

# **Barriers to cardiac rehabilitation utilization**

A review of reviews

Data charting sheets

<b>Influences on attendance at cardiac rehabilitation programs after referral (1)</b>		
First author	Clark, AM	
Publication Year	2012	
Country	Canada	
Study Design	Qualitative Systematic Review	
Aims/objectives	To examine factors and processes that influence patient decisions to attend CR programs and similar secondary prevention systems	
Data bases searched	10	
Number of included studies	90	
Inclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies conducting primary qualitative research or with mixed-methods-design</li> <li>• Adults &gt;18 yrs.</li> <li>• Publication year &gt;1995</li> </ul>	
Data synthesis	Meta-ethnographic approach	
Key findings	Personal barriers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Low insight + knowledge:</b> regarding the nature of programs; patients perceived that CR would not be beneficial generally or people like them, receiving little information from HCP on program content + benefits; patients feel little encouragement to attend; HCPs find patients having little interest in programs</li> <li>• <b>Beliefs about heart disease:</b> attempts at risk reduction are perceived by patients to be futile; CHD seen as unpredictable, inevitable + uncontrollable (low sense of control over their future health)</li> <li>• <b>Negative views of services/health system:</b> HCPs are seen to disrespect patients, provide insufficient time for consultation, give narrow/mixed messages about recovery; poor/insensitive communication; long wait times after referral; HCPs being unresponsive to the needs of particular populations such as older adults or ethnic minorities</li> <li>• <b>Self + identity:</b> patients seeing themselves as different from the type of people who should participate (for “old” people); services being not needed, unlikely to benefit, conflicting with priorities; patients engaged in avoidance strategies to downplay the need to attend; ADLs are seen as health in terms of physical activity; anxiety; pain; recovery from surgery; other illnesses</li> <li>• <b>Financial + work constraints:</b> low income; uncertain employment; competing occupational demands; no flexible home-based program offered</li> <li>• <b>Demands on women:</b> struggled to meet social + financial costs of participation; domestic/family demands; receiving little support from wider community</li> </ul>
	Contextual barriers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Long distances to services:</b> long travel distances from rural settings; poor transport links</li> <li>• <b>Lack of support from family:</b> overprotecting families; families take charge of risk factor reduction</li> </ul>
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wide range of factors influencing CR attendance was found</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical reasons for low attendance such as symptoms or comorbidities were invoked far less often as reasons for nonattendance</li> <li>• High influence of psychosocial factors on decisions to attend CR</li> </ul>
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1/3 of the studies were conducted in the UK</li> <li>• Constrained by quality (moderate) and scope of existing literature</li> <li>• Only high-income countries included</li> </ul>
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professionals from multidisciplinary teams should adapt their support to the individual (by using principles of adult learning)</li> <li>• Interventions including “decision-aids” to ensure that all issues have been raised</li> <li>• Providing accurate and personalised feedback</li> <li>• Fostering patients’ sense of individual control over their CHD</li> <li>• Engage patients AND their families</li> </ul>

Factors influencing referral to CR and secondary prevention programs (2)			
First author	Clark, AM		
Publication Year	2012		
Country	Canada		
Study Design	Systematic Review		
Aims/objectives	To explore factors and complex processes that influence referral as opposed to pre-identified predictors of referral		
Data bases searched	11		
Number of included studies	34		
Inclusion criteria	Qualitative research/mixed-methods design		
Data synthesis	Meta-ethnographic approach		
Key findings	<p>Patient barriers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lack of consistent information + encouragement:</b> patients reported that they received limited or no information/encouragement from physicians + HCP regarding possible participation in programs; Patients having to initiate their own referral by asking HCP or by calling programs on their own behalf</li> <li>• <b>Patient memory:</b> patients could not remember having been given information about programs while in hospital; especially when information was given prior to surgery or when patients found care chaotic + confusing → uncertainty about CR or confusing CR with exercise test/outpatient appointment</li> </ul>	<p>Professional barriers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Physician as gatekeeper:</b> physicians as only type of HCP referring patients; patients waiting for a formal invitation to participate; patients have to initiate their own referral to a program through a physician;</li> <li>• <b>Lacking knowledge</b> about content + benefits of programs; about indications + contraindications of exercise</li> <li>• <b>Patients felt not being included into decision-making process:</b> women felt as “silent players”</li> <li>• <b>Patients being denied a referral</b> by a physician or told that their condition was not bad enough → patients being dependent on physicians to negotiate referrals</li> <li>• <b>Patients were viewed by HCPs</b> as having low interest or motivation for participating</li> </ul>	<p>Systems barriers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Local territoriality:</b> providers reported not referring patients to programs out of fear that these services would replace physician managed care</li> <li>• <b>Programs with different modes of delivery:</b> could be viewed as being in competition for patients</li> <li>• <b>Poor communication across healthcare settings</b> with regard to sharing patient information (laboratory + exercise tolerance tests)</li> <li>• <b>Absence of physician reimbursement</b> for referral + lack of time to refer within competing workload priorities</li> <li>• <b>Programs lacking resources</b> + thus capacity to meet patient needs</li> <li>• <b>Physicians having less capacity</b> to refer due to time constraints</li> <li>• <b>Timing of referral + enrolment:</b> difficulty of providing patients with a</li> </ul>

