



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

Is sports-branded screening effective in identifying adults at greatest risk of developing cardiovascular disease: A convergent parallel mixed-methods design to identify adults at greatest risk of developing cardiovascular disease using an opportunistic sports-branded health screening approach.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2024-087974
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Apr-2024
Complete List of Authors:	Jones, Ian; Liverpool John Moores University Fitzsimmons , Deborah; Liverpool John Moores University, Faculty of Health Musa, Massirufufulay ; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Nursing and Advanced Practice Carroll, Paula; Liverpool Football Club Smith, Emma Johnston; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Nursing and Advanced Practice Clowes, Miriam; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Nursing and Advanced Practice Carr, Jess; Liverpool Football Club Fulstow, Andrew; Liverpool Football Club Lip, Gregory; University of Liverpool, Liverpool Centre for Cardiovascular Science
Keywords:	Cardiovascular Disease, Mass Screening, Risk Factors

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.

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies. Enseignement Supérieur (ABES).

Title

Is sports-branded screening effective in identifying adults at greatest risk of developing cardiovascular disease: A convergent parallel mixed-methods design to identify adults at greatest risk of developing cardiovascular disease using an opportunistic sports-branded health screening approach.

Ian Jones^{1*}, Deborah Fitzsimmons¹, Massirfululay Kpehe Musa¹, Paula Carroll², Emma Johnston Smith¹, Miriam Clowes¹, Jess Carr², Andrew Fulstow² and Gregory YH Lip^{3,4}

¹ Liverpool Centre for Cardiovascular Science, Faculty of Health, Liverpool John Moores University, Tithebarn Building, 79 Tithebarn St, Liverpool, L2 2ER. Tel: +44 151 231 2121

² Liverpool Football Club Foundation, Liverpool Football Club, 10th Floor, 20 Chapel Street, Liverpool, L3 9AG

³ Liverpool Centre for Cardiovascular Science at University of Liverpool, Liverpool John Moores University and Liverpool Heart & Chest Hospital, Liverpool, United Kingdom; and

⁴ Danish Center for Health Services Research, Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark

*Correspondance Professor Ian Jones at I.D.Jones@ljmu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To establish whether sports-branded screening is effective in identifying adults at risk of developing cardiovascular disease (CVD); to determine whether the public would engage with sports-branded health screening, and what were their experiences.

Design: Convergent parallel mixed methods.

Setting: Mass screening at Liverpool Football Club Foundation (LFCF) events at four community centres.

Participants: 100 participants (mean age 46.6 years [SD 14.7], range 20-84 years) were recruited and their risk factors identified. Of these 62 were screened for their SCORE 2 CVD risk. Men and women were equally represented. Participants were predominantly white-British (93%).

Interventions: A dedicated screening area was established at each venue. Data to calculate SCORE 2/OP risk scores were captured (gender, smoking status, age, blood pressure, lipids). Additional risk factors (glucose, incident AF, and Body Mass Index) were measured to assess wider heart health. A purposive sample of twelve participants participated in a semi-structured, one-to-one audio recorded interview about their experience.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Outcomes were the SCORE 2 and SCORE2/OP risk tool; ability to recruit participants; and whether sports-branded screening was acceptable to participants.

Results: CVD risk ranged from <1% to 15%. Twenty-one participants had a 10-year risk of fatal and non-fatal CVD events greater than the estimated risk for their age. Participants reported that they would not have organised a GP health check or had struggled to book a GP appointment and found mass testing to be convenient, quick, and easy.

Conclusions: Sports affiliated branding was well received and identified a significant number of people with high ten-year risk of CVD plus additional risk factors. All participants interviewed spoke positively about the experience. Immediately providing results, alongside individualised health promotion, allowed participants to understand their risk of CVD and the need for a change of lifestyle.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

- Four mass cardiovascular risk health screenings held at community-based sport-branded events;
- 100 participants recruited and their cardiovascular health risk factors identified;
- Participants provided with targeted health promotion advice and contact details for locally-based health resources;
- Participants interviewed regarding their perceptions of community-based health screening

Strengths and limitations:

- The affiliation of a specific sports brand potentially acted as both a strength (for supporters of the team) and limitation (for those with no affiliation to the team or no interest in football) which may have affected engagement levels of the study;
- At some events the screening was offered to adults accompanying children participating in other activities at the centre, so the adults had free time to participate in the screening if they chose to do so;
- Recruitment was undertaken in areas of high deprivation and whilst it is generally acknowledged that those from a lower socio-economic background are less likely to engage with health screening initiatives, the ability to recruit to this study was a key strength.
- To encourage participants to engage with local services suitable for their needs, a strength of the study was that Quick Response (QR) codes providing direct access to those resources were given to participants; and
- A limitation of the study was that participants were not followed beyond the life of the study, and we can therefore not report if they accessed local services.

Key words:

Cardiovascular disease; mass screening; risk factors; health promotion; football.

INTRODUCTION

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is an umbrella term describing a group of heart and circulatory diseases including coronary heart disease, stroke, aortic, and peripheral arterial diseases [1]. CVD accounts for around 17.9 million deaths globally [1] and more than 170,000 deaths in the U.K [2]. The likelihood of developing cardiovascular disease is associated with numerous modifiable risk factors such as obesity, lack of physical exercise, high cholesterol levels, high blood pressure and tobacco smoking [3]. However, with early detection and targeted lifestyle and medical intervention these risks can be substantially reduced, and lives saved [3].

Health screening can be systematic (also known as selective or targeted) where a population that fulfils a pre-defined criterion is targeted; opportunistic, where patients who present to clinical practice for some other health conditions are screened; or mass screening, which adopts a population-based approach [4, 5]. Systematic screening has demonstrated improvements in risk factor profiles [6] but has had no impact on long term CVD outcomes [7]. Among the three forms of health screening, researchers have used opportunistic screening to investigate health conditions of the 'hard-to-reach' population [8, 9]. Although opportunistic screening has been found to be effective in increasing detection of risk factors, its impact on long terms CVD outcomes is unclear [10, 4].

The term 'hard-to-reach' or 'marginalised/hidden-population' varies among and within disciplines but is commonly used to describe populations that experience discrimination and stigma, which potentially imperil their uptake of health care services for fear of health care providers exacerbating stereotyping [11]. The term is commonly attributed to the LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer) communities [12, 13, 9], diverse ethnic communities [14], traveller families [15], asylum seekers, disabled people, lower socio-economic groups, children and young people, and older people [16, 8]. People described as 'hard-to-reach' populations report discriminatory encounters from health care providers that results in unmet needs and their reluctance to re-engage with health services [17, 18]. In one study conducted to assess routine healthcare access and the risks of readmission in CVD patients among hard-to-reach populations, approximately 15.7% (mostly young, male, non-white with low social support) reported difficulty in accessing routine healthcare services, with the consequence of more hospital readmissions [19]. It would therefore suggest that these populations are not hard-to-reach, but they find that healthcare is hard-to-access and are consequently underserved.

There is a raising interest in a shift to proactive, patient-centred approach to healthcare delivery that seeks prevention and promotion of healthy lifestyles from a reactive, treatment-and-prescription centric healthcare delivery system [20]. Researchers have used several health behaviour theories to inform health intervention development and delivery, among which include the Theory of Planned Behaviour [21], the Transtheoretical Model [22], and the Health Belief Model (HBM) [23, 24]. The HBM was developed in the 1950s to investigate why people fail to undertake preventive health measures [24]; it remains one of the most widely employed theories of health behaviour. The HBM posits that a person's decision and motivation to adopt a healthy behaviour depends on three factors: personal perception, moderating behaviours, and the likelihood of doing that behaviour [24]. This study is underpinned by the HBM as it sought to unravel individuals' CVD susceptibility, perceived severity and benefits of early screening, potential modifying variables and cues to action [23, 25]. By doing so it was envisaged that the

study could identify an alternative approach to delivery of preventive screening that would improve participant uptake by reducing access barriers.

Liverpool Football Club Foundation (LFCF) is the official charity of Liverpool Football Club (LFC) in the Northwest of England. The city of Liverpool has a proud sporting history and LFC is one of the most recognisable sports brands associated with the area. The definition of brand has been explored in different bodies of literature depending upon the philosophy and perspective applied. It has been defined by the American Marketing Association [26] as “a name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors”. Muniz and O’Guinn [27] described brand community as a “specialized, non-geographically bound community, based on a structured set of social relationships among admirers of a brand”. LFCF aims to harness the power and passion of the Club’s fans and stakeholders to create life changing opportunities for young people and families. The Foundation uses an evidence-based approach to identify and work in the most deprived communities both locally and internationally to support people who need it most. LFCF have capitalised on their brand value to undertake several ground-breaking projects within the city, using sport as a means of positively influencing the behaviours and attitudes of the local community. Their community projects supported nearly 123,000 individuals in the 2022/23 season with over half (59%) of the registered participants on these programmes living in the most deprived local authority wards in the country in the same period [28].

Sporting organisations possess an ability to attract individuals in a way that healthcare systems cannot. Collaboration between a recognised sporting brand and a healthcare provider could offer a novel means of undertaking mass screening for CVD risk factors among underserved populations. The ‘power of the (LFC) badge’ [29] has been demonstrated to access people and support positive change.

The primary aim of our study was to determine whether the LFC brand could be leveraged to facilitate local health improvement by identifying adults at greatest risk of developing CVD through the provision of sports-branded screening at community-based events. Secondary research aims were to assess whether the public would engage with sports-branded health screening and the provision of information based on the HBM to encourage healthy lifestyle choices, and their opinions regarding the acceptability and effectiveness of this approach.

METHODOLOGY

A convergent parallel mixed-methods design was used to gain in-depth understanding of the topic. This design entails concurrently conducting quantitative and qualitative elements in the same phase of the research process, analysing the two components independently, and giving equal weight to both strands during data integration and interpretations [30, 31].

Mass screening was chosen for this study to enable screening of people who had no prior knowledge about the screening assessments when they attended community sporting events, and enabled the researchers to screen some participants from the ‘hard-to-reach’ population [8, 9].

This study was undertaken within four mass screening events delivered by Registered and student nurses in collaboration with LFCF over five days in August 2022. Advertising for the screening at one of the events is shown in Figure 1.

The study used the SQUIRE reporting guidelines [32].

Figure 1: Brand-lead advertising from a screening event

Patient and Public Involvement

A patient and public involvement (PPI) group was established specifically for this project. The group consisted of leads from community organisations that the LFC Foundation support via a Community Wellbeing 'hubs' model. This model provides both financial support and support to co-deliver programmes and activities from different locations in the Liverpool City Region. They were initially approached by staff at the LFCF, and they agreed to meet with the principal investigator (PI). During the meeting they provided advice on when and where we should undertake the screening and they advised on how best to seek feedback through short interviews. The guide used during the participant interviews was developed in collaboration with the PPI group who recommended a short interview to be undertaken immediately after the assessment to generate immediate feedback without distracting people from their daily activities.

Eligibility Criteria

To be included in the study, participants were required to be over 18 years of age and able to provide written informed consent. Exclusion criteria included those with established CVD or diabetes. Previous participants were unable to participate on a second occasion.

Recruitment

Participants were recruited while attending a LFCF event at one of four community centres in Liverpool, Wirral, and Knowsley. These events were free to attend and diverse in nature including, for example, arts and crafts and physical activities aimed at all ages. A total of 100 of 131 participants approached who were attending these events and meeting the inclusion criteria were recruited over a five-day period. A purposive sample of twelve participants (five males and seven females) who completed the risk assessment were invited to participate in interviews to explore their experiences of the health screening process and the impact that affiliation with sports-branding had upon their decision to participate.

Informed Consent

Potential recruits were approached during the event by either Registered or student nurses and/or LFCF employees involved in the study who explained the purpose of the study and invited potential participants to meet with a member of the research team. The researchers at the events, all Registered Nurses, provided the participants with a participant information sheet, clarified any outstanding issues, and gained written informed consent. Participants were

advised that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Contact details of the principal investigator were provided to each participant.

Prior to conducting the interviews, the twelve individuals who had agreed to participate were asked to provide additional verbal consent for this second stage of the study.

Quantitative Data Collection

A dedicated screening area was established at each community venue. Several risk factors, detailed below, were assessed in accordance with the SCORE 2 and SCORE 2 OP CVD 10-year CVD risk assessment tool as recommended by the European Society of Cardiology guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice [3]. The tool uses an algorithm derived, calibrated, and validated to predict 10-year risk of first-onset CVD in European populations and enhances the identification of individuals at higher risk of developing CVD [33]. Results are easily understood and are provided in the form of a percentage and a traffic light system. The U.K. is classed as a low-risk population and the calculations were undertaken using the algorithm relevant to this group. Those under the age of 40 years were included in the assessments but their risk was not assessed in line with the SCORE 2 methodology.

