 >0.8 was strong consensus. Consensus achieved in each round is summarized in Table 2.

235

236 Table 2 here

237

238 The seven BCTs (see Table 1) that were most preferred by experts in round 3 were then used
239 to guide the development of the IMPRESS intervention.

240

241 **Qualitative Interviews**

242 The interview findings were revisited to provide detail for the seven selected BCTS as
243 ingredients of the IMPRESS intervention components (see Table 1). As an example, for the
244 BCT “identify reasons/ motives for wanting and not wanting to stop smoking inside homes”,
245 pregnant women disliked the smell of smoke, felt nauseous and wanted a smoke free home
246 for their own health and that of their children/future child. Some husbands wanted to quit
247 smoking in their home to protect their children and future child. Although most liked
248 smoking in the comfort of their own home, surrounded by their family. They did not want to
249 be seen by others when smoking outside and mentioned concerns about the cold, insects,
250 personal safety and being fined. The consensus amongst pregnant women, husbands and
251 family members was that the husband’s priority is his children including the future child.
252 This detail was used to develop positive images of a smoke free home highlighting the cited
253 benefits. In addition, feedback about the impact of the husband’s smoking in the home on his
254 future child directly targeted the husband.

255

256 **Development of the Intervention**

257 The findings of the three studies described above were discussed at an intervention
258 development workshop in Dhaka, Bangladesh (September 2016), where the research team
259 participated in intensive week-long deliberations. During this workshop, three team members
260 leading one of the three studies presented their key findings to the team. Following the
261 presentations, relevant findings from each of the three studies that informed content and
262 delivery were extracted through discussion and consensus among team members was
263 achieved (resulting in Table 1).

264

265 A working draft of the content and delivery of our proposed multicomponent IMPRESS
266 intervention was created and reviewed to ensure it could be feasible, scalable, sustainable,
267 gender and culturally relevant, and cost-effective. An additional consideration was to ensure
268 that the intervention could be delivered to people with low literacy. This was identified as a
269 limitation in existing SHS interventions [21,22] and a priority for our target audience.

270

271 A team of illustrators, graphic designers, and technology partners were later involved to
272 ensure that the content and delivery of health messages were impactful.

273

274 **Intervention content**

275 The four components of the IMPRESS multicomponent behaviour change intervention are
276 now described (see Figure 2).

277

278 Figure 2 here

279

280 **a) Picture Booklet:** The picture booklet titled, “Clean air, healthy baby” consists of a
281 combination of graphics and text description on topics relevant to reduction of SHS at home.
282 These include but are not limited to i) knowledge about SHS, ii) benefits of change, iii)
283 taking practical steps to reduce smoking at home, iv) getting the help of others e.g., family
284 members. It includes a page where the pregnant woman and her husband agree to any three
285 commitments, they choose to make towards a smoke free home. The picture booklet also
286 includes a pocket to store the cotinine feedback report and letter from the future child
287 described below. It was developed in English and translated to Kannada and Bengali for use
288 in the pilot RCT in India and Bangladesh.

289

290 **b) Cotinine report:** NICALERT, is a quick saliva cotinine screening test for
291 exposure to SHS is a standardized and reliable measure. A saliva sample was collected from
292 women in the antenatal clinic using a funnel and collection container provided. The
293 NicAlert™ test device was laid on a dry flat surface with the numbered levels facing up.
294 The saliva sample was applied to the absorbent cotton wick end of the test strip till it was
295 completely saturated (usually 4-5 drops). Results were read after 20 minutes. A level above
296 10 ng/ml indicates a positive test. Objective colour coded feedback about the presence of
297 cotinine through the NICALERT test is provided in the report.

298

299 **c) Letter from the future child:** The letter from the future child is a rich narrative
300 about their exposure to SHS and its harmful effects on the foetus and mother. This
301 letter is addressed to the father (who smokes at home).

302

303 **d) Voice messages:** Four automated voice messages to be delivered as per a standard
304 schedule (weekly=2, fortnightly=1 and monthly=1) from the study office to the husband of
305 the pregnant woman. The automated voice messages remind him to read the picture booklet if
306 he has not done so already, and to take steps to make their home smoke free.

307

308 **Intervention Delivery**

309 One face-to-face session with the pregnant woman was planned where the interventionist
310 would briefly go through the contents of the picture booklet. This picture booklet (including
311 the cotinine report and letter from the future child) was subsequently given to the pregnant
312 woman to take home, encouraging her to share it with her husband and family members. A
313 week later, voice messages were delivered to the husband as per the above-described
314 schedule.

