A Study of Adherence to Physicians' Instructions for Physical Activity among Patients with First-Time Acute Myocardial Infarction.

Master of Public Health Integrating Experience Project

Professional Publication Framework

by

Mikhayil Melikov, MPH Candidate

Advisor: Byron Crape MSPH, PhD
Reader: Robert Scharpf MS, PhD

College of Health Sciences
American University of Armenia

Yerevan, Armenia

2009
Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ............................................................................................................................ ii

ABSTRACT .................................................................................................................................................. iii

1. INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................................................... 1
   1.1 Background/Literature Review ................................................................................................................ 1
   1.2 Study Objectives/ Research Questions/ Study Variables .................................................................... 4

2. METHODOLOGY ............................................................................................................................................ 5
   2.1 Study design ............................................................................................................................................ 5
   2.2 Study population ................................................................................................................................... 6
   2.3 Study settings ......................................................................................................................................... 6
   2.4 Sample size ............................................................................................................................................ 6
   2.5 Sampling methodology .......................................................................................................................... 7
   2.6 Study instrument .................................................................................................................................... 7
   2.7 Data collection ....................................................................................................................................... 7
   2.8 Data coding .......................................................................................................................................... 8

3. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS ...................................................................................................................... 9

4. DATA ANALYSIS ........................................................................................................................................... 9

5. RESULTS ....................................................................................................................................................... 9
   5.1 Response Rate Calculation ....................................................................................................................... 9
   5.2 Socio-demographic Data ......................................................................................................................... 10
   5.3 Bivariate analyses results with the primary dependent variable of “level of adherence to physician’s instructions for physical activity” and independent factors .................................................................................. 10
   5.4 Bivariate analyses results comparing independent factors with the secondary dependent variable “Number of MI patients reportedly receiving instructions for PA from their physicians” ......................................................................................................................... 13

6. DISCUSSION ................................................................................................................................................. 14
   First outcome variable – level of adherence to physicians instructions for PA ........................................ 14
   Second outcome variable – proportion of receiving instructions from physicians for PA among MI Patients .............................................................................................................................................. 16

7. STUDY LIMITATIONS .................................................................................................................................. 17

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .......................................................................................... 18

APPENDIX 1. TABLES ........................................................................................................................................ 25

APPENDIX 2. QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH AND ARMENIAN) .................................................................. 31

APPENDIX 3. CONSENT FORM (ENGLISH AND ARMENIAN) ...................................................................... 44
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express deep gratitude to my advisor Byron Crape for his great contribution to this project. I would like to thanks to my reader Robert Scharpf for his helpful comments.

I am grateful to all faculty members of the College of Health Science, for their support and help during the studying process.

I am also thankful to Astghik Tadevosyan and the staff of Yerevan Institute of Cardiology for their kind assistance in conducting of the study.

I also would like to express my gratitude to my family and my classmates for their encouragement and support during these two years of study.
ABSTRACT
BACKGROUND: Myocardial Infarction (MI) survivors are especially at increased risk for recurrent MI. Because of this increased risk of recurrences, cardiac rehabilitation should be carried out within the treatment process to decrease the risk of a second MI. Since there is no current Physical Activity rehabilitative program in Armenia and rehabilitative Physical activity is promoted only through physicians' advice for which adherence is unknown it will be crucial to know 1) the level of non-adherence to physicians' instructions for PA, 2) the proportion of MI patients reportedly receiving instructions for PA from their physicians and various factors associated with them.

METHODOLOGY: A cross-sectional telephone survey of MI patients was utilized for assessing the three research questions. Sample size for this study was 110. Study population was MI patients aged 18 to 70 who were treated at the Yerevan institute of Cardiology from 2007 to 2008 and who can speak and understand Armenian language. Systematic random sampling was conducted to select the sample of MI patients who met the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study. The survey questionnaire was designed and adapted from an existing standard questionnaire International physical activity questionnaire. Additional questions were added to more-completely answer the research questions.

RESULTS: Of the study subjects, 21.8% (24/110) of the study population reported adhering poorly, 52.7% (58/110) reported adhering fairly and 25.5% (28/110) reported adhering well to physicians' instructions for PA. Age was found to be positively associated with the level of adherence to physicians' instructions (adjusted OR=1.12, p=0.009). Amazingly, smoking status appeared to be marginally positively associated with the level of adherence to physicians’ instructions (adjusted OR=2.91, p=0.072).

Out of the approached sample, 72.7% (80/110) reported that they received instructions for physical activity from their physicians, with only 27.3% (30/110) of participants not reporting receiving such instructions. Age was negatively associated with receiving instructions for PA (adjusted OR=0.89, p=0.023).