			referral prior to hospital discharge; hospital stays considered too short for patients to receive a referral from HCP
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most patients are not referred for avoidable reasons</li> <li>• Systems-based solutions should promote shared care</li> <li>• Timely and automated referral should be implemented</li> <li>• Educational outreach</li> <li>• In the studies reviewed, referral was almost exclusively discussed in relation to hospital-based programs with little recognition of alternative types</li> <li>• Despite increased availability of various referral mechanisms, some patients may not attend CR due to complex social + personal factors</li> <li>• Eligible patients should be referred to CR for clinical and ethical reasons irrespective of whether patients indicate they will subsequently participate</li> </ul>		
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constrained by the quality of the included studies (small samples, urban medical centres)</li> <li>• Few studies addressed non-hospital programs</li> </ul>		

<b>Participation and adherence to CR programs (3)</b>	
First author	Ruano-Ravina, A
Publication Year	2016
Country	Spain
Study Design	Systematic review
Aims/objectives	To determine, which factors influence participation and adherence rates in CR programs in patients with AMI
Data bases searched	3
Number of included studies	29
Inclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sample size &gt;100</li> <li>• Study design: systematic reviews and meta-analyses, case-control studies and cross-sectional studies</li> <li>• Patients: AMI, coronary heart diseases</li> <li>• Publication date &gt;2004</li> </ul>
Data synthesis	n.a.
Key findings	Barriers related to participation and adherence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Gender:</b> women participate less in CR than men do</li> <li>• <b>Age:</b> older individuals participate less than younger ones</li> <li>• <b>Employment status:</b> dropout because of return to work</li> <li>• <b>Income:</b> higher income was associated with higher participation and higher education; higher socioeconomic status may lead to higher adherence</li> <li>• <b>Comorbidities:</b> suffering from depression, feeling too ill to participate</li> <li>• <b>Civil status:</b> living alone or being single</li> <li>• <b>Other aspects:</b> being a smoker, lack of interest or the perception that the program was not going to be useful</li> <li>• <b>Accessibility:</b> individuals living farther from the nearest CR centre; not owning means of transportation, or not having a driving license; difficulties in transportation could lead to less adherence</li> </ul>
Principal findings and discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Factors appear homogeneously in most studies</li> <li>• Studies conducted in USA, UK, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Australia</li> <li>• Participation and adherence patterns may differ between EU and USA due to different health coverage systems and costs</li> <li>• Factors affecting participation are usually the same in different locations</li> <li>• Subgroup-specific approaches seem to be needed in order to increase CR participation in women, elderly, and individuals without transportation possibilities</li> </ul>
Implications for future research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative studies can provide interesting inputs in specific settings and should be used to study patients' and cardiologists' attitudes towards CR programs</li> <li>• Specific CR approaches needed for subgroups</li> </ul>
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No meta-analysis due to the heterogeneity of the studies included</li> </ul>