315

316 **Training of Interventionists**

317 Two research assistants with a Master's degree in psychology/humanities delivered the
318 intervention. A half-day training package was developed. It comprised a brief rationale for
319 the proposed intervention, overview of the multicomponent intervention, do's and don'ts in
320 the conduct of the intervention, and role plays. Some of the skills and competencies imparted
321 during training included finding the right time and setting to negotiate a smoke free home, not
322 engaging in blaming the husband rather jointly taking steps to promote a smoke free home in
323 the interest of the entire family. Specifically, communication and negotiation skills were the
324 key focus.

325

326 **DISCUSSION**

327 BCTs are theory-informed and evidence-based strategies aimed at enhancing positive health
328 behaviours [23, 32]. They have received widespread popularity and have an evidence base in
329 reducing smoking behaviours [31, 33]. However, there is little research on behaviour change
330 interventions to reduce home exposure to SHS in pregnancy [21,22]. Consistent with
331 recommendations [24,25,32], we employed theory and evidence-based approach to detail the
332 systematic development of our multi component behaviour change intervention (IMPRESS)
333 that was informed by a systematic review, modified Delphi survey and qualitative interviews
334 with key informants. Whilst our approach is described as 'theory and evidence-based', it uses
335 the philosophy of other approaches, namely, 'target population centred', 'implementation
336 based' and 'efficiency based'[25]. IMPRESS is also gender and culturally relevant. It is
337 designed empower the pregnant woman to be the main agent of change of her husband's
338 smoking behaviour whilst recognising that this a significant challenge in developing and
339 patriarchal countries [14, 15, 33].

340

341 IMPRESS comprised four components. Cotinine levels in the pregnant women's saliva were
342 measured as an objective indicator of SHS exposure. Feedback via an "official" cotinine
343 report was designed to educate the pregnant woman and her husband on the health risks of his
344 smoking to the women and the future child. The letter from the future child to the father was
345 written to appeal directly to the husband's motivation to protect his children. The picture
346 booklet was developed to increase awareness about SHS and its harms; it also offered
347 practical strategies to help the woman discuss smoking with her husband and enlist help from
348 supportive family members to negotiate with her husband. It was simple and self-explanatory
349 to cater to the low literacy levels of our sample but also to be visually appealing, to engage
350 the target audience. Finally, automated voice messages were delivered to the husband to
351 encourage him to read the picture booklet and discuss with his wife how he could take steps
352 to make their home smoke free. Voice messages have been under-utilized in SHS
353 interventions although m-health interventions are known to be cost effective, scalable, and
354 sustainable [21]. Voice messages were used as opposed to text messages, due to the low
355 literacy level of our target population. They were also considered to be more feasible than
356 engaging with the men in person.

357

358 The IMPRESS intervention package was designed to be brief and easy to deliver by antenatal
359 staff with minimal training to maximise its scalability and sustainability. In line with WHO's
360 directive, it could potentially be integrated into routine antenatal care for screening and
361 intervention in these countries where the prevalence of SHS is high[20].

362

363 In line with the MRC framework [24], the next step was a pilot RCT to assess the
364 acceptability and feasibility of the IMPRESS intervention in India and Bangladesh. This has

365 recently been completed. The results, to be published soon, will inform plans to conduct a
366 multi-country definitive RCT.

367

368 While our approach has many strengths as described above, it also has limitations related to
369 the modified Delphi survey. A moderate consensus among experts on the most effective
370 BCTs was achieved after three rounds. This may be because the Delphi panel was heavily
371 skewed towards the UK experts. Although a high consensus is desirable, a moderate one is
372 acceptable in this niche area where there is paucity of research on SHS [31].

373

374 **CONCLUSIONS**

375 A theory and evidence-based approach informed the development of a multicomponent
376 behaviour change intervention informed by a systematic review, modified Delphi method and
377 qualitative interviews. The intervention has subsequently been evaluated in a pilot RCT for
378 its feasibility and acceptability in two LAMI countries, India and Bangladesh, where the
379 prevalence of home exposure to SHS is high.

380

381 **List of Abbreviations**

382 SHS- Second hand smoke

383 LAMI- Low and Middle Income

384 BCT- Behaviour Change Techniques

385 RCT- Randomized Controlled Trial

386 WHO – World Health Organization

387

388 **Declarations**

389 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

390 This intervention development work and associated research studies were approved by the
391 Institutional Ethics Committees of the University of Liverpool, UK; the National Institute of
392 Mental Health and Neurosciences, India and the Medical Research Council, Bangladesh.
393 Delphi survey and interview participants gave written informed consent to take part.