Risk factors measured included self-reported gender at the time of birth, smoking status, and age. Blood pressure was measured by a student or registered nurses using a calibrated sphygmomanometer in accordance with the British Hypertension society recommendations for manual blood pressure measurement [34]. Blood lipids and glucose were measured using an Abbott LDX V2 point of care analyser. These data were entered directly into the SCORE 2 and SCORE2 OP online risk algorithm and their 10-year CVD risk was calculated and discussed with the participant [33].

Incident atrial fibrillation (AF) was also assessed using a MyDiagnostik sensor. MyDiagnostick is a cylindrical shaped MDD Class IIa medical device, intended to discriminate AF from normal rhythm. MyDiagnostick has been shown to be highly sensitive in detecting AF, with sensitivity levels ranging between 94% (95% CI 87–98%) [35] to 100% (95% CI 93–100%) [36]. In addition, high specificity values of 93% (95% CI 85–97%) [35] to 95.9% (95% CI 91.3% to 98.1%) [36] were also reported in the same datasets. The detection threshold is already embedded in MyDiagnostick and was not modified for this study. Atrial fibrillation does not feature in the SCORE2 assessments but given the prevalence of undiagnosed AF and the increased risk of morbidity and mortality associated with the condition it was felt that it would be remiss not to assess participants’ heart rhythm. Students and registered nurses had been trained to use the kit prior to study commencement. Each person was asked to hold the MyDiagnostick sensor using both hands for 60 seconds in a static position in line with the manufacturer’s guidelines.

Whilst Body Mass Index (BMI) was also not required for the SCORE 2 calculator and therefore did not feature in the overall risk score, each person’s height and weight and BMI level were recorded to provide feedback and health promotion advice to participants. A BMI between 25-29.9 kg/m² was categorised as overweight and a BMI >30 kg/m² was categorised as obese in line with the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance [37].

Consideration was given to maintaining dignity and privacy for participants, so private rooms were used, and screening took place away from the main activity hives of the community hubs.

Data were input by the research team and cross checked for completeness. Risk scores were calculated independently by two researchers.

Delivery of Health Promotion

Underpinned by the theory of health belief model [23, 24, 25], results of SCORE2 assessment were discussed with each participant by a Registered Nurse who delivered targeted health promotion advice. This was done to ensure that participants appreciated their susceptibility to CVD and were given the opportunity to mitigate potential risks by adapting individualised healthy behaviours.

All participants were provided with a paper record of their health assessment results and they were advised to discuss their results with their practice nurse. Quick response codes (QR codes) were created for each community hub which provided information about local smoking cessation, weight loss, physical activity and mental health services, alongside direct links to websites and contact information for support group.

Qualitative data collection

Participants who agreed to be interviewed about their experiences after completing their screening and being provided with their health promotion advice were invited to be interviewed in a quiet room by a researcher who was not involved in the risk assessment. The interviews were conducted by the male PI (IJ PhD RN), a senior cardiac nurse specialist and highly experienced academic researcher. No prior relationship was established with participants prior to the interviews. The investigator introduced themselves and explained their role in the study. To reduce any opportunity for bias and ensure responses were based on the participant's reflection on their experience, an interview guide was developed and, along with recruitment and content, tested with the PPI panel prior to conducting the interviews. The interviewer used open-ended, short, semi-structured interviews to elicit spontaneous and individualistic responses from the participants regarding their experience of the screening programme, the results of the screening and how participants felt about them, whether attending the programme had changed their views on their health future, whether the participant felt there should be any changes to the programme and if so, why this was the case. To elicit the broadest range and depth of responses in order to achieve data saturation, the interviewer asked probing questions during the interview. The interviews lasted between two and seven minutes and were audio recorded with prior permission from the participants. No repeat interviews were conducted. Field note annotations from the PI were provided to the research team members (DAF, MKM) undertaking analysis of the interviews.

Data analysis

The quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics using IBM SPSS version 29 software.

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

The interviews were transcribed verbatim by a researcher, MKM, who had not participated in their completion. The transcripts were not returned to the participants for comment or correction given the verbatim transcription. The transcripts were analysed descriptively to reflect participants’ perspectives [38], using Braun and Clarke’s reflective thematic approaches [39]. An inductive approach was used for data analysis and employed both sematic and latent coding [40] using MS Office Excel software. The data were analysed independently by two researchers, MKM and DAF, who had not participated in the interviews. Their analysis was compared and minor differences were discussed and agreed to overcome any potential bias. No participant checking was conducted after the analysis.

RESULTS

Demographics

Participants ranged from 20- 84 years with a mean age of 46.6 years [SD = 14.7] with 41.5% of the sample aged between 40 and 59 years (Table 1). Men and women were equally represented. Participants were predominantly white British (93%) with the remaining participants identifying as Asian or Asian British (5%) and mixed or multiple ethnic group (2%) (Figure 2).

Table 1: Age distribution of participants

Age	Percentage of sample
<30	10%
30-39	28%
40-59	42%
60-75	16%
>75	5%

Figure 2: Ethnicity of participants

Blood lipids

Blood lipid results were not available on all participants due to the limited blood provided. Measurements were available on total cholesterol (n=99), HDL (n=98), LDL (n=87), Triglyceride (n=99), non-HDL (n=94) and LDL/HDL (n=79). Of those tested, 41% of the participants recorded a total cholesterol level greater than the recommended normal range (>5mmol/l) (Table 2). 71% of those with high total cholesterol were over the age of 40 years. More than 36% of the participants recorded a High-Density Lipoprotein below the recommended level of 1mmol/l for men and 1.2mmol/l for women (Table 2). 53% of those

with low HDL were over 40 years. Approximately 40% of participants with data recorded Low Density Lipoproteins levels above the recommended normal range ($<3\text{mmol/l}$), 66% of whom were over 40 years of age. LDL/HDL ratio was found to be higher than the normal range in 54% with almost two thirds (65%) being over 40 years.

Table 2: Blood related measurements

Variable	Tested population with results outside normal range (%)
Total Cholesterol	41.5% High cholesterol
High Density Lipoprotein	37% High HDL
Triglyceride	22% High Triglyceride
Low Density Lipoprotein	40% Low LDL
Non-HDL cholesterol	34% High non-HDL
LDL/HDL ratio	54% High LDL/HD: ratio
Glucose	2% High Glucose
Blood pressure	20% High Blood pressure

Blood Pressure

Blood pressure was recorded for 98 participants with a minimum and maximum blood pressure range 90-170mmHg systolic and between 46-100mmHg diastolic. Twenty percent (20%) of participants recorded a blood pressure greater than the normal range of 140/90mmHg; 60% of which were aged over 40 years.

Smoking

Smoking status was recorded in 100 patients with 21% of participants admitting to being smokers, 6% described themselves as ex-smokers, and 6% reported using e-cigarettes. 72% of smokers were over 40 years of age.

Body Mass index

BMI was recorded for 82 participants. Mean BMI was recorded as 29 within a range of 17.8 and 51. 70% of the participants were classified as overweight or obese, and 65% of those overweight/obese were aged over 40 years or older. Thirty-eight percent of participants were classified as obese (class 1, 2, or 3); 23% were Class 1 obese, 8.5% were Class 2 obese, and 6.1% were Class 3 obese. Those over 40 years made up 72% of the overweight group, 63% class 1, 50% of class 2 and 60% of class 3 obese groups respectively.

Table 3: Body Mass Index

BMI measurement	Participants (%)
<18.5 underweight	2
18.5 - <25 normal weight	28
25 - <30 overweight	32
30 - <35 Class 1 obese	23
35 - <40 Class 2 obese	9
>40 class 3 obese	6

Cardiovascular risk scores

Date of birth data was missing from six participants and 32 participants were aged less than 40 years of age so while they participated in the screening it was not possible to estimate CVD risk using SCORE 2. For the 62 participants screened CVD risk ranged from <1% to 15%. Twenty-one participants were classed as low risk (<1%) due to their low levels of total cholesterol and HDL cholesterol. Twenty-one participants (33.9%) were reported to have a 10-year risk of fatal and non-fatal CVD events greater than the estimated risk for their age, placing them at high risk.

Incident atrial fibrillation

Only one individual was identified as having an irregular heart rhythm. As the individual had already been diagnosed with AF no further action was taken.

Qualitative Data

Twelve participants completed interviews with the PI (IJ) as noted above. Analysis of the interviews identified five main themes:

- The Screening Programme;
- Pre-existing health risks for each individual;
- Presenting health and health behaviour;
- Proposed changes in behaviour following screening; and
- GP access and health screening.

Each of these will be discussed in turn.

The Screening Programme

Four sub-themes were identified:

- Location and timing of the programme;

- Perceptions about the targeted health advice;
- How to improve the programme; and
- Why the programme was felt to be successful by the participants.

Each of these subthemes will be discussed in turn.

Six participants stated that they felt the community location of the screening to be beneficial, with comments such as:

“this is great that I can do it here, I mean I play football anyway” [0021] and

“the fact that just after football, the opportunity to get yourself screened for potential risk, cardiovascular risk is important. Especially for our families I think it is important to know where you standing in regards to your risks” [0023]

“it is not something you have to phone your GP to go and do, so it is nice to have it in the community, isn’t it?” [0026]

“In the hospital... it is (a) scary... environment. Whereas here they come around and explain it” [0025].

The brief nature of the screening was also appreciated with one participant stating:

“All was fantastic. It was quick; it didn’t feel like it was too long. You so busy in your normal day-to-day, you don’t want it to drag on; no, really efficient” [0026].

Five participants appreciated the targeted health promotion information provided after screening with one noting:

“I was given some advice how to make adjustments to my diet and lifestyle too to address those numbers and make sure they stay in low range” [0023]

The immediate provision of results was positively received with applicants declaring:

“when they put ..(the results) in front of you. I was like I’ll do it” [0028]

“I was really happy to have access to that today and also to get the results quickly right away. I didn’t have to wait or anything. So, it was really good to know that is fine and is actually helpful” [0027]

The format of providing additional resources was also appreciated, with a participant stating:

“I was given a barcode to access services. So that was really good, that was really positive” [0019]

Whilst one participant felt they “wouldn’t change anything” [0020] about the screening programme, some suggestions were made that could offer improvements. Two participants suggested a need for more resources to reduce delays waiting for test results; two felt the programme should be repeated twelve months later to offer a follow-up service to see if people had followed the advice and provide further guidance; one suggested a need for additional advertising to make the screening availability and location clearer. In the interview it was evident that one participant had not realized that they had been given a QR code with links to community resources that could be beneficial, so this could be more explicit. Finally, one

participant felt that the health promotion advice could be more explicit to encourage people to change their health behaviour, stating:

“you’re (doing) some fabulous things here, but if you don’t say to people ‘this is going to kill you’ ...you’ve got to be ruthless to be kind” [0022]

The screening programme was described as “fantastic” [0022 and 0026], “helpful” [0027], “providing motivation” [0026], “raising awareness” [0030], “positive” [0020], “works well” [0019] and one individual noted that:

“I’m quite happy to be honest because they checked all, ‘cause I wouldn’t have known the outcome” [0029].

Pre-existing health risks for each individual

One third of participants (n=4) interviewed identified that they had concerns regarding their weight, but it was interesting to note that whilst one participant identified that the screening had indicated an elevated Body Mass Index (BMI), none of these four individuals mentioned their BMI results.

One participant recognised that their ethnicity increased their cardiovascular risk. Three participants identified familial health issues that would suggest regular screening would be beneficial. For example, one participant stated:

“my mum has high cholesterol and she got high blood pressure. And she’s recently been to the doctors, and they said she’s prediabetic. My nan had diabetes; my nan from dad side, they both suffered stroke” [0030].

Another participants stated:

“I was advised to have my cholesterol checked too (due to familial health issue) but that was before Covid I thought I’m not going to get my cholesterol checked so will not just think about it” [0027].

Two participants identified that the screening had indicated they had high blood pressure. Five participants identified high cholesterol levels with one attributing it to their diet and recognised the issues associated with fast food:

“Sometimes taking kids out is more convenient when you’re out somewhere and you don’t time to make choice. It’s just convenient to say, oh, drive to McDonalds. And sometimes it’s a treat as well for them...and it is actually nice, but I know it’s not good” [030]

Presenting health and health behaviour

This theme had four sub-themes:

- Results of the screening tests (BMI, BP and cholesterol);
- Current levels of activity;
- Current diet; and

- Prior weight loss.

Only one of the four individuals who voiced concerns about their weight identified that they were attempting to address this:

"I've start losing 3 and a half stones and I quitted smoking 8 years ago. So, I know what I need to work on to get my cholesterol little bit lower" [0028].

Two other individuals noted that they had lost weight in the past two years, with one stating:

"About 2 years ago I was 15.2 and I thought is I don't do something about it I'm going to end up 16 stones which is wrong for me. So, I've lost over a stone in about last couple years" [0020]

Rather than attending slimming clubs as noted by the other participants, this individual attributed their weight loss as follows:

"I cut down my alcohol in general, but in particular I cut down beers... losing the beers have helped with the weight lost" [0020].