AMI = acute myocardial infarction

<b>Factors associated with non-participation in and dropout from CR (4)</b>	
First author	Resurrección, DM
Publication Year	2019
Country	Spain
Study Design	Systematic review of prospective cohort studies
Aims/objectives	To review factors specifically associated with non-participation (NP) in and/or dropout from CR
Number of data bases searched	6
Number of included studies	43
Inclusion criteria	Prospective cohort studies
Data synthesis	Data extraction sheets
Key findings	Intrapersonal factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Older age or young age associated with NP</li> <li>• Female sex (four times higher odds of NP)</li> <li>• Male sex higher dropout rates</li> <li>• Vulnerable socioeconomic situation</li> <li>• Comorbid conditions: were associated with up to nearly twice the odds of NP + with higher dropout rates</li> <li>• Depression: positive relationship between depression + anxiety with dropout</li> <li>• Low self-efficacy for managing disease was associated with NP</li> <li>• Not feeling the need for CR</li> </ul>
	Clinical factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smoker: nearly 2x the odds of NP + 3x odds for CR dropout</li> <li>• Higher BMI: increased risk for NP + dropout</li> <li>• Comorbidities: Diabetes, obesity, not having controlled cholesterol were associated with NP</li> </ul>
	Interpersonal factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being single</li> <li>• Being unemployed or retired: higher rates of NP</li> <li>• Being employed: higher odds of NP and dropout</li> <li>• Low practical + social support have been identified as factors associated with NP</li> </ul>
	Logistical factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longer travel times, being a non-driver, lack of transport, living in a rural area or in a geographically inaccessible area were associated with NP</li> </ul>
	Cardiac rehab <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attending 2x/week was associated with higher odds of dropout than attending 3x</li> </ul>
	Health system factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of a referral or having a low strength of endorsement from physicians was associated with NO</li> <li>• Long intervals between doctors' visit: 4x greater odds of dropout</li> </ul>
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clinical factors, logistical factors and health system factors were the main factors assessed for NP in + dropout from CR</li> <li>• Studies from USA, Canada, Europe, Oceania</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several factors with scarce evidence: ethnicity, employment, practical support and illness beliefs</li> <li>• Age, gender and employment: controversial for NP + dropout</li> <li>• Findings argue in favour of automatic referral regardless of cardiovascular diagnosis and sociodemographic factors</li> <li>• Combination of inpatient CR + eHealth or community resources would decrease NP + dropout rates due to better adoption to patient profiles</li> </ul>
Implications for future research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systematic referral as an option to address non-participation</li> </ul>
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heterogeneity</li> <li>• Half of studies provided non-adjusted results</li> <li>• Hospital-based settings only</li> </ul>

NP = *non-participation*



<b>Factors influencing participation in CR after referral and initial attendance (5)</b>	
First author	Cark, AM
Publication Year	2013
Country	Canada
Study Design	Qualitative systematic review and meta-synthesis
Aims/objectives	To examine the process and factors that influence patient decisions to complete programmes after referral and initial programme access to build a basis for future interventions aiming at promoting higher participation rates in CR
Number of data bases searched	11
Number of included studies	62
Inclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies reporting primarily qualitative data (wholly or as part of mixed-methods designs)</li> <li>• Adults &gt;18 yrs.</li> <li>• Secondary prevention or CR after referral</li> <li>• Publication date &gt;1995</li> <li>• Definition “participation”: findings related to any process, phenomena, or construct that pertains to participation in a secondary prevention or CR programme at referral, uptake or at participation stages”</li> </ul>
Data synthesis	Qualitative meta-synthesis (iterative approach)
Key findings	Individual factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Theme <i>Identity and the self</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patients struggling to assimilate their diagnosis</li> <li>• Programmes were seen to people who were older, sicker, less fit, take more risks, and need goals prescribed for them → program not beneficial for themselves</li> <li>• Women: concern that participation would increase stress on other family members</li> </ul> </li> <li>Theme <i>Negative views and reactions to health care</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative experiences of programme or programme providers</li> <li>• Received information in CR was inconsistent, badly timed, cajoling</li> <li>• Health professionals were too judgmental and lacking in cultural sensitivity</li> <li>• Services poorly organized, to narrowly focused without including the need of the individuals, not beneficial and less effective than surgery</li> <li>• Women: missing social support and encouragement by services/staff, preferring individual care over group-based sessions</li> </ul> </li> <li>Theme <i>Views and reactions to heart disease</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anxiety: feeling overwhelmed, out of control, public exercising, social interaction in the rehab centre</li> <li>• Denial of diagnosis</li> <li>• Women: process of adjustment after the diagnosis of heart disease, uncertainty, desire to return to normality</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	Contextual factors