394

395 ***Consent for publication***

396 Not applicable

397

398 ***Availability of data and materials***

399 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the
400 corresponding author on reasonable request.

401

402 ***Competing interests***

403 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

404

405 ***Funding***

406 The intervention development is one component of a study funded jointly by the MRC, UK
407 (Ref: MR/N006224/1) and DBT India (BT/IN/DBT-MRC/DFID/19/PSC-2015-16). The
408 funders had no role in the conduct or reporting of the intervention development.

409

410 ***Authors' contributions***

411 VAS, CJ, KS, PSC, RH, MD, PM and AR conceived the idea, developed the multi-
412 component intervention, and conducted the contributing studies (systematic review, Delphi
413 survey, interviews). SN collected and analysed the interview data. VS prepared the first draft
414 of the manuscript. CJ and KS reviewed the first draft. All authors contributed to subsequent

415 drafts and have read and approved the final version of this manuscript.

416 *Acknowledgements*

417 We would like to thank our Delphi survey and interview participants.

418

419 **Contributor Information**

420 Veena A. Satyanarayana veena.a.s@gmail.com

421 Cath Jackson cath@validresearch.co.uk

422 Kamran Siddiqi kamran.siddiqi@york.ac.uk

423 Prabha S. Chandra prabhasch@gmail.com

424 Rumana Huque rumanah14@yahoo.com

425 Mukesh Dherani m.k.dherani@liverpool.ac.uk

426 Shammi Nasreen shammibadrul@yahoo.com

427 Pratima Murthy pratimamurthy@gmail.com

428 Atif Rahman atif.rahman@liverpool.ac.uk

429

430

431 **References**

- 432 1. World Health Organisation. Report of the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2009: Implementing
433 Smoke-free Environments. Geneva: World Health Organization.
434 2009; <http://www.who.int/tobacco/mpower/2009/en/> (accessed 12/1/2013).
- 435 2. Öberg M, Jaakkola MS, Woodward A, Peruga A, Prüss-Ustün A. Worldwide burden of
436 disease from exposure to second-hand smoke: a retrospective analysis of data from 192
437 countries. *The Lancet*. 2011; 377: 139–146.
- 438 3. Ezzati M, Lopez AD, Rodgers A, Vander Hoorn S, Murray CJ. Selected major risk factors
439 and global and regional burden of disease. *The Lancet*. 2002; 360: 1347–1360.
- 440 4. Yang G, Fan L, Tan J, et al. Smoking in China. *JAMA* 1999; 282: 1247.
- 441 5. Yang G, Ma J, Liu N, Zhou, L. Smoking and passive smoking in Chinese, 2002.
442 *Zhonghualixingbingxuezhazhi = Zhonghualixingbingxuezhazhi* 2005; 26: 77–83.
- 443 6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Current tobacco use and secondhand smoke
444 exposure among women of reproductive age—14 countries 2008–
445 2010. *MMWR*. 2012; 61: 877–82.
- 446 7. Reece S, Morgan C, Parascandola M, Siddiqi K. Secondhand smoke exposure during
447 pregnancy: a cross-sectional analysis of data from Demographic and Health Survey from
448 30 low-income and middle-income countries. *Tob Control*. 2019; 28(4): 420–426.
- 449 8. Deshmukh J, Motghare D, Zodpey S. Low birth weight and associated maternal factors in
450 an urban area. *Indian Pediatr*. 1998; 35: 33–36.
- 451 9. Gupta P, Subramoney S. Smokeless tobacco use and risk of stillbirth: a cohort study in
452 Mumbai, India. *Epidemiology* 2006; 17: 47–51.
- 453 10. Goel P, Radotra A, Singh I, Aggarwal A, Dua D. Effects of passive smoking on outcome in
454 pregnancy. *J. Postgrad. Med.* 2004; 50: 12–6.