Only two participants discussed engaging in regular activity but only one of these described specific sporting activity, stating:

"I do train, not weight or stuff like that but I do train. I do little bit weight, but I'm very active, very active. And I have a big garden, so tend to do all sorts" [0019].

Three participants described their current diet, and in two cases how they had modified it to improve their health:

"I'm generally trying to eat a bit less and a bit better stuff, a bit more fruits and vegs ...I've done that" [0020].

"Less carbs. I've had my first chocolate bar today; I haven't had any for about a month... I eat more than 50% vegetarian or treat myself with a bit meat" [0028]

Proposed changes in behaviour following screening

As a result of the screening, three individuals identified that they would make changes to their diet, with one having discussed diet in their health promotion advice stating:

"I'm going to make deliberate change because the whole nation probably we love our butter and our toast and bread. So, I think looking for alternative to butter, which obviously contributed to increasing LDL is a big sort of change I think I can potentially make" [0023]

Two participants were attending slimming clubs or were on eating plans and had successfully lost weight, so were not intending making further changes as a result of the screening. A second individual noted that whilst they had plans to commence attending a slimming club:

"I was worried about the cholesterol thing because that's not good. I've just got to try now, try harder" [0029]

Only one participant stated that they wanted to stop smoking. Another identified that they smoked “only” nine cigarettes per day and felt that their activity ameliorated the impact of smoking, saying:

“I am happy staying at none, and nine is quite difficult to do. I have been smoking since the age of 16, that’s a long time. I’ve been smoking nine now (I may have extra one someday)... Nine is a pretty good....if it was just smoking nine without any other exercise, that wouldn’t be good” [0019]

It was interesting to note that one individual who had self-identified as “oversized” [0028] did not identify any issues with their results or any wish to make any lifestyle changes as they felt their screening results to be “great, so, really, really reassuring to know that” [0028].

GP access and health screening

Five participants identified problems with getting appointments to see their GP, including one participant who had tried to book an appointment earlier in the day:

“I happened to ring my GP this morning for an appointment for something. I rang 72 times, 72 times, ehmm...eventually when it was answered, no appointment. And that’s quite a common thing for my GP practice. In the past I’ve rung far more than 72 times, I’ve rung 100 times before and got no appointment” [0020].

One additional participant felt that people do not see their GP:

“because they’re frightened to go to doctors... These people think it’s alright, and you know it’s like Covid disease people will die of underlying illnesses that they didn’t know they had” [0022].

Health screening was not something five participants felt would approach their GP for, even in one case where it had been recommended:

“I was advised to have my cholesterol checked too (due to familial health issue) but that was before Covid I thought I’m not going to get my cholesterol checked so will not just think about it” [0027]

Only two participants identified attending health screening appointments in the past, with one feeling it was important to pursue this as an individual:

“I try to beat the clock... Not to deteriorate due to my own fault and find that I’m in hospital with some major health issues and they say well if you’ve done that 5 years ago you won’t be here” [0021]

DISCUSSION

The study highlighted how mass screening can identify individuals with a previously unknown increased risk of CVD, hypertension, or abnormal lipid profiles, and highlighted other risks including smoking and obesity that could be discussed using an appropriate health promotion framework. The screening assessed individuals who, according to the interviews, would not

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.
Enseignement Supérieur (ABES)

have independently arranged a health check with their GP. These individuals could be considered hard to reach for traditional health service delivery models, but mass screening reduced access issues and made health testing and health guidance available to all who wished to make use of it. Such mass testing was shown to be convenient, quick, and easy; with all interviewee's reporting positively about the experience and stating that they were happy to engage. Participants recommended rolling out similar sessions with local sports teams more regularly.

The affiliation of a leading sports brand, in this case LFC, was considered a strength by the participants of this particular study, but it was recognised that this could have also acted as a deterrent to some potential participants who did not have an affiliation with the specific football team or had no interest in football, thereby limiting the potential engagement levels of the study. Whilst it is widely established that those from a lower socio-economic background are less likely to engage with health screening initiatives and while socio-economic background of participants was not collated, recruitment was deliberately undertaken in areas of high deprivation. The ability to recruit to this study in these areas was seen as a strength of the study. More participants were recruited by staff wearing LFC branded clothing rather than those in nurses uniform, and participants provided feedback that they found the latter to be off-putting. Results supplied immediately to participants, alongside individualised health promotion and advice, allowed participants to understand their risk of CVD and highlighted to them the need for a change of lifestyle in keeping with the HBM approach. The provision of QR codes specifically aligned with local resources provided participants with direct access to services suitable for their needs. This study did not follow these participants following assessment and can therefore not report if they accessed local services, however evidence suggests that individuals are more likely to engage with services if they are shown how to access them [41, 42].

This study identified a high prevalence of major risk factors for both CVD and other long-term illnesses. Total cholesterol, especially non-high-density lipoprotein (non-HDL-C), is an important predictor of CVD events [43]. Almost half of adults living in the UK are reported as having cholesterol levels above 5mmol/L [2]. Approximately 8 million adults in the UK are currently taking lipid-lowering drugs such as statins [2]. In this study, 41% of participants had cholesterol levels greater than the recommended normal range ($>5\text{mmol/l}$), and almost 71% of these participants were over the age of 40 years. LDL/HDL ratio was found to be higher than the normal range in 54% with almost two thirds (65%) of these being over 40 years. Approximately 16 million adults in the UK are reported to have hypertension (e.g., $\geq 140/90\text{ mmHg}$), with almost half of them not receiving effective treatment [2]. According to the British Heart Foundation [2], about 50% of heart attacks and strokes in the UK are associated with hypertension. We found 20% of participants to have high blood pressure readings with 60% of these over the age of 40. This is higher than the national average where 9% of adults aged 16 to 44, 31% aged 45 – 64, and 60% aged 65 and over are associated with hypertension [44]. It is estimated that at least 7 million adults in the UK smoke cigarettes [2]. Meanwhile, about 15,000 deaths each year due to CVD in the UK are reported to be attributed to smoking [2]). It is reported [45] that in 2022, the age group 25 to 34 years had the highest proportion of current smokers in the UK (16.3%); those aged 65 years and over had the lowest (8.3%). The proportion of smokers in the UK in 2002 was 12.9%, or 6.4 million people [45] and has reduced from 2021 (13.3%) and 2011 (20.2%) levels. Our participants had a higher rate of smoking

with 21% of the participants admitting to being smokers (72% of whom were over the age of 40), 7% describing themselves as ex-smokers and another 6% reporting using e-cigarettes. Vapes pose a CVD risk [46]. Whilst it is reported that the use of vapes is increasing in younger people [45], and people are switching to vapes to help them quit smoking cigarettes (31%); to prevent relapse (22%); because they enjoy the experience (14%); and to save money (12%) [47], and the proportion of the participants who were vaping was lower than the 2022 national average of 8.7% [44]. The 1% incidence of AF in this population was lower than that expected for the local population [48]. Finally, more than 26% of adults in the UK are classified as obese (e.g., BMI > 30kg/m²) and about 38% of them have a BMI index defined as overweight (e.g., BMI range 25-29.9kg/m²) [2]. The British Heart Foundation [2] indicates that 1 in 6 CVD deaths in the UK are associated with high BMI index. Our study found that nearly three quarters of the sample were either overweight or obese. These findings highlight the potential extent of future health harms that can be expected unless healthcare services intervene.

The involvement of LFCF branding and staff created a sense of partnership and, it could be argued, encouraged participants to trust the researchers more readily than they would have if an unaffiliated screening study had taken place. This argument is echoed by the work of Pringle et al [49] who completed a study incorporating eleven foundation Community Charity trusts affiliated with football clubs and found that football branding allowed for effective engagement with local communities, describing such affiliation as providing a ‘powerful reach’ to local people. Participants requested the rollout of more sessions affiliated with sports teams as a positive way to gain greater future engagement. Feedback from participants also highlighted the need for health screening provisions to become common place within local community setting, allowing for easy access to local people, which could support public health initiatives.

To gain a greater understanding of the impact that sports-branded health screening has upon engagement, a larger scale study is needed with a larger budget to allow for the purchase of more equipment to support a wider roll out of health screening. It is also recommended that information on socio-economic background of participants is collated to examine any link between socio-economic status and engagement with health screening, particularly those affiliated with sports branding, allowing for future exploration of the barriers that are faced and how community led initiatives can address this. Future studies should also consider affiliation with other sports brands to capture the engagement of other members of the wider community. Furthermore, affiliation with other charitable organisations, religious groups, community hubs and social clubs recognised by the local community may capture individuals who do not affiliate themselves with any sport. Participants in this study recommended extended advertising to encourage recruitment and the need for follow-up with participants in future studies.

CONCLUSION

Sports affiliated branding was well received and allowed for positive engagement with the study. The screening identified a significant number of people with high ten-year risk of CVD and high levels of CVD risk factors. Moreover, all participants engaged in discussion regarding lifestyle choices and were provided with information about local health provision. Participants articulated their desire to engage in such screening but were either unable to secure a GP

appointment or would not consider accessing the GP for these services. Screening that was immediately available was valued. Larger scale studies are needed to explore the impact that sports branding has upon community health initiatives in a drive to reduce the incidence of cardiovascular disease.

ABBREVIATIONS

AF – incident atrial fibrillation

CVD – cardiovascular disease

LFCF - Liverpool Football Club Foundation

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

ETHICS APPROVAL

All methods were carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, relevant guidelines and regulations. Ethical approval was provided by the Liverpool John Moores ethics committee (UREC 22/NAH/029) on 29th June 2022.

FUNDING

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS

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

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

IJ developed the study design, participated in qualitative data collection, conducted quantitative data analysis, and developed the draft manuscript. DF conducted qualitative analysis, wrote the final version of the article, completed the COREQ and SRQR checklists, formatted the article and prepared it for submission. MKM conducted qualitative data analysis and contributed to the manuscript. PC developed the study design, supported participant recruitment, and

contributed to the manuscript. EJS developed the study design, participated in quantitative data collection, supported health promotion delivery, and contributed to the manuscript. MC developed the study design, participated in quantitative data collection supported health promotion delivery and contributed to the manuscript. JC developed the study design, supported participant recruitment, and contributed to the manuscript. AF developed the study design, supported participant recruitment, and contributed to the manuscript. GL developed the study design and contributed to the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organisation (WHO). World Health statistics: monitoring health for the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals) [online]. 2020. <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1547&context=srreports> [accessed: 15 February 2024].
2. British Heart Foundation (BHF). UK Factsheet: January 2024 [online]. 2024. www.bhf.org.uk/-/media/files/for-professionals/research/heart-statistics/bhf-cvd-statistics-uk-factsheet.pdf (accessed: 15 February 2024).
3. Visseren, F.L.J., Mach, F., Smulders, Y.M., et al. 2021 ESC Guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice. *Eur. Heart J.* 2021;42(34):3227-3337.
4. Dyakova, M., Shantikumar, S., Colquitt, J.L. et al. Systematic versus opportunistic risk assessment for the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2016;(1), Cd010411.
5. Piepoli, M.F., Hoes, A.W., Agewall, S. et al. 2016 European Guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice: The Sixth Joint Task Force of the European Society of Cardiology and Other Societies on Cardiovascular Disease Prevention in Clinical Practice (constituted by representatives of 10 societies and by invited experts). Developed with the special contribution of the European Association for Cardiovascular Prevention & Rehabilitation (EACPR). *Eur. Heart J.* 2016;37(29): 2315-2381.
6. Jørgensen Peter, G., Jensen Jan, S., Marott Jacob, L. et al. Electrocardiographic Changes Improve Risk Prediction in Asymptomatic Persons Age 65 Years or Above Without Cardiovascular Disease. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol* 2014;64(9):898-906.
7. Krogsbøll, L.T., Jørgensen, K.J. and Gøtzsche, P.C. General health checks in adults for reducing morbidity and mortality from disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2019;1(1),Cd009009.
8. Flanagan, S.M. and Hancock, B. 'Reaching the hard to reach'-lessons learned from the VCS (voluntary and community Sector). A qualitative study. *BMC Health Serv. Res.* 2010;10: 1-9.
9. Haire, B.G., Brook, E., Stoddart, R. et al. Trans and gender diverse people's experiences of healthcare access in Australia: A qualitative study in people with complex needs. *Plos one* 2021;16(1):e0245889.
10. Majumdar, A., Chinnakali, P., Vinayagamoorthy, V. et al. Opportunistic Screening for Hypertension and Selected Cardiovascular Risk Factors among Adults

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies. Ensignement Supérieur (ABES).