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To rely on public transport or on family members</li> <li>• Women: living in a rural setting, distance, and time</li> </ul> <p>Theme <i>Lack of family support</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relying on family members to participate in programs</li> <li>• Women who were caregiver for their partners or provided income to other family members</li> </ul> <p>Theme <i>Gender roles</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programmes seen as “men’s clubs” that insufficiently recognize the contemporary social and occupational roles of women</li> <li>• Conflict with women’s occupational demands</li> <li>• “Domestic responsibilities” as childcare, housework, family life: Perceived responsibility to other family members were often placed by women before their health needs</li> <li>• Services failing to be sufficiently inclusive of patients’ different languages, cultures, and clothing preferences while exercising</li> </ul>
Principal findings and discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation was more fundamentally influenced by social dimensions of services related to user experiences, conceptions (of identity, the services, and the disease) and contextual factors</li> <li>• Social experience of attending programmes was highly valued by patients and seen to be beneficial</li> <li>• Most patients see CR as being intended for patients who are less healthy than they are</li> <li>• Perceptions and knowledge of programme benefits and risks of non-participation appear to influence participation less</li> </ul>	
Implications for future research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender-sensitivity: Interventions should be adapted to women’s needs and must seek to supplement the information content of CR with approaches that harness the social elements of CR</li> <li>• Interventions should encourage patients to see their own values represented in CR programmes and the professionals providing them</li> <li>• Social marketing approaches: Interventions should use social marketing to link CR content to a wide range of types of patients in terms of age, sex, and fitness levels</li> <li>• Mobilize family support: Support and education of relatives regarding their role in facilitating the health benefits that can accrue from CR</li> </ul>	
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publication date 1995 or later</li> <li>• Limited age or sex-based analysis and lack of theory/concepts to interpret or understand the influence of gender/ethnicity in detail</li> <li>• Older adults were underrepresented in the studies</li> </ul>	

<b>Barriers to CR in ethnic minority groups (6)</b>		
First author	Vanzella, L	
Publication Year	2021	
Country	Brazil	
Study Design	Scoping review	
Aims/objectives	To identify barriers to CR reported by people from ethnic minorities	
Number of data bases searched	6	
Number of included studies	20	
Inclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer-reviewed literature</li> <li>• Other languages than English or Portuguese</li> <li>• Studies including patients from ethnic minorities with CVD eligible to participate CR</li> <li>• Definition "ethnic minority": a group of people of a particular nationality living in a country or area where most people are from a different nationality</li> </ul>	
Data synthesis	Thematic analysis	
Key findings	Barriers to CR referral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of CR knowledge</li> <li>• Unawareness of CR programs</li> <li>• Information sharing problems (patient-provider communication): Lack of discussion about CR</li> <li>• Language proficiency: Documents with information not discussed with providers or not provided in native language</li> </ul>
	Barriers to enrolment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of family support: withhold of information from patients to prevent them from becoming alarmed or distressed about their CVD</li> <li>• Language: Lack of understanding of verbal and written instructions</li> <li>• Information material not adapted to the language, cultural, and religious needs</li> <li>• Lack of interaction to the CR team and communication about feelings and disease-related information</li> <li>• CR knowledge: patients being unaware of the role of CR as no discussions were initiated by providers</li> <li>• Logistical barriers: lack of transport, lack of time, distance to the CR program, work conflicts, long waiting times to start CR</li> <li>• Fatalistic health beliefs (health problems chosen by God)</li> <li>• Individual perceptions: being too old to change habits or exercise, limited understanding of their CVD, cardiac misconceptions</li> <li>• Financial difficulties</li> </ul>
	Barriers to adherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logistical barriers</li> <li>• Lack of family support</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual perceptions: lack of motivation, feeling CR is not helpful, not feeling comfortable with the exercises, feeling vulnerable and hopeless about the future</li> <li>• Language and communication difficulties</li> <li>• Lack of knowledge about CR and cardiac condition</li> <li>• Religion: being fated to have CVD, dietary habits, lack of cultural adaption of messages/info</li> <li>• Psychological status, socioeconomic status</li> </ul>
Principal findings and discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate health literacy, lack of cultural adaption, limited provision of interpretation services, lack of translated and customized educational materials, short consultation times, resource constraints</li> <li>• Especially: language, logistical aspects, lack of CR knowledge, individual perceptions, culture, lack of family support</li> <li>• Referral as dependent upon patients' characteristics, providers' practice, and health system characteristics</li> </ul>	
Implications for future research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overcome language barriers: appropriate translation of info material</li> <li>• Dissemination of patient education materials or motivational letters in patients' first language</li> <li>• Training for providers to improve cultural awareness and communication skills</li> <li>• Encouragement to provide in-hospital discussions about CR</li> <li>• Extra support for ethnic minorities (cultural, psychological, practical, financial)</li> <li>• Liaison strategies: Automated referral in combination with an in-hospital discussion with providers</li> </ul>	
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generalizability</li> <li>• No RCT included</li> </ul>	