CONCLUSION: Study findings suggest that those MI patients who have more risk factors reportedly adhering better to physicians’ instructions for PA than those with fewer risk factors. Older patients were more likely to report not receiving instructions from their physicians than younger patients.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background/Literature Review

Cardiovascular diseases (CVD) are currently the leading causes of death in industrialized countries and are expected to become the leading causes of death in emerging countries by 2020 (1). In 2001, CVD’s were the number one cause of death worldwide and are responsible for almost 15 million deaths in the world each year (2). Overall, the rates of cardiac mortality in the Eastern European countries which were formerly part of the U.S.S.R. are higher than in Western Europe (3).

The World Health Organization (WHO) identifies France in the European region (which includes former Soviet Republics) as having the lowest rates of age-adjusted mortality due to cardiovascular disease, with a rate of 170 CVD deaths per 100,000 men and 69 CVD deaths per 100,000 women for 2002 (4). However in Armenia, the age-adjusted CVD mortality rate was estimated to be 673 deaths per 100,000 population in 2004 for both sexes combined, in comparison with age adjusted 593 and 430 CVD deaths per 100,000 population within the same year for Azerbaijan and Georgia respectively (5).

Like other countries that were former Republics of the Soviet Union, Armenia has a relatively high rate of mortality due to cardiovascular diseases. According to a 2002 WHO report, mortality rates for non-communicable diseases account for 88.4% of all deaths in Armenia; out of all deaths from non-communicable diseases, 62.2% are due to cardiovascular diseases and 61% percent of all cardiovascular disease deaths are due to ischemic heart disease (IHD) (6, 7). A leading cause of death among IHD’s is myocardial infarction (MI), commonly known as a “heart attack” (8). MI is the disease of interest in this study.

Coronary artery disease is the most common disease among CVD’s and is associated with high mortality rates and morbidity rates (9). Coronary artery disease usually leads to Ischemic Heart Disease (IHD) (10). The clinical signs of ischemic heart disease include silent
ischemia, stable angina pectoris, unstable angina, *myocardial infarction (MI)*, heart failure, and sudden death (11). MI is an especially apparent event in the sequelae of IHD’s and will be the focus of this study.

"The term myocardial infarction should be used when there is evidence of myocardial necrosis in a clinical setting consistent with myocardial ischemia. Under these conditions any one of the following criteria meets the diagnosis for myocardial infarction. Any one of the following criteria meets the diagnosis for prior myocardial infarction:

- Development of new pathological Q waves with or without symptoms
- Imaging evidence of a region of loss of viable myocardium that is thinned and fails to contract, in the absence of a non-ischemic cause.
- Pathological findings of a healed or healing myocardial infarction" (12).

Myocardial infarction may be either a minor event in a lifelong chronic disease or it may be major catastrophic event leading to death. MI survivors are especially at increased risk for recurrent MI’s (13). Because of this increased risk of recurrence, cardiac rehabilitation should be carried out within the treatment process to decrease the risk of a second MI. The main components for risk reduction are physical activity counseling and exercise training, nutritional counseling, management of lipid levels, management of hypertension, management of weight and diabetes, and smoking cessation (14).

The WHO describes physical activity as “a fundamental means of improving people's physical and mental health and is not necessarily considered exercise training. It reduces the risks of many non-communicable diseases and benefits society by increasing social interaction and community engagement (15, 16).” Physical Activity (PA) as cardiac rehabilitation is a safe and effective way to prevent and to prolong the time to the second MI.
Several studies have shown that PA improves health-related quality of life and prolongs the life years for MI patients (18, 19, 20). However, many first-time MI survivors who would benefit from PA as a cardiac rehabilitation are not adhering to physician’s instructions for PA. The barriers against participation in PA as a cardiac rehabilitation include both service (health providers) and patient factors. Adherence to physicians’ instructions, including physical activity during daily work and medications prescribed, is essential for the proper rehabilitation for MI patients. The sources of first-time MI patient activities which may put the patient at risk may include both physician and patient factors. Some of these factors which are attributed to physicians are lack of advice to their patients, the quality of their advice for PA, and failure to prescribe appropriate medications. Various characteristics and conditions of the patient may be associated with adherence to physicians’ instructions, including demographic characteristics, health condition and life-style behaviors. Patient adherence rates for PA as a cardiac rehabilitation reportedly range from 15–59% (21, 22). Non-adherence to physicians' instructions has a potential to cause a number of problems that affect the patient and society. Some of these problems are increases in treatment failures, recurrences, complications, increases in return visits to physicians, increases in number of hospitalization, and increases in health care costs (23). Finally, there are several studies which find that CVD patients who did not follow PA instructions given by their physician have 20-30 % greater likelihood of having a fatal event than those who regularly adhere to PA instructions (24, 25).