- Attending a Primary Health Center in Puducherry, India. *Int. J. Prev. Med.* 2014;5(12):1616-1620.
11. Jiao, S., Slemon, A., Guta, A. et al. Exploring the conceptualization, operationalization, implementation, and measurement of outreach in community settings with hard-to-reach and hidden populations: A scoping review. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 2022;309:115232.
 12. Elliott, E., Watson, A.J. and Harries, U. Harnessing expertise: involving peer interviewers in qualitative research with hard-to-reach populations. *Health Expect.* 2002;5(2):172-178.
 13. Liljas, A.E.M., Walters, K., Jovicic, A. et al. Strategies to improve engagement of 'hard to reach' older people in research on health promotion: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 2017;17(1):349.
 14. Darko, N. *Engaging Black and Minority Ethnic Groups in Health Research: 'Hard to Reach'? Demystifying the Misconceptions.* 1st ed., Bristol University Press, 2021. JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1s2t0g4>. Accessed 8 Apr. 2024.
 15. Milbourne, L. Unspoken Exclusion: Experiences of continued marginalisation from education among 'hard to reach' groups of adults and children in the UK. *Br. J. Sociol. Educ.* 2002;23:287 - 305.
 16. Jones, T. and Newburn, T.. *Widening Access: Improving Police Relations With Hard To Reach Groups.* Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate Research Paper. 138. 2001. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tim-Newburn/publication/240417389_Widening_Access_Improving_Police_Relations_With_Hard_To_Reach_Groups/links/53ce769c0cf2b8e35d1496a8/Widening-Access-Improving-Police-Relations-With-Hard-To-Reach-Groups.pdf?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uLiwicGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIn19 (accessed 8 April 202).
 17. Clement, S., Schauman, O., Graham, T. et al. What is the impact of mental health-related stigma on help-seeking? A systematic review of quantitative and qualitative studies. *Psychol. Med.* 2015;45(1):11-27.
 18. Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C. et al. The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development. *The lancet* 2018;392 (10157):1553-1598.
 19. Dupre, M.E., Xu, H., Granger, B.B. et al. (2018) Access to routine care and risks for 30-day readmission in patients with cardiovascular disease. *Am. heart j.* 2018; 196:9-17.
 20. Orji, R., Vassileva, J. and Mandryk, R. Towards an effective health interventions design: an extension of the health belief model. *Online J. Public Health Inform.* 2012;4(3).
 21. Bosnjak, M., Ajzen, I. and Schmidt, P. The Theory of Planned Behavior: Selected Recent Advances and Applications. *Eur J Psychol* 2020;16(3):352-356.
 22. Hashemzadeh, M., Rahimi, A., Zare-Farashbandi, F. et al. Transtheoretical Model of Health Behavioral Change: A Systematic Review. *Iran J. Nurs. Midwifery Res.* 2019;24(2):83-90.
 23. Becker, M.H. *The Health Belief Model and Sick Role Behavior.* Health Ed. Monog. 1974;2(4):409-419.

24. Champion, V. L., & Skinner, C. S. The health belief model. In K. Glanz, B. K. Rimer, & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. 2008;pp. 45–65.
25. Jones, C.L., Jensen, J.D., Scherr, C.L. et al. The Health Belief Model as an explanatory framework in communication research: exploring parallel, serial, and moderated mediation. *Health Commun.* 2015;30(6):566-576.
26. American Marketing Association. Definitions of Marketing. <https://www.ama.org/the-definition-of-marketing-what-is-marketing/> (accessed 8 April 2024).
27. Muniz, A.M., O'Guinn T.C. Brand Community. *J. Consum. Res.* 2001;27(4):412–432.
28. Liverpool Football Club Foundation. LFC Foundation Impact Report 2022 2023 [online]. 2023. <https://www.efdn.org/blog/resource/liverpool-fc-foundation-impact-report-2022-2023/> (accessed 8 April 2024).
29. Hargreaves, F., Carroll, P., Robinson, G. et al. County Lines and the power of the badge: the LFC Foundation's approach to youth intervention. *Safer Communities* 2023;22(2):91-105.
30. Creswell, J. W. and Clark, V. L. P. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2017.
31. Demir, S.B. and Pismek, N. A Convergent Parallel Mixed-Methods Study of Controversial Issues in Social Studies Classes: A Clash of Ideologies. *Edu. Sci.Theory Prac.* 2018;18(1):119-149.
32. Ogrinc G, Davies L, Goodman D, Batalden P, Davidoff F, Stevens D. Squire 2.0 (Standards For Quality Improvement Reporting Excellence): Revised Publication Guidelines From A Detailed Consensus Process. *Bmj Qual Saf.* 2016 Dec;25(12):986-992. Doi: 10.1136/Bmjqs-2015-004411. Epub 2015 Sep 14. Pmid: 26369893; Pmcid: Pmc5256233
33. Chipayo-Gonzales, D., Ramakrishna, H. and Nuñez-Gil, I.J. Score2: A New Updated Algorithm to Predict Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Europe. *J. Cardiothorac. Vasc. Anesth.* 2022;36(1):18-21.
34. <https://bihsoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/BP-Measurement-Poster-Manual-2017.pdf> accessed 1st August 2022
35. Vaes, B., Stalpaert, S., Tavernier, K., Thael, B., Lapeire, D., Mullens, W., & Degryse, J. (2014). The diagnostic accuracy of the MyDiagnostick to detect atrial fibrillation in primary care. *BMC family practice*, 15, 113. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2296-15-113>
36. Tieleman, R. G., Plantinga, Y., Rinkes, D., Bartels, G. L., Posma, J. L., Cator, R., Hofman, C., & Houben, R. P. (2014). Validation and clinical use of a novel diagnostic device for screening of atrial fibrillation. *Europace : European pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac electrophysiology : journal of the working groups on cardiac pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac cellular electrophysiology of the European Society of Cardiology*, 16(9), 1291–1295. <https://doi.org/10.1093/europace/euu057>

37. NICE (2023) How should I confirm if a person is overweight or obese? [online]. <https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/obesity/diagnosis/identification-classification/>. [accessed: 13/12/2023]
38. Doyle, L., McCabe, C., Keogh, B. et al. An overview of the qualitative descriptive design within nursing research. *J. Res. Nurs.* 2020;25(5):443-455.
39. Braun, V. and Clarke, V. One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qual. Res. Psychol.* 2021;18(3):328-352.
40. Clarke, V. and Braun, V. Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners [online]. 2013. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Victoria-Clarke-11/publication/256089360_Successful_Qualitative_Research_A_Practical_Guide_for_Beginners/links/00b7d52259909e356d000000/Successful-Qualitative-Research-A-Practical-Guide-for-Beginners.pdf?tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIiwicGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIn19. [accessed 8 April 2024].
41. Pattoni, L. Strengths-based approaches for working with individuals [online]. <https://www.iriss.org.uk/resources/insights/strengths-based-approaches-working-individuals> [online]. 2012. [accessed: 20 February 2024]
42. NHS England. Working in partnership with people and communities: statutory guidance [online]. 2022. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/long-read/working-in-partnership-with-people-and-communities-statutory-guidance/> [accessed: 20 February 2024]
43. NICE Lipid modification - CVD prevention [online]. 2024. <https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/lipid-modification-cvd-prevention/>. [accessed: 20 February 2024]
44. NHS England. Health Survey for England, 2021 part 2 [online]. 2023. <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/2021-part-2/adult-health-hypertension> [accessed 8 April 2024].
45. Office for National Statistics (ONS). Adult smoking habits in the UK: 2022 [online]. 2023. [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandlifeexpectancies/bulletins/adultsmokinghabitsingreatbritain/2022/pdf#:~:text=A%20higher%20proportion%20of%20men,women%20\(7.9%25\)%20in%202022.&text=The%20total%20proportion%20of%20young,in%202021%20\(Figure%209\)](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandlifeexpectancies/bulletins/adultsmokinghabitsingreatbritain/2022/pdf#:~:text=A%20higher%20proportion%20of%20men,women%20(7.9%25)%20in%202022.&text=The%20total%20proportion%20of%20young,in%202021%20(Figure%209)). [accessed 8 April 2024].
46. El-Mahdy, M.A., Ewees, M.G., Eid, M.S. et al. Electronic cigarette exposure causes vascular endothelial dysfunction due to NADPH oxidase activation and eNOS uncoupling. *Am. J. Physiol. Heart Circ. Physiol.* 2022;322:4,H549-H567.
47. Action on Smoking and Health. Use of e-cigarettes (vapes) among adults in Great Britain [online]. 2023. <https://ash.org.uk/uploads/Use-of-e-cigarettes-among-adults-in-Great-Britain-2023.pdf?v=1691058248> [accessed 8 April 2024].
48. Public Health England. Atrial Fibrillation Prevalence Estimates for Local Populations [online]. 2020. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/atrial-fibrillation-prevalence-estimates-for-local-populations>. (accessed on 8 April 2024).

49. Pringle, A.R., Zwolinsky, S. and Lozano-Sufrategui, L. Investigating the delivery of health improvement interventions through professional football club community trusts-strengths and challenges. Public Health Pract. 2021;2:100104.

Word count: 6271 excluding title page, abstract, references, figures, tables or acknowledgments.

For peer review only

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies. Enseignement Supérieur (ABES).

LFC FOUNDATION HEALTH SCREENING

This is a research Study

Researchers from Liverpool John Moores University and Liverpool Football Club Foundation are trying to find out if providing a health screening service at public events is a good way of identifying people at risk of developing heart and blood vessel disease.

Are you at risk of Cardiovascular disease?

Many people are at risk of heart and blood vessel disease but do not know. Screening can help to find out your chances of you suffering from these diseases in the future, so you can reduce that risk now.

Screening

If you are interested in taking part in the study, we would like to ask you some questions about your health and lifestyle, take your blood pressure, and a finger prick of blood to test your cholesterol and blood sugar.


Further Support

If you are at risk of heart and blood vessel disease, we can provide your GP with the results of the test, if you agree. We can also advise you about the sessions that Liverpool FC Foundation and their partners deliver that you might want to attend.



Foundation





BMJ Open

Is sports-branded screening effective in identifying adults at greatest risk of developing cardiovascular disease: A convergent parallel mixed-methods design to identify adults at greatest risk of developing cardiovascular disease using an opportunistic sports-branded health screening approach in the community.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2024-087974.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Feb-2025
Complete List of Authors:	Jones, Ian; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Nursing and Advanced Practice, Faculty of Health, Innovation, Technology, and Science; Liverpool Centre for Cardiovascular Science at University of Liverpool, Liverpool John Moores University and Liverpool Heart & Chest Hospital, Liverpool, United Kingdom Fitzsimmons , Deborah; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Nursing and Advanced Practice, Faculty of Health, Innovation, Technology, and Science Musa, Massirfulay ; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Nursing and Advanced Practice, Faculty of Health, Innovation, Technology, and Science Carroll, Paula; Liverpool Football Club , Liverpool Football Club Foundation Smith, Emma Johnston; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Nursing and Advanced Practice, Faculty of Health, Innovation, Technology, and Science Clowes, Miriam; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Nursing and Advanced Practice, Faculty of Health, Innovation, Technology, and Science Carr, Jess; Liverpool Football Club , Liverpool Football Club Foundation Fulstow, Andrew; Liverpool Football Club, Liverpool Football Club Foundation Yates, James; Liverpool John Moores University, School of Nursing and Advanced Practice, Faculty of Health, Innovation, Technology, and Science Lip, Gregory; University of Liverpool, Liverpool Centre for Cardiovascular Science; Aalborg University, Danish Center for Health Services Research, Department of Clinical Medicine
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine, Nursing, Patient-centred medicine
Keywords:	Cardiovascular Disease, Mass Screening, Risk Factors

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



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
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

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

nTitle

Is sports-branded screening effective in identifying adults at greatest risk of developing cardiovascular disease: A convergent parallel mixed-methods design to identify adults at greatest risk of developing cardiovascular disease using an opportunistic sports-branded health screening approach in the community.

Ian Jones^{1,3*}, Deborah Fitzsimmons¹, Massirfufulay Kpehe Musa¹, Paula Carroll², Emma Johnston Smith^{1,3}, Miriam Clowes¹, Jess Carr ², Andrew Fulstow² James Yates^{1,3} and Gregory YH Lip^{3,4}

¹ School of Nursing and Advanced Practice, Faculty of Health, Innovation, Technology, and Science, Liverpool John Moores University, Tithebarn Building, 79 Tithebarn St, Liverpool, L2 2ER. Tel: +44 151 231 2121

² Liverpool Football Club Foundation, Liverpool Football Club, 10th Floor, 20 Chapel Street, Liverpool, L3 9AG

³ Liverpool Centre for Cardiovascular Science at University of Liverpool, Liverpool John Moores University and Liverpool Heart & Chest Hospital, Liverpool, United Kingdom

⁴ Danish Center for Health Services Research, Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark

*Correspondence Professor Ian Jones at I.D.Jones@ljmu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To establish whether sports-branded screening is effective in identifying adults at risk of developing cardiovascular disease (CVD); to determine whether the public would engage with sports-branded health screening, and what were their experiences.

Design: Convergent parallel mixed methods.

Setting: Mass screening at Liverpool Football Club Foundation (LFCF) events at four community centres.

Participants: 100 participants (mean age 46.6 years [SD 14.7], range 20-84 years) were recruited, and their risk factors identified. Of these 62 were screened for their SCORE 2 CVD risk. Men and women were equally represented. Participants were predominantly white-British (93%).