<b>CR for women (7)</b>							
First author	Supervia, M						
Publication Year	2017						
Country	USA						
Study Design	Systematic Review						
Aims/objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To identify gender-related barriers to CR participation</li> <li>To rate solutions to the gender-related gap in CR participation</li> </ul>						
Number of data bases searched	Min. 5						
Number of included studies	54 (24 studies regarding barriers and 31 studies regarding potential solutions)						
Inclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RCT, controlled clinical trials, observational studies</li> <li>Adults &gt;18 yrs.</li> <li>Quantitative research</li> </ul>						
Data synthesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Systematic review software (Covidence)</li> <li>Scoring solutions according to the AHA for level of evidence and strength of recommendation</li> </ul>						
Key findings	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Patient-level factors</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-morbidities (depression, diabetes, obesity...)</li> <li>Lack of information on or familiarity with CR</li> <li>Negative beliefs and perceptions about CR</li> <li>Lack of CR awareness</li> <li>Perception of exercise as being tiring or painful</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provider-level factors</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive endorsement is helpful for CR participation</li> <li>Lack of written referral necessary for participation</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Societal/Environmental factors</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport problems</li> <li>Family obligations and responsibilities</li> <li>Lack of insurance and financial concerns</li> <li>Lack of social support from family and friends</li> <li>Individuals from underrepresented minority groups</li> <li>Low education level</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </table>	Patient-level factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-morbidities (depression, diabetes, obesity...)</li> <li>Lack of information on or familiarity with CR</li> <li>Negative beliefs and perceptions about CR</li> <li>Lack of CR awareness</li> <li>Perception of exercise as being tiring or painful</li> </ul>	Provider-level factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive endorsement is helpful for CR participation</li> <li>Lack of written referral necessary for participation</li> </ul>	Societal/Environmental factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport problems</li> <li>Family obligations and responsibilities</li> <li>Lack of insurance and financial concerns</li> <li>Lack of social support from family and friends</li> <li>Individuals from underrepresented minority groups</li> <li>Low education level</li> </ul>
	Patient-level factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-morbidities (depression, diabetes, obesity...)</li> <li>Lack of information on or familiarity with CR</li> <li>Negative beliefs and perceptions about CR</li> <li>Lack of CR awareness</li> <li>Perception of exercise as being tiring or painful</li> </ul>					
	Provider-level factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive endorsement is helpful for CR participation</li> <li>Lack of written referral necessary for participation</li> </ul>					
Societal/Environmental factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport problems</li> <li>Family obligations and responsibilities</li> <li>Lack of insurance and financial concerns</li> <li>Lack of social support from family and friends</li> <li>Individuals from underrepresented minority groups</li> <li>Low education level</li> </ul>						
Principal findings and discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barriers identified reflect a complex array of demographic, socioeconomic, medical, and societal challenges</li> <li>Non-modifiable factors vs. modifiable</li> <li>Increased public awareness on cardiac diseases through campaigns should be supported</li> </ul>						
Implications for future research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative delivery models for women must be taken into account</li> <li>Uptake of gender-specific research</li> </ul>						
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quantitative research studies only</li> <li>Low availability of gender-based solutions to CR referrals</li> </ul>						
<b>Previous experience of physical activity influences engagement with CR (8)</b>							