- 455 11. Leonardi-Bee J, Britton J, Venn A. Secondhand smoke and adverse fetal outcomes in
456 nonsmoking pregnant women: a meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*. 2011;127:734–741.
- 457 12. Kwok MK, Schooling CM, Ho LM, et al. Early life second-hand smoke exposure and
458 serious infectious morbidity during the first 8 years: evidence from Hong Kong's
459 "Children of 1997" birth cohort. *Tob Control*. 2008; 17: 263–270.
- 460 13. Yang L, Tong EK, Mao Z, Hu T. Exposure to secondhand smoke and associated factors
461 among non-smoking pregnant women with smoking husbands in Sichuan province,
462 China. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2010; 89: 549–57.
- 463 14. Lee AH. A pilot intervention for pregnant women in Sichuan, China on passive smoking.
464 *Patient Educ Couns*. 2008; 71: 396–401.
- 465 15. Zheng P, Berg C, Kegler M et al. Smoke-Free Homes and Home Exposure to Secondhand
466 Smoke in Shanghai, China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2014; 11: 12015–12028.
- 467 16. Venners SA, Wang X, Chen C, et al. Paternal Smoking and Pregnancy Loss: A
468 Prospective Study Using a Biomarker of Pregnancy. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2004; 159: 993–
469 1001.
- 470 17. Huang CM, Wu HL, Huang SH, Chien LY, Guo JL. Transtheoretical model-based passive
471 smoking prevention programme among pregnant women and mothers of young children.
472 *Eur J Public Health*. 2013; 23: 777–82.
- 473 18. Jackson C, Huque R, Satyanarayana V et al. "He Doesn't Listen to My Words at All, So I
474 Don't Tell Him Anything"-A Qualitative Investigation on Exposure to Second Hand
475 Smoke among Pregnant Women, Their Husbands and Family Members from Rural
476 Bangladesh and Urban India. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2016; 8:13(11),pii: E1098.
- 477 19. Mao A, Bristow K, Robinson J. Caught in a dilemma: why do non-smoking women in
478 China support the smoking behaviors of men in their families? *Health Educ Res*. 2013;
479 28: 153–164.

- 480 20. World Health Organization. WHO Recommendations for the Prevention and Management
481 of Tobacco Use and Second-Hand Smoke Exposure in Pregnancy. World Health
482 Organization; Geneva, Switzerland: 2013; (accessed on 20 July 2016), Available online:
483 <http://www.who.int/tobacco/publications/pregnancy/guidelinestobaccosmokeexposure/en>.
- 484 21. Tong TV, Dietz PM, Rolle IV, Kennedy SM, Thomas W, England LJ. Clinical
485 interventions to reduce secondhand smoke exposure among pregnant women: a
486 systematic review. *Tob Control*. 2015;24:217–223.
- 487 22. Dherani M, Zaidi SN, Jackson C, et al. Behaviour change interventions to reduce second-
488 hand smoke (SHS) exposure in pregnant women – A systematic review and Intervention
489 appraisal. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2017;17(1):378.
- 490 23. Michie S, Richardson M, Johnston M, et al. The Behavior Change Technique Taxonomy
491 of 93 Hierarchically Clustered Techniques: Building an International Consensus for the
492 Reporting of Behavior Change Interventions. *Ann Behav Med*. 2013;46(1):81-95.
- 493 24. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and
494 evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance.
495 *BMJ*. 2008;337: a1655.
- 496 25. O’Cathain A, Croot L, Sworn K, et al. Taxonomy of approaches to developing
497 interventions to improve health: a systematic methods overview. *Pilot Feasibility
498 Stud*. 2019;5: 41.
- 499 26. Hashemzadeh M, Rahimi A, Zare-Farashbandi F, Alavi-Naeini AM, Daei A.
500 Transtheoretical Model of Health Behavioral Change: A Systematic Review. *Iran J Nurs
501 Midwifery Res*. 2019 Mar-Apr;24(2):83-90.
- 502 27. Jones CJ, Smith H, Llewellyn C. Evaluating the effectiveness of health belief model
503 interventions in improving adherence: a systematic review. *Health Psychology Review*.
504 2014; 8:3, 253-269.

- 505 28. Albrecht L, Archibald M, Arseneau D, Scott SD. Development of a checklist to assess the
506 quality of reporting of knowledge translation interventions using the Workgroup for
507 Intervention Development and Evaluation Research (WIDER) recommendations.
508 *Implement Sci.* 2013;8:52.
- 509 29. Black N, Murphy M, Lamping D, et al. Consensus development methods: a review of
510 best practice in creating clinical guidelines. *J Health Serv Res Policy.* 1999;4(4):236–248.
- 511 30. Fink A, Koseoff J, Chassin M, Brook RH. Consensus methods: characteristics and
512 guidelines for use. *Am J Public Health.* 1984;74(9):979–983.
- 513 31. O’Neill N, Dogar O, Jawad M, Keller I, Kanaan M, Siddiqi K. Which Behavior Change
514 Techniques May Help Waterpipe Smokers to Quit? An Expert Consensus Using a
515 Modified Delphi Technique. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2018; 20 (20): 154-160.
- 516 32. Michie S, Fixsen D, Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP. Specifying and reporting complex
517 behaviour change interventions: the need for a scientific method. *Implement Sci.*
518 2009;4:40.
- 519 33. Robertson S, Williams R. Masculinities, men and public health policy. *The International*
520 *Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences.* 2007; 2: 361–368.