Interventions: A dedicated screening area was established at each venue. Data to calculate SCORE 2/OP risk scores were captured (gender, smoking status, age, blood pressure, lipids). Additional risk factors (glucose, incident AF, and Body Mass Index) were measured to assess

wider heart health. A purposive sample of twelve participants participated in a semi-structured, one-to-one audio recorded interview about their experience.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Outcomes were the SCORE 2 and SCORE2/OP risk tool; ability to recruit participants; and whether sports-branded screening was acceptable to participants.

Results: Participants ranged from 20- 84 years with a mean age of 46.6 years. Men and women were equally represented. Participants were predominantly white British with 41% and 40% recording a high than normal Total cholesterol and LDL-C level respectively, and 36% recording lower than normal LDL-C level. Twenty percent of participants recorded a blood pressure greater than 140/90mmhg and 21% of participants were smokers. Mean BMI was 29 ranging from 17.8 and 51 with 70% of the participants were classified as overweight or obese. CVD risk ranged from <1% to 15%. Twenty-one participants had a 10-year risk of fatal and non-fatal CVD events greater than the estimated risk for their age. Participants reported that they would not have organised a GP health check or had struggled to book a GP appointment and found mass testing to be convenient, quick, and easy.

Conclusions: Sports affiliated branding was well received and identified a significant number of people with high ten-year risk of CVD plus additional risk factors. All participants interviewed spoke positively about the experience. Immediately providing results, alongside individualised health promotion, allowed participants to understand their risk of CVD and the need for a change of lifestyle.

Strengths and limitations:

- The affiliation of a specific sports brand potentially acted as both a strength (for supporters of the team) and limitation (for those with no affiliation to the team or no interest in football) which may have affected engagement levels of the study;
- Recruitment was undertaken in areas of high deprivation and whilst it is generally acknowledged that those from a lower socio-economic background are less likely to engage with health screening initiatives, the ability to recruit to this study was a key strength.
- To encourage participants to engage with local services suitable for their needs, a strength of the study was that Quick Response (QR) codes providing direct access to those resources were given to participants; and
- A limitation of the study was that participants were not followed beyond the life of the study, and we can therefore not report if they accessed local services.
- A further limitation is the lack of ethnic diversity within the study population, which may limit the generalisability of the findings.

Key words:

Cardiovascular disease; mass screening; risk factors; health promotion; football.

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3 79 Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is an umbrella term describing a group of heart and circulatory
4 80 diseases including coronary heart disease, stroke, aortic, and peripheral arterial diseases [1].
5 81 CVD accounts for around 17.9 million deaths globally [1] and more than 170,000 deaths in the
6 82 U.K [2]. The likelihood of developing cardiovascular disease is associated with numerous
7 83 modifiable risk factors such as obesity, lack of physical exercise, high cholesterol levels, high
8 84 blood pressure and tobacco smoking [3]. However, with early detection and targeted lifestyle
9 85 and medical intervention these risks can be substantially reduced, and lives saved [3].

12 86 Health screening can be systematic (also known as selective or targeted) where a population
13 87 that fulfils a pre-defined criterion is targeted; opportunistic, where patients who present to
14 88 clinical practice for some other health conditions are screened; or mass screening, which adopts
15 89 a population-based approach [4, 5]. Systematic screening has demonstrated improvements in
16 90 risk factor profiles [6] but has had no impact on long term CVD outcomes [7]. Among the three
17 91 forms of health screening, researchers have used opportunistic screening to investigate health
18 92 conditions of the ‘hard-to-reach’ population [8, 9]. Although opportunistic screening has been
19 93 found to be effective in increasing detection of risk factors, its impact on long terms CVD
20 94 outcomes is unclear [10, 4].

24 95 The term ‘hard-to-reach’ or ‘marginalised/hidden-population’ varies among and within
25 96 disciplines but is commonly used to describe populations that experience discrimination and
26 97 stigma, which potentially imperil their uptake of health care services for fear of health care
27 98 providers exacerbating stereotyping [11]. The term is commonly attributed to the LGBTQ
28 99 (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer) communities [12, 13, 9], diverse ethnic
29 100 communities [14], traveller families [15], asylum seekers, disabled people, lower socio-
30 101 economic groups, children and young people, and older people [16, 8]. People described as
31 102 ‘hard-to-reach’ populations report discriminatory encounters from health care providers that
32 103 results in unmet needs and their reluctance to re-engage with health services [17, 18]. In one
33 104 study conducted to assess routine healthcare access and the risks of readmission in CVD
34 105 patients among hard-to-reach populations, approximately 15.7% (mostly young, male, non-
35 106 white with low social support) reported difficulty in accessing routine healthcare services, with
36 107 the consequence of more hospital readmissions [19]. It would therefore suggest that these
37 108 populations are not hard-to-reach, but they find that healthcare is hard-to-access and are
38 109 consequently underserved.

43 110 There is a raising interest in a shift to proactive, patient-centred approach to healthcare delivery
44 111 that seeks prevention and promotion of healthy lifestyles from a reactive, treatment-and-
45 112 prescription centric healthcare delivery system [20]. Researchers have used several health
46 113 behaviour theories to inform health intervention development and delivery, among which
47 114 include the Theory of Planned Behaviour [21], the Transtheoretical Model [22], and the Health
48 115 Belief Model (HBM) [23, 24]. The HBM was developed in the 1950s to investigate why people
49 116 fail to undertake preventive health measures [24]; it remains one of the most widely employed
50 117 theories of health behaviour. The HBM posits that a person’s decision and motivation to adopt
51 118 a healthy behaviour depends on three factors: personal perception, moderating behaviours, and
52 119 the likelihood of doing that behaviour [24]. This study is underpinned by the HBM as it sought
53 120 to unravel individuals’ CVD susceptibility, perceived severity and benefits of early screening,
54 121 potential modifying variables, and cues to action [23, 25]. By doing so it was envisaged that
55 122 the study could identify an alternative approach to delivery of preventive screening that would
56 123 improve participant uptake by reducing access barriers.

Liverpool Football Club Foundation (LFCF) is the official charity of Liverpool Football Club (LFC) in the Northwest of England. The city of Liverpool has a proud sporting history and LFC is one of the most recognisable sports brands associated with the area. The definition of brand has been explored in different bodies of literature depending upon the philosophy and perspective applied. It has been defined by the American Marketing Association [26] as “a name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors”. Muniz and O’Guinn [27] described brand community as a “specialized, non-geographically bound community, based on a structured set of social relationships among admirers of a brand”. LFCF aims to harness the power and passion of the Club’s fans and stakeholders to create life changing opportunities for young people and families. The Foundation uses an evidence-based approach to identify and work in the most deprived communities both locally and internationally to support people who need it most. LFCF have capitalised on their brand value to undertake several ground-breaking projects within the city, using sport as a means of positively influencing the behaviours and attitudes of the local community. Their community projects supported nearly 123,000 individuals in the 2022/23 season with over half (59%) of the registered participants on these programmes living in the most deprived local authority wards in the country in the same period [28].

Sporting organisations possess an ability to attract individuals in a way that healthcare systems cannot. Collaboration between a recognised sporting brand and a healthcare provider could offer a novel means of undertaking mass screening for CVD risk factors among underserved populations. The ‘power of the (LFC) badge’ [29] has been demonstrated to access people and support positive change.

The primary aim of our study was to determine whether the LFC brand could be leveraged to facilitate local health improvement by identifying adults at greatest risk of developing CVD through the provision of sports-branded screening at community-based events. Secondary research aims were to assess whether the public would engage with sports-branded health screening and the provision of information based on the HBM to encourage healthy lifestyle choices, and their opinions regarding the acceptability and effectiveness of this approach.

METHODOLOGY

A convergent parallel mixed-methods design was used to gain in-depth understanding of the topic. This design entails concurrently conducting quantitative and qualitative elements in the same phase of the research process, analysing the two components independently, and giving equal weight to both strands during data integration and interpretations [30, 31].

Mass screening was chosen for this study to enable screening of people who had no prior knowledge about the screening assessments when they attended community sporting events and enabled the researchers to screen some participants from the ‘hard-to-reach’ population [8, 9].

This study was undertaken within four mass screening events delivered by Registered and student nurses in collaboration with LFCF over five days in August 2022. Advertising for the screening at one of the events is shown in Figure 1.

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

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

The study used the SRQR and STROBE reporting guidelines.

Figure 1: Brand-lead advertising from a screening event-

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

Patient and Public Involvement

A patient and public involvement (PPI) group was established specifically for this project. The group consisted of leads from community organisations that the LFC Foundation support via a Community Wellbeing 'hubs' model. This model provides both financial support and support to co-deliver programmes and activities from different locations in the Liverpool City Region. They were initially approached by staff at the LFCF, and they agreed to meet with the principal investigator (PI). During the meeting they provided advice on when and where we should undertake the screening and they advised on how best to seek feedback through short interviews. The guide used during the participant interviews was developed in collaboration with the PPI group who recommended a short interview to be undertaken immediately after the assessment to generate immediate feedback without distracting people from their daily activities.

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

Eligibility Criteria

To be included in the study, participants were required to be over 18 years of age and able to provide written informed consent. Exclusion criteria included those with established CVD or diabetes. People who had participated in the study previously were not permitted to be screened a second time

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

Recruitment

Participants were recruited while attending a LFCF event at one of four community centres in Liverpool, Wirral, and Knowsley. These events were free to attend and diverse in nature including, for example, arts and crafts and physical activities aimed at all ages. A total of 100 of 131 participants approached who were attending these events and meeting the inclusion criteria were recruited over a five-day period. Sample size for the first phase of the study was determined by the number of people attending the events rather than a priori calculation. A purposive sample of twelve participants (five males and seven females) who completed the risk assessment were invited to participate in interviews to explore their experiences of the health screening process and the impact that affiliation with sports-branding had upon their decision to participate. Sample size was not predetermined for these interviews as Braun and Clarke [32] argue that judgements about ‘how many’ data items, and when to stop data collection, are subjective, and cannot be determined in advance of analysis. Data saturation was deemed to have occurred at this point.

203

204

205

206

207

Informed Consent

Potential recruits were approached during the event by either Registered or student nurses and/or LFCF employees involved in the study who explained the purpose of the study and invited potential participants to meet with a member of the research team. The researchers at the events, all Registered Nurses, provided the participants with a participant information sheet,

clarified any outstanding issues, and gained written informed consent. Participants were advised that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Contact details of the principal investigator were provided to each participant.

Prior to conducting the interviews, the twelve individuals who had agreed to participate were asked to provide additional verbal consent to participate in this second stage of the study and for their interview to be audio recorded.

Quantitative Data Collection

A dedicated screening area was established at each community venue. Several risk factors, detailed below, were assessed in accordance with the SCORE 2 and SCORE 2 OP CVD 10-year CVD risk assessment tool as recommended by the European Society of Cardiology guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice [3]. The tool uses an algorithm derived, calibrated, and validated to predict 10-year risk of first-onset CVD in European populations and enhances the identification of individuals at higher risk of developing CVD [33]. Results are easily understood and are provided in the form of a percentage and a traffic light system. The U.K. is classed as a low-risk population and the calculations were undertaken using the algorithm relevant to this group. Those under the age of 40 years were included in the assessments but their risk was not assessed in line with the SCORE 2 methodology.

Risk factors measured included self-reported gender at the time of birth, smoking status, and age. Blood pressure was measured by a student or registered nurses using a calibrated sphygmomanometer in accordance with the British Hypertension society recommendations for manual blood pressure measurement [34]. Blood lipids and glucose were measured using an Abbott LDX V2 point of care analyser. These data were entered directly into the SCORE 2 and SCORE2 OP online risk algorithm and their 10-year CVD risk was calculated and discussed with the participant [33].

Incident atrial fibrillation (AF) was also assessed using a MyDiagnostik sensor. MyDiagnostik is a cylindrical shaped MDD Class IIa medical device, intended to discriminate AF from normal rhythm. MyDiagnostik has been shown to be highly sensitive in detecting AF, with sensitivity levels ranging between 94% (95% CI 87–98%) [35] to 100% (95% CI 93–100%) [36]. In addition, high specificity values of 93% (95% CI 85–97%) [35] to 95.9% (95% CI 91.3% to 98.1%) [36] were also reported in the same datasets. The detection threshold is already embedded in MyDiagnostik and was not modified for this study. Atrial fibrillation does not feature in the SCORE2 assessments but given the prevalence of undiagnosed AF and the increased risk of morbidity and mortality associated with the condition it was felt that it would be remiss not to assess participants' heart rhythm. Students and registered nurses had been trained to use the kit prior to study commencement. Each person was asked to hold the MyDiagnostik sensor using both hands for 60 seconds in a static position in line with the manufacturer's guidelines.