First author	McHale, S	
Publication Year	2020	
Country	UK	
Study Design	Systematic review	
Aims/objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To examine qualitative evidence systematically</li> <li>To describe patients' perceptions and experiences</li> </ul>	
Number of data bases searched	4	
Number of included studies	12	
Inclusion criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publication date 1990-2017</li> <li>Adults &gt;18 yrs. eligible to attend CR with ACS</li> </ul>	
Data synthesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thematic synthesis methodology (Thomas and Harden)</li> </ul>	
Key findings	Barriers related to post-event communication + advice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication regarding CR primarily focused on exercise: patients felt embarrassment at the idea of group exercise</li> <li>Participants felt able to exercise independently → meant attendance was not necessary</li> </ul>
	Barriers regarding expectations of exercised-based CR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program-related: Not receiving individual monitoring of cardiovascular fitness and goal settings → expectations unmet</li> <li>Participants who were not previously active lacked motivation to exercise and social support</li> <li>Patients perceiving themselves as self-reliant, having resources to support their return to exercise, and being knowledgeable about exercise exertion levels, feeling able to reproduce a "better" exercise programme, having access to gym</li> <li>Patients perceiving themselves fitter than the exercise intensity levels of exercise-based CR</li> <li>Comparisons with others perceived to be more suited to exercise-based CR (due to the severity of illness)</li> <li>Patients considering themselves as being outside age norms → negative attitudes towards exercise-based CR</li> <li>CR as a reminder of physical losses → decision to not attend</li> <li>Perception to be already active and conducting alternative PA (walking, gym...) → these activities were less strenuous than CR and more accommodated to physical ability, lifestyle, and social/cultural beliefs → perception that further exercise was not appropriate</li> <li>CR exercises not individualised</li> </ul>
	Illness related barriers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perception to manage their condition</li> <li>Perception that heart attack was "mild"</li> <li>Perception that medical management helped recovery (CR had no value)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existence of comorbidities</li> </ul>
Principal findings and discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advice given post-event and during CR provided the context for decisions about engagement with exercise-based CR</li> <li>• Prompt contact of individuals diagnosed with ACS and share information</li> <li>• There is a need to clarify the multidisciplinary nature of CR (not primarily an exercise intervention)</li> <li>• For persons immediately post-cardiac event, HCP could benefit from making prompt contact to identify previously active persons and understand their perceptions and confidence</li> <li>• Early communication should highlight the benefits of attending CR such as learning about exercise intensity</li> <li>• Development of a “model of engagement”</li> <li>• Early decision-making was improved by reinforcement of CR benefits, details of aims and objectives, types of CR, and info of supervised environment</li> <li>• Accessing individualised information, for example regarding exercise and age appropriateness</li> <li>• For completing patients, the “fitter self” was at the core of their discussions</li> <li>• Individual assessment of all patients to identify exercise behaviours and support needs → tailored approaches</li> </ul>	
Implications for future research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need of studies to explore how participants engaging with CR self-regulate exercises independently and in accordance with CR exercise guidelines</li> <li>• How does gender influence the strength of self-perceptions?</li> <li>• To what extent does CR information inflate the perceptions?</li> </ul>	
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small number of studies</li> <li>• Mixture of inpatient and outpatient CR</li> </ul>	