521

522

Table 1: Multicomponent behaviour change intervention informed by the systematic review, modified Delphi survey and qualitative interviews

Informed by the Systematic Review	Selected BCTs from modified Delphi survey	Context and detail from qualitative interviews	Intervention content and delivery (intervention component)
Decision to develop a multicomponent behaviour change intervention and 14 BCTs taken forward for inclusion in the modified Delphi survey	Measure cotinine (marker for SHS exposure) in non-smokers and give feedback	<p>Pregnant women, husbands and family members have poor understanding of the health risks of SHS to the health of the pregnant women and their future child.</p> <p>Pregnant women and family members think educating their husbands about the risks of his smoking to his future child, may change his behaviour. Husbands agree this would motivate them.</p>	<p>Personalised feedback on the impact of SHS on the pregnant woman (and therefore her future child) is presented in an “official report” (cotinine report).</p>
	Information about health consequences of SHS and of smoking restrictions at home	<p>The source of this education is seen as important with university employees or health professionals seen as more credible (and influential) than the pregnant woman.</p>	<p>Story provides information on the health consequences of SHS to the entire family, and the benefits of smoking restrictions in the home (picture booklet).</p> <p>Feedback on the impact of the husband’s smoking in the home on his future child is directly targeted at the husband (letter from future child).</p>
	Information about social and environmental consequences	<p>Pregnant women lose confidence in asking their husbands to smoke outside. Some are frightened of his reaction.</p>	<p>The story shows the husband being receptive to discuss his with his wife (picture booklet).</p> <p>Husbands are encouraged to discuss with their wives the steps they could take to make their home smoke free (voice messages).</p>
	Salience of consequences	<p>Husbands do not acknowledge the impact of their smoking inside.</p>	<p>Emotive language directed at the husband is used (letter from future child) and the story included pictures showing the impact on his entire family (picture booklet).</p>
	Identify reasons/motives for	<p>Pregnant women dislike the smell of smoke, feel</p>	<p>Story shows the pregnant woman and her husband</p>

<p>wanting and not wanting to stop smoking inside homes</p>	<p>nauseas and struggle to breath. They want a smoke free home for their own and children's health (also a motive for some husbands). Most husbands enjoy smoking in their home surrounded by family. They don't want to be seen smoking outside, dislike the cold and insects, and fear fines/for their safety.</p> <p>Clear consensus amongst pregnant women, husbands and family members that the husband's priority is his children including the future child.</p>	<p>sitting together to discuss the husband's smoking and reasons why he should stop smoking in the home. Reference is made to the harms to children and future child from their father's smoking indoors. Positive images of a smoke free home, highlighting multiple benefits are depicted (picture booklet).</p> <p>Feedback about the impact of the husband's smoking in the home on his future child is directly targeted at the husband (letter from future child).</p>
<p>Facilitate barrier identification and problem solving</p>	<p>Pregnant women repeatedly ask their husbands to smoke away from them and their children, or to smoke outside, with little success. They feel frustrated and often decide to give up. Husbands agree they usually ignore these requests.</p>	<p>Story shows the pregnant woman and her husband sitting down together to discuss the barriers to him smoking outside. There is an action plan for them to complete together (picture booklet).</p> <p>Husbands are reminded to take steps to make their home smoke free (voice messages).</p>
<p>Prompt practice</p>	<p>Pregnant women report feeling unsupported by family members in challenging husbands' smoking behaviours. They lose confidence to negotiate with their husbands and some are frightened of his reaction. Conversely most husbands do not believe is hard for their wives to request them to smoke outside.</p> <p>Pregnant women think that if other family members, especially elders, ask the husbands to smoke outside, this may be successful. Requests from their children were also seen as potentially influential.</p>	<p>Story shows the pregnant woman asking for support from her family members to ask her husband to smoke outside. Women are instructed to enlist support from their own family members to negotiate with their husband (picture booklet).</p>

Table 2: **Kendall's W coefficient across the three rounds of Delphi**

	Round 1 (N=17)	Round 2 (N=15)	Round 3 (N=15)
Kendall's W	0.25 (<0.001)	0.43 (<0.001)	0.61 (<0.001)




Figure 1: **The three approaches that informed the development of IMPRESS Multicomponent Behaviour Change Intervention**



Figure2: **IMPRESS Multicomponent Behaviour Change Intervention**