Whilst Body Mass Index (BMI) was also not required for the SCORE 2 calculator and therefore did not feature in the overall risk score, each person's height and weight and BMI level were recorded to provide feedback and health promotion advice to participants. A BMI between 25–

1
2
3 250 29.9 kg/m² was categorised as overweight and a BMI >30 kg/m² was categorised as obese in
4 251 line with the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance [37].
5
6 252 Consideration was given to maintaining dignity and privacy for participants, so private rooms
7 253 were used, and screening took place away from the main activity hives of the community hubs.
8
9 254
10
11 255 Data were input by the research team and cross checked for completeness. Risk scores were
12 256 calculated independently by two researchers.
13
14 257

15
16 258 **Delivery of Health Promotion**

17 259 Underpinned by the theory of health belief model [23, 24, 25], results of SCORE2 assessment
18 260 were discussed with each participant by a Registered Nurse who delivered targeted health
19 261 promotion advice. This was done to ensure that participants appreciated their susceptibility to
20 262 CVD and were given the opportunity to mitigate potential risks by adapting individualised
21 263 healthy behaviours.
22
23 264 All participants were provided with a paper record of their health assessment results and they
24 265 were advised to discuss their results with their practice nurse. Quick response codes (QR codes)
25 266 were created for each community hub which provided information about local smoking
26 267 cessation, weight loss, physical activity and mental health services, alongside direct links to
27 268 websites and contact information for support group.
28
29
30

31 269
32
33 270 **Qualitative data collection**

34 271 Participants who agreed to be interviewed about their experiences after completing their
35 272 screening and being provided with their health promotion advice were invited to be interviewed
36 273 in a quiet room by a researcher who was not involved in the risk assessment. The interviews
37 274 were conducted by the male PI (IJ PhD RN), a senior cardiac nurse specialist and highly
38 275 experienced academic researcher. No prior relationship was established with participants prior
39 276 to the interviews. The investigator introduced themselves and explained their role in the study.
40 277 The interviews were recorded on a digital audio recording device. At the earliest opportunity
41 278 after the interview, the recording was uploaded onto a secure server at the University and the
42 279 audio recording on the device deleted. To reduce any opportunity for bias and ensure responses
43 280 were based on the participant's reflection on their experience, an interview guide was
44 281 developed (supplementary file) and, along with recruitment and content, tested with the PPI
45 282 panel prior to conducting the interviews. The interviewer used open-ended, short, semi-
46 283 structured interviews to elicit spontaneous and individualistic responses from the participants
47 284 regarding their experience of the screening programme, the results of the screening and how
48 285 participants felt about them, whether attending the programme had changed their views on their
49 286 health future, whether the participant felt there should be any changes to the programme and if
50 287 so, why this was the case. To elicit the broadest range and depth of responses to achieve data
51 288 saturation, the interviewer asked probing questions during the interview. The interviews lasted
52 289 between two and seven minutes and were audio recorded with prior permission from the
53 290 participants. No repeat interviews were conducted. Field note annotations from the PI were
54 291 provided to the research team members (DAF, MKM) undertaking analysis of the interviews.
55
56
57
58
59
60

292

293 Data analysis

294 The quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics using IBM SPSS version 29
295 software.

296 The interviews were transcribed by a researcher, MKM, who had not participated in their
297 completion and the transcripts checked against the recording to confirm accuracy. The
298 transcripts were not returned to the participants for comment or correction given the verbatim
299 transcription. Once accurately transcribed the recordings were deleted and the transcripts were
300 stored on a secure server at the University in a location only accessible to the two researchers
301 conducting the analysis. The transcripts were anonymised by the transcriber with each
302 given a unique identifying number.

303 A framework model [39] was used to analyse the transcripts by two researchers (MKM and
304 DAF) who had not participated in the interviews. Using an inductive approach, the transcripts
305 were independently coded with coding marked by highlighter on paper transcripts by each
306 coder. The codes were then clustered around identified themes. The two sets of coding were
307 compared and discussed. Very few differences in the coding were noted, and these were
308 typically where two categories applied. The final coding was agreed through discussion with
309 both coders to prevent any potential bias. An Excel workbook was created with a spreadsheet
310 for each participant. This Excel document was located on a secure server with access only for
311 the two researchers conducting the analysis. Participant responses were entered into the
312 spreadsheet with a column for each theme. The framework enabled the researchers to compare
313 and contrast responses by participant within each of the themes. The coded paper copies of the
314 transcripts were subsequently destroyed. No participant checking was conducted after the
315 analysis.

316

317 RESULTS

318 Demographics

319 Participants ranged from 20- 84 years with a mean age of 46.6 years [SD = 14.7] with 41.5%
320 of the sample aged between 40 and 59 years (Table 1). Men and women were equally
321 represented. Participants were predominantly white British (93%) with the remaining
322 participants identifying as Asian or Asian British (5%) and mixed or multiple ethnic group
323 (2%) (Figure 2).

324 Figure 2: Ethnicity of participants

325

326 Blood lipids

327 Blood lipid results were not available on all participants due to the limited blood provided.
328 Measurements were available on total cholesterol (n=99), HDL (n=98), LDL (n=87),
329 Triglyceride (n=99), non-HDL (n=94) and LDL/HDL (n=79). Of those tested, 41% of the
330 participants recorded a total cholesterol level greater than the recommended normal range
331 (>5mmol/l) (Table 1). 71% of those with high total cholesterol were over the age of 40 years.
332 More than 36% of the participants recorded a High-Density Lipoprotein below the

recommended level of 1mmol/l for men and 1.2mmol/l for women (Table 1). 53% of those with low HDL were over 40 years. Approximately 40% of participants with data recorded Low Density Lipoproteins levels above the recommended normal range (<3mmol/l), 66% of whom were over 40 years of age. LDL/HDL ratio was found to be higher than the normal range in 54% with almost two thirds (65%) being over 40 years.

Table 1: Participant’s age and body mass index distribution and blood related measurements

Age	Percentage of sample
<30	10%
30-39	28%
40-59	42%
60-75	16%
>75	5%
BMI measurement	Percentage of sample (%)
<18.5 underweight	2%
18.5 - <25 normal weight	28%
25 - <30 overweight	32%
30 - <35 Class 1 obese	23%
35 - <40 Class 2 obese	9%
>40 class 3 obese	6%
Variable	Percentage of sample with results outside normal range (%)
Total Cholesterol	41.5% High cholesterol (M=4.7621, SD=1.17256)
High Density Lipoprotein	37% High HDL (M=1.1849, SD=.36965)
Triglyceride	22% High Triglyceride (M=1.7861, SD= 1.29174)
Low Density Lipoprotein	40% Low LDL (M=2.7792, SD= .94606)
Non-HDL cholesterol	34% High non-HDL (M= 3.5952, SD=1.12200)
LDL/HDL ratio	54% High LDL/HD: ratio (M=3.0934, SD= 1.78428)
Glucose	2% High Glucose (M= 5.8121, SD= 1.53900)
Blood pressure	20% High Blood pressure Systolic BP M= 127.82, SD= 12.131 Diastolic BP M= 71.93, SD= 11.872

Blood Pressure

Blood pressure was recorded for 98 participants with a minimum and maximum blood pressure range 90-170mmg systolic and between 46-100mmhg diastolic. Twenty percent (20%) of participants recorded a blood pressure greater than the normal range of 140/90mmhg; 60% of which were aged over 40 years.

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies. Ensignement Supérieur (ABES).

Smoking

Smoking status was recorded in 100 patients with 21% of participants admitting to being smokers, 6% described themselves as ex-smokers, and 6% reported using e-cigarettes. 72% of smokers were over 40 years of age.

Body Mass index

BMI was recorded for 82 participants (Table 1). Mean BMI was recorded as 29 within a range of 17.8 and 51. 70% of the participants were classified as overweight or obese, and 65% of those overweight/obese were aged over 40 years or older. Thirty-eight percent of participants were classified as obese (class 1, 2, or 3); 23% were Class 1 obese, 8.5% were Class 2 obese, and 6.1% were Class 3 obese. Those over 40 years made up 72% of the overweight group, 63% class 1, 50% of class 2 and 60% of class 3 obese groups respectively.

Cardiovascular risk scores

Date of birth data was missing from six participants and 32 participants were aged less than 40 years of age so while they participated in the screening it was not possible to estimate CVD risk using SCORE 2. For the 62 participants screened CVD risk ranged from <1% to 15%. Twenty-one participants were classed as low risk (<1%) due to their low levels of total cholesterol and HDL cholesterol. Twenty-one participants (33.9%) were reported to have a 10-year risk of fatal and non-fatal CVD events greater than the estimated risk for their age, placing them at high risk.

Incident atrial fibrillation

Only one individual was identified as having an irregular heart rhythm. As the individual had already been diagnosed with AF no further action was taken.

Qualitative Data

Twelve participants completed interviews with the PI (IJ) as noted above. Analysis of the interviews identified five main themes:

- The Screening Programme;
- Pre-existing health risks for each individual;
- Presenting health and health behaviour;
- Proposed changes in behaviour following screening; and
- GP access and health screening.

Each of these will be discussed in turn.

The Screening Programme

Four sub-themes were identified:

- Location and timing of the programme;

1
2
3 386 • Perceptions about the targeted health advice;
4 387 • How to improve the programme; and
5 388 • Why the programme was felt to be successful by the participants.
6
7
8 389 Each of these subthemes will be discussed in turn.
9
10 390 Six participants stated that they felt the community location of the screening to be beneficial,
11 391 with comments such as:
12
13 392 *“this is great that I can do it here, I mean I play football anyway”* [0021] and
14
15 393 *“the fact that just after football, the opportunity to get yourself screened for potential*
16 394 *risk, cardiovascular risk is important. Especially for our families I think it is important*
17 395 *to know where you standing in regards to your risks”* [0023]
18
19 396 *“it is not something you have to phone your GP to go and do, so it is nice to have it in*
20 397 *the community, isn’t it?”* [0026]
21
22 398 *“In the hospital... it is (a) scary... environment. Whereas here they come around and*
23 399 *explain it”* [0025].
24
25 400 The brief nature of the screening was also appreciated with one participant stating:
26
27 401 *“All was fantastic. It was quick; it didn’t feel like it was too long. You so busy in your*
28 402 *normal day-to-day, you don’t want it to drag on; no, really efficient”* [0026].
29
30 403 Five participants appreciated the targeted health promotion information provided after
31 404 screening with one noting:
32
33 405 *“I was given some advice how to make adjustments to my diet and lifestyle too to*
34 406 *address those numbers and make sure they stay in low range”* [0023]
35
36 407 The immediate provision of results was positively received with applicants declaring:
37
38 408 *“when they put ..(the results) in front of you. I was like I’ll do it”* [0028]
39
40 409 *“I was really happy to have access to that today and also to get the results quickly right*
41 410 *away. I didn’t have to wait or anything. So, it was really good to know that is fine and*
42 411 *is actually helpful”* [0027]
43
44 412 The format of providing additional resources was also appreciated, with a participant stating:
45
46 413 *“I was given a barcode to access services. So that was really good, that was really*
47 414 *positive”* [0019]
48
49 415 Whilst one participant felt they *“wouldn’t change anything”* [0020] about the screening
50 416 programme, some suggestions were made that could offer improvements. Two participants
51 417 suggested a need for more resources to reduce delays waiting for test results; two felt the
52 418 programme should be repeated twelve months later to offer a follow-up service to see if people
53 419 had followed the advice and provide further guidance; one suggested a need for additional
54 420 advertising to make the screening availability and location clearer. In the interview it was
55 421 evident that one participant had not realized that they had been given a QR code with links to
56 422 community resources that could be beneficial, so this could be more explicit. Finally, one
57
58
59
60

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.
Enseignement Supérieur (ABES)

participant felt that the health promotion advice could be more explicit to encourage people to change their health behaviour, stating:

“you’re (doing) some fabulous things here, but if you don’t say to people ‘this is going to kill you’ ...you’ve got to be ruthless to be kind” [0022]

The screening programme was described as “fantastic” [0022 and 0026], “helpful” [0027], “providing motivation” [0026], “raising awareness” [0030], “positive” [0020], “works well” [0019] and one individual noted that:

“I’m quite happy to be honest because they checked all, ‘cause I wouldn’t have known the outcome” [0029].

Pre-existing health risks for each individual

One third of participants (n=4) interviewed identified that they had concerns regarding their weight, but it was interesting to note that whilst one participant identified that the screening had indicated an elevated Body Mass Index (BMI), none of these four individuals mentioned their BMI results.

One participant recognised that their ethnicity increased their cardiovascular risk. Three participants identified familial health issues that would suggest regular screening would be beneficial. For example, one participant stated:

“my mum has high cholesterol and she got high blood pressure. And she’s recently been to the doctors, and they said she’s prediabetic. My nan had diabetes; my nan from dad side, they both suffered stroke” [0030].

Another participants stated:

“I was advised to have my cholesterol checked too (due to familial health issue) but that was before Covid I thought I’m not going to get my cholesterol checked so will not just think about it” [0027].