ACS = acute coronary symptom

<b>Barriers for non-participation and dropout of women in CR (9)</b>		
First author	Resurrección, DM	
Publication Year	2017	
Country	Spain	
Study Design	Systematic review	
Aims/objectives	To review the literature on barriers perceived by women with CVD affecting their non-participation in and/or dropping out from CR programs	
Number of data bases searched	>8	
Number of included studies	24	
Inclusion criteria	No restrictions	
Data synthesis	Using a specified data extraction sheet	
Key findings	Intrapersonal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-reported health: Feeling too sick, feeling too old, feeling depressed, needing to receive another medical treatment</li> <li>• Health beliefs: perception that CR is unnecessary, belief that heart attacks cannot be prevented, belief to manage and solve their heart problem by themselves</li> <li>• Lack of motivation</li> <li>• Lack of time</li> <li>• Religious expectations</li> </ul>
	Interpersonal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of family and social support and caretaking responsibilities</li> <li>• Work conflicts and employment restrictions</li> </ul>
	Logistical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport and distance: not having transport, not driving or want to disturb family members</li> <li>• Personal or community resources</li> </ul>
	CR program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services offered not adapted to individual needs</li> <li>• Group format made women feel uncomfortable (talking in groups)</li> <li>• Exercise component physically too heavy or painful, frightened to exercise</li> <li>• Inconvenient timing of the program</li> </ul>
	Health system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of referral by physicians, waiting too long to be referred, physician felt it unnecessary to refer them to CR</li> <li>• Unawareness of CR</li> <li>• Costs too high, lack of insurance</li> <li>• Negative experiences with the health system</li> <li>• Language: CR program not offered in their first language → communication difficulties</li> </ul>
Principal findings and discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Women reported multilevel barriers</li> <li>• Future guidelines should address the barriers to improve adherence</li> <li>• The heterogeneity in the assessment of barriers should be addressed with a valid instrument</li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most findings were reported from the USA</li> </ul>
Implications for future research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More studies from different healthcare contexts are needed</li> <li>• Develop a valid instrument to measure and report barriers</li> </ul>
Limitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different study designs included → heterogeneity</li> <li>• No common definition of non-participation and dropout</li> </ul>

---

## References

1. **Clark AM**, King-Shier KM, Thompson DR, Spaling MA, Duncan AS, Stone JA, et al. A qualitative systematic review of influences on attendance at cardiac rehabilitation programs after referral. *American Heart Journal*. 2012;164(6):835-845.e2.
2. **Clark AM**, King-Shier KM, Duncan A, Spaling M, Stone JA, Jaglal S, et al. Factors influencing referral to cardiac rehabilitation and secondary prevention programs: A systematic review. *European Journal of Preventive Cardiology*. 2013;20(4):692–700.
3. **Ruano-Ravina A**, Pena-Gil C, Abu-Assi E, Raposeiras S, van 't Hof A, Meindersma E, et al. Participation and adherence to cardiac rehabilitation programs. A systematic review. *International Journal of Cardiology*. 2016;223:436–43.
4. **Resurrección DM**, Moreno-Peral P, Gómez-Herranz M, Rubio-Valera M, Pastor L, Caldas de Almeida JM, et al. Factors associated with non-participation in and dropout from cardiac rehabilitation programmes: a systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *European Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*. 2019;18(1):38–47.
5. **Clark AM**, King-Shier KM, Spaling MA, Duncan AS, Stone JA, Jaglal SB, et al. Factors influencing participation in cardiac rehabilitation programmes after referral and initial attendance: qualitative systematic review and meta-synthesis. *Clin Rehabil*. 2013;27(10):948–59.
6. **Vanzella L**, Oh P, Pakosh M, Ghisi G. Barriers to Cardiac Rehabilitation in Ethnic Minority Groups: A Scoping Review. *JOURNAL OF IMMIGRANT AND MINORITY HEALTH*. 2021;23(4):824–39.
7. **Supervía M**, Medina-Inojosa JR, Yeung C, Lopez-Jimenez F, Squires RW, Pérez-Terzic CM, et al. Cardiac Rehabilitation for Women: A Systematic Review of Barriers and Solutions. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 2017;92(4):565–77.
8. **McHale S**, Astin F, Neubeck L, Dawkes S, Hanson CL. A systematic review and thematic synthesis exploring how a previous experience of physical activity influences engagement with cardiac rehabilitation. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2020;19(1):31–43.
9. **Resurrección DM**, Motrico E, Rigabert A, Rubio-Valera M, Conejo-Cerón S, Pastor L, et al. Barriers for Nonparticipation and Dropout of Women in Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Women's Health*. 2017;26(8):849–59.