Two participants identified that the screening had indicated they had high blood pressure. Five participants identified high cholesterol levels with one attributing it to their diet and recognised the issues associated with fast food:

“Sometimes taking kids out is more convenient when you’re out somewhere and you don’t time to make choice. It’s just convenient to say, oh, drive to McDonalds. And sometimes it’s a treat as well for them...and it is actually nice, but I know it’s not good” [030]

Presenting health and health behaviour

This theme had four sub-themes:

- Results of the screening tests (BMI, BP and cholesterol);
- Current levels of activity;
- Current diet; and

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

461 • Prior weight loss.

462 Only one of the four individuals who voiced concerns about their weight identified that they
463 were attempting to address this:

464 *“I’ve start losing 3 and a half stones and I quitted smoking 8 years ago. So, I know what I need*
465 *to work on to get my cholesterol little bit lower”* [0028].

466 Two other individuals noted that they had lost weight in the past two years, with one stating:

467 *“About 2 years ago I was 15.2 and I thought is I don’t do something about it I’m going*
468 *to end up 16 stones which is wrong for me. So, I’ve lost over a stone in about last couple*
469 *years”* [0020]

470 Rather than attending slimming clubs as noted by the other participants, this individual
471 attributed their weight loss as follows:

472 *“I cut down my alcohol in general, but in particular I cut down beers... losing the beers*
473 *have helped with the weight lost”* [0020].

474 Only two participants discussed engaging in regular activity but only one of these described
475 specific sporting activity, stating:

476 *“I do train, not weight or stuff like that but I do train. I do little bit weight, but I’m very*
477 *active, very active. And I have a big garden, so tend to do all sorts”* [0019].

478 Three participants described their current diet, and in two cases how they had modified it to
479 improve their health:

480 *“I’m generally trying to eat a bit less and a bit better stuff, a bit more fruits and vegs*
481 *...I’ve done that”* [0020].

482 *“Less carbs. I’ve had my first chocolate bar today; I haven’t had any for about a*
483 *month... I eat more than 50% vegetarian or treat myself with a bit meat”* [0028]

484

485 **Proposed changes in behaviour following screening**

486 As a result of the screening, three individuals identified that they would make changes to their
487 diet, with one having discussed diet in their health promotion advice stating:

488 *“I’m going to make deliberate change because the whole nation probably we love our*
489 *butter and our toast and bread. So, I think looking for alternative to butter, which*
490 *obviously contributed to increasing LDL is a big sort of change I think I can potentially*
491 *make”* [0023]

492 Two participants were attending slimming clubs or were on eating plans and had successfully
493 lost weight, so were not intending making further changes as a result of the screening. A second
494 individual noted that whilst they had plans to commence attending a slimming club:

495 *“I was worried about the cholesterol thing because that’s not good. I’ve just got to try*
496 *now, try harder”* [0029]

Only one participant stated that they wanted to stop smoking. Another identified that they smoked “only” nine cigarettes per day and felt that their activity ameliorated the impact of smoking, saying:

“I am happy staying at none, and nine is quite difficult to do. I have been smoking since the age of 16, that’s a long time. I’ve been smoking nine now (I may have extra one someday)... Nine is a pretty good....if it was just smoking nine without any other exercise, that wouldn’t be good” [0019]

It was interesting to note that one individual who had self-identified as “oversized” [0028] did not identify any issues with their results or any wish to make any lifestyle changes as they felt their screening results to be “great, so, really, really reassuring to know that” [0028].

GP access and health screening

Five participants identified problems with getting appointments to see their GP, including one participant who had tried to book an appointment earlier in the day:

“I happened to ring my GP this morning for an appointment for something. I rang 72 times, 72 times, ehmm...eventually when it was answered, no appointment. And that’s quite a common thing for my GP practice. In the past I’ve rung far more than 72 times, I’ve rung 100 times before and got no appointment” [0020].

One additional participant felt that people do not see their GP:

“because they’re frightened to go to doctors... These people think it’s alright, and you know it’s like Covid disease people will die of underlying illnesses that they didn’t know they had” [0022].

Health screening was not something five participants felt would approach their GP for, even in one case where it had been recommended:

“I was advised to have my cholesterol checked too (due to familial health issue) but that was before Covid I thought I’m not going to get my cholesterol checked so will not just think about it” [0027]

Only two participants identified attending health screening appointments in the past, with one feeling it was important to pursue this as an individual:

“I try to beat the clock... Not to deteriorate due to my own fault and find that I’m in hospital with some major health issues and they say well if you’ve done that 5 years ago you won’t be here” [0021]

DISCUSSION

The study highlighted how mass screening can identify individuals with a previously unknown increased risk of CVD, hypertension, or abnormal lipid profiles, and highlighted other risks including smoking and obesity that could be discussed using an appropriate health promotion framework. The screening assessed individuals who, according to the interviews, would not

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

have independently arranged a health check with their GP. These individuals could be considered hard to reach for traditional health service delivery models, but mass screening reduced access issues and made health testing and health guidance available to all who wished to make use of it. Such mass testing was shown to be convenient, quick, and easy; with all interviewee’s reporting positively about the experience and stating that they were happy to engage. Participants recommended rolling out similar sessions with local sports teams more regularly.

The affiliation of a leading sports brand, in this case LFC, was considered a strength by the participants of this study. Whilst it is widely established that those from a lower socio-economic background are less likely to engage with health screening initiatives and while socio-economic background of participants was not collated, recruitment was deliberately undertaken in areas of high deprivation. The ability to recruit to this study in these areas was seen as a strength of the study. More participants were recruited by staff wearing LFC branded clothing rather than those in nurses’ uniform, and participants provided feedback that they found the latter to be off-putting. Results supplied immediately to participants, alongside individualised health promotion and advice, allowed participants to understand their risk of CVD and highlighted to them the need for a change of lifestyle in keeping with the HBM approach. The provision of QR codes specifically aligned with local resources provided participants with direct access to services suitable for their needs. This study identified a high prevalence of major risk factors for both CVD and other long-term illnesses. Total cholesterol, especially non-high-density lipoprotein (non-HDL-C), is an important predictor of CVD events [40]. Almost half of adults living in the UK are reported as having cholesterol levels above 5mmol/L [2]. Approximately 8 million adults in the UK are currently taking lipid-lowering drugs such as statins [2]. In this study, 41% of participants had cholesterol levels greater than the recommended normal range (>5mmol/l), and almost 71% of these participants were over the age of 40 years. LDL/HDL ratio was found to be higher than the normal range in 54% with almost two thirds (65%) of these being over 40 years. Approximately 16 million adults in the UK are reported to have hypertension (e.g., $\geq 140/90$ mmHg), with almost half of them not receiving effective treatment [2]. According to the British Heart Foundation [2], about 50% of heart attacks and strokes in the UK are associated with hypertension. We found 20% of participants to have high blood pressure readings with 60% of these over the age of 40. This is higher than the national average where 9% of adults aged 16 to 44, 31% aged 45 – 64, and 60% aged 65 and over are associated with hypertension [41]. It is estimated that at least 7 million adults in the UK smoke cigarettes [2]. Meanwhile, about 15,000 deaths each year due to CVD in the UK are reported to be attributed to smoking [2]). It is reported [42] that in 2022, the age group 25 to 34 years had the highest proportion of current smokers in the UK (16.3%); those aged 65 years and over had the lowest (8.3%). The proportion of smokers in the UK in 2002 was 12.9%, or 6.4 million people [42] and has reduced from 2021 (13.3%) and 2011 (20.2%) levels. Our participants had a higher rate of smoking with 21% of the participants admitting to being smokers (72% of whom were over the age of 40), 7% describing themselves as ex-smokers and another 6% reporting using e-cigarettes. Vapes pose a CVD risk [43]. Whilst it is reported that the use of vapes is increasing in younger people [42], and people are switching to vapes to help them quit smoking cigarettes (31%); to prevent relapse (22%); because they enjoy the experience (14%); and to save money (12%) [44], and the proportion of the participants who were vaping was lower than the 2022 national average of 8.7% [41]. The 1% incidence of AF in this population was lower than that expected for the local population [45]. Finally, more

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.
Enseignement Supérieur (ABES)

than 26% of adults in the UK are classified as obese (e.g., BMI > 30kg/m²) and about 38% of them have a BMI index defined as overweight (e.g., BMI range 25-29.9kg/m²) [2]. The British Heart Foundation [2] indicates that 1 in 6 CVD deaths in the UK are associated with high BMI index. Our study found that nearly three quarters of the sample were either overweight or obese. These findings highlight the potential extent of future health harms that can be expected unless healthcare services intervene.

The involvement of LFCF branding and staff created a sense of partnership and, it could be argued, encouraged participants to trust the researchers more readily than they would have if an unaffiliated screening study had taken place. This argument is echoed by the work of Pringle et al [46] who completed a study incorporating eleven foundation Community Charity trusts affiliated with football clubs and found that football branding allowed for effective engagement with local communities, describing such affiliation as providing a 'powerful reach' to local people. Participants requested the rollout of more sessions affiliated with sports teams as a positive way to gain greater future engagement. Feedback from participants also highlighted the need for health screening provisions to become common place within local community setting, allowing for easy access to local people, which could support public health initiatives.

To gain a greater understanding of the impact that sports-branded health screening has upon engagement, a larger scale study is needed with a larger budget to allow for the purchase of more equipment to support a wider roll out of health screening. It is also recommended that information on socio-economic background of participants is collated to examine any link between socio-economic status and engagement with health screening, particularly those affiliated with sports branding, allowing for future exploration of the barriers that are faced and how community led initiatives can address this. Future studies should also consider affiliation with other sports brands to capture the engagement of other members of the wider community. Furthermore, affiliation with other charitable organisations, religious groups, community hubs and social clubs recognised by the local community may capture individuals who do not affiliate themselves with any sport. Participants in this study recommended extended advertising to encourage recruitment and the need for follow-up with participants in future studies.

The findings from this study provide a rationale to evaluate further the validity, feasibility, and clinical value of a mass community screening programme. Expansion of the research to include a wider range of people from different underserved populations would provide greater insight into the different cultural or community-specific factors that may influence engagement with health screening and provide more comprehensive insight, supporting the development of inclusive interventions.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY INCLUDE RECOGNITION THAT AFFILIATION WITH A LEADING SPORTS BRAND COULD HAVE ACTED AS A DETERRENT TO SOME POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT HAVE AN AFFILIATION WITH THE SPECIFIC FOOTBALL TEAM OR HAD NO INTEREST IN FOOTBALL, THEREBY LIMITING THE POTENTIAL ENGAGEMENT LEVELS OF THE STUDY. ADDITIONALLY, THIS STUDY DID NOT FOLLOW PARTICIPANTS AFTER ASSESSMENT AND CAN THEREFORE NOT REPORT IF THEY ACCESSED LOCAL SERVICES, HOWEVER EVIDENCE SUGGESTS THAT INDIVIDUALS ARE MORE

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

LIKELY TO ENGAGE WITH SERVICES IF THEY ARE SHOWN HOW TO ACCESS THEM [47, 48].CONCLUSION

Sports affiliated branding was well received and allowed for positive engagement with the study. The screening identified a significant number of people with high ten-year risk of CVD and high levels of CVD risk factors. Moreover, all participants engaged in discussion regarding lifestyle choices and were provided with information about local health provision. Participants articulated their desire to engage in such screening but were either unable to secure a GP appointment or would not consider accessing the GP for these services. Screening that was immediately available was valued. Larger scale studies are needed to explore the impact that sports branding has upon community health initiatives in a drive to reduce the incidence of cardiovascular disease.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AF – incident atrial fibrillation
- CVD – cardiovascular disease
- LFCF - Liverpool Football Club Foundation

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

ETHICS APPROVAL

All methods were carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, relevant guidelines and regulations. Ethical approval was provided by the Liverpool John Moores ethics committee (UREC 22/NAH/029) on 29th June 2022.

FUNDING

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies. Ensignement Supérieur (ABES).

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

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

IJ developed the study design, participated in qualitative data collection, conducted quantitative data analysis, and developed the draft manuscript. DF conducted qualitative analysis, wrote the final version of the article, completed the STROBE and SRQR checklists, formatted the article and prepared it for submission. MKM conducted qualitative data analysis and contributed to the manuscript. PC developed the study design, supported participant recruitment, and contributed to the manuscript. EJS developed the study design, participated in quantitative data collection, supported health promotion delivery, and contributed to the manuscript. MC developed the study design, participated in quantitative data collection supported health promotion delivery and contributed to the manuscript. JC developed the study design, supported participant recruitment, and contributed to the manuscript. AF developed the study design, supported participant recruitment, and contributed to the manuscript. JY analysed quantitative data and contributed to the manuscript. GL developed the study design and contributed to the manuscript. IJ is the Guarantor.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organisation (WHO). World Health statistics: monitoring health for the SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals) [online]. 2020. <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1547&context=srhreports> [accessed: 15 February 2024].
2. British Heart Foundation (BHF). UK Factsheet: January 2024 [online]. 2024. www.bhf.org.uk/-/media/files/for-professionals/research/heart-statistics/bhf-cvd-statistics-uk-factsheet.pdf (accessed: 15 February 2024).
3. Visseren, F.L.J., Mach, F., Smulders, Y.M., et al. 2021 ESC Guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice. *Eur. Heart J.* 2021;42(34):3227-3337.
4. Dyakova, M., Shantikumar, S., Colquitt, J.L. et al. Systematic versus opportunistic risk assessment for the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2016;(1), Cd010411.
5. Piepoli, M.F., Hoes, A.W., Agewall, S. et al. 2016 European Guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice: The Sixth Joint Task Force of the European Society of Cardiology and Other Societies on Cardiovascular Disease Prevention in Clinical Practice (constituted by representatives of 10 societies and by invited experts). Developed with the special contribution of the European Association for Cardiovascular Prevention & Rehabilitation (EACPR). *Eur. Heart J.* 2016;37(29): 2315-2381.
6. Jørgensen Peter, G., Jensen Jan, S., Marott Jacob, L. et al. Electrocardiographic Changes Improve Risk Prediction in Asymptomatic Persons Age 65 Years or Above Without Cardiovascular Disease. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol* 2014;64(9):898-906.

1
2
3 696 7. Krogsbøll, L.T., Jørgensen, K.J. and Gøtzsche, P.C. General health checks in adults
4 697 for reducing morbidity and mortality from disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*
5 698 2019;1(1),Cd009009.
6
7 699 8. Flanagan, S.M. and Hancock, B. 'Reaching the hard to reach'-lessons learned from
8 700 the VCS (voluntary and community Sector). A qualitative study. *BMC Health Serv.*
9 701 *Res.* 2010;10: 1-9.
10
11 702 9. Haire, B.G., Brook, E., Stoddart, R. et al. Trans and gender diverse people's
12 703 experiences of healthcare access in Australia: A qualitative study in people with
13 704 complex needs. *Plos one* 2021;16(1):e0245889.
14
15 705 10. Majumdar, A., Chinnakali, P., Vinayagamoorthy, V. et al. Opportunistic Screening
16 706 for Hypertension and Selected Cardiovascular Risk Factors among Adults
17 707 Attending a Primary Health Center in Puducherry, India. *Int. J. Prev. Med.*
18 708 2014;5(12):1616-1620.
19
20 709 11. Jiao, S., Slemon, A., Guta, A. et al. Exploring the conceptualization,
21 710 operationalization, implementation, and measurement of outreach in community
22 711 settings with hard-to-reach and hidden populations: A scoping review. *Soc. Sci.*
23 712 *Med.* 2022;309:115232.
24
25 713 12. Elliott, E., Watson, A.J. and Harries, U. Harnessing expertise: involving peer
26 714 interviewers in qualitative research with hard-to-reach populations. *Health Expect.*
27 715 2002;5(2):172-178.
28
29 716 13. Liljas, A.E.M., Walters, K., Jovicic, A. et al. Strategies to improve engagement of
30 717 'hard to reach' older people in research on health promotion: a systematic review.
31 718 *BMC Public Health* 2017;17(1):349.
32
33 719 14. Darko, N. Engaging Black and Minority Ethnic Groups in Health Research: 'Hard
34 720 to Reach'? Demystifying the Misconceptions. 1st ed., Bristol University Press,
35 721 2021. JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1s2t0g4>. Accessed 8 Apr. 2024.
36
37 722 15. Milbourne, L. Unspoken Exclusion: Experiences of continued marginalisation from
38 723 education among 'hard to reach' groups of adults and children in the UK. *Br. J.*
39 724 *Sociol. Educ.* 2002;23:287 - 305.
40
41 725 16. Jones, T. and Newburn, T.. Widening Access: Improving Police Relations With
42 726 Hard To Reach Groups. Home Office Research Development and Statistics
43 727 Directorate Research Paper. 138. 2001. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tim-Newburn/publication/240417389_Widening_Access_Improving_Police_Relations_With_Hard_To_Reach_Groups/links/53ce769c0cf2b8e35d1496a8/Widening-Access-Improving-Police-Relations-With-Hard-To-Reach-Groups.pdf?_tp=eyJjb250ZXh0Ijp7ImZpcnN0UGFnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uInIwIjw6ZnZSI6InB1YmxpY2F0aW9uIn19 (accessed 8 April 202).
44 728
45 729
46 730
47 731
48 732
49
50
51 733 17. Clement, S., Schauman, O., Graham, T. et al. What is the impact of mental health-
52 734 related stigma on help-seeking? A systematic review of quantitative and qualitative
53 735 studies. *Psychol. Med.* 2015;45(1):11-27.
54
55 736 18. Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C. et al. The Lancet Commission on global mental
56 737 health and sustainable development. *The lancet* 2018;392 (10157):1553-1598.
57
58 738 19. Dupre, M.E., Xu, H., Granger, B.B. et al. (2018) Access to routine care and risks
59 739 for 30-day readmission in patients with cardiovascular disease. *Am. heart j.* 2018;
60 740 196:9-17.

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies. Ensignment Supérieur (ABES).

20. Orji, R., Vassileva, J. and Mandryk, R. Towards an effective health interventions design: an extension of the health belief model. *Online J. Public Health Inform.* 2012;4(3).
21. Bosnjak, M., Ajzen, I. and Schmidt, P. The Theory of Planned Behavior: Selected Recent Advances and Applications. *Eur J Psychol* 2020;16(3):352-356.
22. Hashemzadeh, M., Rahimi, A., Zare-Farashbandi, F. et al. Transtheoretical Model of Health Behavioral Change: A Systematic Review. *Iran J. Nurs. Midwifery Res.* 2019;24(2):83-90.
23. Becker, M.H. The Health Belief Model and Sick Role Behavior. *Health Ed. Monog.* 1974;2(4):409-419.
24. Champion, V. L., & Skinner, C. S. The health belief model. In K. Glanz, B. K. Rimer, & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (4th ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. 2008:pp. 45–65.
25. Jones, C.L., Jensen, J.D., Scherr, C.L. et al. The Health Belief Model as an explanatory framework in communication research: exploring parallel, serial, and moderated mediation. *Health Commun.* 2015;30(6):566-576.
26. American Marketing Association. Definitions of Marketing. <https://www.ama.org/the-definition-of-marketing-what-is-marketing/> (accessed 8 April 2024).
27. Muniz, A.M., O'Guinn T.C. Brand Community. *J. Consum. Res.* 2001;27(4):412–432.
28. Liverpool Football Club Foundation. LFC Foundation Impact Report 2022 2023 [online]. 2023. <https://www.efdn.org/blog/resource/liverpool-fc-foundation-impact-report-2022-2023/> (accessed 8 April 2024).
29. Hargreaves, F., Carroll, P., Robinson, G. et al. County Lines and the power of the badge: the LFC Foundation's approach to youth intervention. *Safer Communities* 2023;22(2):91-105.
30. Creswell, J. W. and Clark, V. L. P. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2017.
31. Demir, S.B. and Pismek, N. A Convergent Parallel Mixed-Methods Study of Controversial Issues in Social Studies Classes: A Clash of Ideologies. *Edu. Sci.Theory Prac.* 2018;18(1):119-149.
32. Braun, V. and Clarke, V. One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qual. Res.Psychol.* 2021;18(3):328-352.
33. Chipayo-Gonzales, D., Ramakrishna, H. and Nuñez-Gil, I.J. Score2: A New Updated Algorithm to Predict Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Europe. *J. Cardiothorac. Vasc. Anesth.* 2022;36(1):18-21.
34. <https://bihsoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/BP-Measurement-Poster-Manual-2017.pdf> accessed 1st August 2022
35. Vaes, B., Stalpaert, S., Tavernier, K., Thael, B., Lapeire, D., Mullens, W., & Degryse, J. (2014). The diagnostic accuracy of the MyDiagnostick to detect atrial fibrillation in primary care. *BMC family practice*, 15, 113. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2296-15-113>

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

36. Tieleman, R. G., Plantinga, Y., Rinkes, D., Bartels, G. L., Posma, J. L., Cator, R., Hofman, C., & Houben, R. P. (2014). Validation and clinical use of a novel diagnostic device for screening of atrial fibrillation. *Europace : European pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac electrophysiology : journal of the working groups on cardiac pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac cellular electrophysiology of the European Society of Cardiology*, 16(9), 1291–1295. <https://doi.org/10.1093/europace/euu057>

37. NICE (2023) How should I confirm if a person is overweight or obese? [online]. <https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/obesity/diagnosis/identification-classification/>. [accessed: 13/12/2023]

38. Doyle, L., McCabe, C., Keogh, B. et al. An overview of the qualitative descriptive design within nursing research. *J. Res. Nurs.* 2020;25(5):443-455.

39. Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (2003). *Qualitative research practice* (Vol. 757). London: sage.

40. NICE Lipid modification - CVD prevention [online]. 2024. <https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/lipid-modification-cvd-prevention/>. [accessed: 20 February 2024]

41. NHS England. Health Survey for England, 2021 part 2 [online]. 2023. <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/2021-part-2/adult-health-hypertension> [accessed 8 April 2024].

42. Office for National Statistics (ONS). Adult smoking habits in the UK: 2022 [online]. 2023. [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandlexpectancies/bulletins/adultsmokinghabitsingreatbritain/2022/pdf#:~:text=A%20higher%20proportion%20of%20men,women%20\(7.9%25\)%20in%202022.&text=The%20total%20proportion%20of%20young,in%202021%20\(Figure%209](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandlexpectancies/bulletins/adultsmokinghabitsingreatbritain/2022/pdf#:~:text=A%20higher%20proportion%20of%20men,women%20(7.9%25)%20in%202022.&text=The%20total%20proportion%20of%20young,in%202021%20(Figure%209)). [accessed 8 April 2024].

43. El-Mahdy, M.A., Ewees, M.G., Eid, M.S. et al. Electronic cigarette exposure causes vascular endothelial dysfunction due to NADPH oxidase activation and eNOS uncoupling. *Am. J. Physiol. Heart Circ. Physiol.* 2022;322:4,H549-H567.

44. Action on Smoking and Health. Use of e-cigarettes (vapes) among adults in Great Britain [online]. 2023. <https://ash.org.uk/uploads/Use-of-e-cigarettes-among-adults-in-Great-Britain-2023.pdf?v=1691058248> [accessed 8 April 2024].

45. Public Health England. Atrial Fibrillation Prevalence Estimates for Local Populations [online]. 2020. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/atrial-fibrillation-prevalence-estimates-for-local-populations>. (accessed on 8 April 2024).

46. Pringle, A.R., Zwolinsky, S. and Lozano-Sufrategui, L. Investigating the delivery of health improvement interventions through professional football club community trusts-strengths and challenges. *Public Health Pract.* 2021;2:100104.

47. Pattoni, L. Strengths-based approaches for working with individuals [online]. <https://www.iriss.org.uk/resources/insights/strengths-based-approaches-working-individuals> [online]. 2012. [accessed: 20 February 2024]

48. NHS England. Working in partnership with people and communities: statutory guidance [online]. 2022. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/long-read/working-in->

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.
Enseignement Supérieur (ABES)


partnership-with-people-and-communities-statutory-guidance/ [accessed: 20
February 2024]

Word count: 6271 excluding title page, abstract, references, figures, tables or
acknowledgments.

Figure legend:

Figure 1: Brand-lead advertising from a screening event-

Figure 2: Ethnicity of participants



Participants were predominantly white British (93%) with the remaining participants identifying as Asian or Asian British (5%) and mixed or multiple ethnic group (2%) (Figure 2).

86x50mm (96 x 96 DPI)

LFC FOUNDATION HEALTH SCREENING

This is a research Study

Researchers from Liverpool John Moores University and Liverpool Football Club Foundation are trying to find out if providing a health screening service at public events is a good way of identifying people at risk of developing heart and blood vessel disease.

Are you at risk of Cardiovascular disease?

Many people are at risk of heart and blood vessel disease but do not know. Screening can help to find out your chances of you suffering from these diseases in the future, so you can reduce that risk now.

Screening

If you are interested in taking part in the study, we would like to ask you some questions about your health and lifestyle, take your blood pressure, and a finger prick of blood to test your cholesterol and blood sugar.

Further Support

If you are at risk of heart and blood vessel disease, we can provide your GP with the results of the test, if you agree. We can also advise you about the sessions that Liverpool FC Foundation and their partners deliver that you might want to attend.



Foundation
THE CLUB'S OFFICIAL CHARITY



**LIVERPOOL
JOHN MOORES
UNIVERSITY**





Suggested interview schedule

Liverpool Cardiovascular Disease Screening Study

- Introduction and consent
- Can you tell me about your experience of the screening programme?
- Clarify what the results of the health screening programme were and how you feel about the findings
- Has attending the programme changed your views on your future in any way? If yes ask how and if no ask why
- Do you think we need to change anything in the current programme? Relate this to the answers given in the previous question