In the existing literature, negative and positive factors which may be associated with adherence to physician’s instructions for PA include age, gender, socio-economic status (SES), occupation, education, body mass index (BMI), smoking status, current self-perceived health status of the patients, fearful that PA may cause another MI, not believing that PA is
good for health, the absence of physicians’ advice and family support (26, 27, 28). These factors were all evaluated in this study.

The current study examining factors associated with adherence of MI survivors to physician’s instructions for PA rehabilitation is the first study of its kind in Armenia. The vast majority of studies which were reviewed studied adherence to PA rehabilitation programs by MI survivors (29, 30, 31). There is no current program for PA rehabilitation for MI survivors in Armenia; rehabilitative PA is only promoted through physician’s instructions, for which adherence is unknown.

1.2 Study Objectives/ Research Questions/ Study Variables

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the adherence to physical activity instructions provided by physicians and the frequency by which physician’s provided advice for cardiac rehabilitation within the treatment process for myocardial infarction patients and to test some factors, which are associated with physicians' instructions for PA and receiving instructions for PA from physicians.

The research objectives were:

➢ To investigate the prevalence of non-adherence to physicians’ instructions for PA among MI patients with a first MI within the period 2007-2008 who are patients at Institute of Cardiology.
➢ To investigate the prevalence of those patients with a first MI who recall receiving instructions for PA from their physician.
➢ To identify the factors which are associated with adherence to physicians’ instructions for PA and with receiving instructions for PA from the physicians among patients with a first MI.

Corresponding research questions were:
What is the prevalence of non-adherence to physicians' instructions for PA among MI patients with a first MI within the period 2007-2008 who are patients at Institute of Cardiology?

What is the prevalence of those patients who recall receiving instructions for PA among patients with a first MI?

What are the factors, which are associated with adherence to physicians' instructions and receiving instructions for PA from the physicians?

The outcome variables of the study are the level of adherence to physicians' instructions for PA and the proportion of patients reportedly receiving instructions for PA from their physicians. The independent variables are age, gender, education, SES, marital status, BMI, smoking status, occupation, self-perceived health conditions, fear to PA, belief towards PA and social support. Studies indicate that measure of severity of the MI as defined by segment-elevated and non-segment-elevated myocardial infarction are not associated with risk of MI or time-to-second MI (32).

Table 1 shows the measurements and scales of measurement of study variables.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Study design

A cross-sectional telephone survey of MI patients was utilized for assessing the three research questions. The study is not only descriptive but also analytical, which aims to find some associations between dependent and independent variables. Study design has its advantages and disadvantages. The major advantages of this study design are cost-effectiveness in identifying the associations between study variables. It is very cheap and simple to conduct and the data collection is performed very quickly by “one-shot” interview. The major disadvantage of this study was inability to identify causal relationships (33).
2.2 Study population

The target population was adult MI patients.

The study population consisted of the MI patients who meet the following inclusion and exclusion criteria:

Inclusion criteria:

- Patients with first acute myocardial infarction who were treated at the Yerevan Institute of Cardiology within the period 2007-2008
- Patients with the age of 18-70 years
- Patients who can speak and understand Armenian

Exclusion criteria:

- First MI patients who have Lerish's syndrome (vascular complications)
- Patients with articular complications
- Patients at the time of the study who were out of country
- Prisoners

Rationale for choosing the study population

Patients with Lerish’s syndrome or with articular complications are excluded because their conditions would not allow them to adhere to PA regimens (34).

2.3 Study settings

The study was based on patients registered at the Yerevan at the Institute of Cardiology, which is located in Zeytun district.

2.4 Sample size

Sample size calculations were based on computations in EpiInfo for cross-sectional studies (35), with assumptions including 5% of type one error α and .80 for Power. The third research question was used, specifically for the factor of fear that physical activity may lead
to recurrent MI with the outcome of adherence to physician’s instructions for physical activity; those reporting fear of physical activity were assumed to consist of 30% of all participants and that 10% of those adhere to instructions for physical activity. Those without fear (70% of all participants) were assumed to adhere to instructions at a rate of 40%. These assumptions were in part based on literature previously cited. Sample size calculations produced a sample size of 93 with adjusted for non-response of 10%, producing a final sample size of 103.

2.5 Sampling methodology

Systematic random sampling was conducted to select the sample of patients to be interviewed by telephone using the sampling frame of MI patients enrolled at the Yerevan Institute of Cardiology, based on the exclusion and inclusion criteria. The sampling frame was the list of all MI patients at the Institute of Cardiology.

2.6 Study instrument

The survey questionnaire was designed and adapted from an existing standard questionnaire (International physical activity questionnaire, November 2002 long last 7 days format) (36). Additional questions were added to more-completely answer the research questions. The study instrument had three major domains: 1) physicians' instructions for physical activity, 2) socio-demographic questions (such as age and educational level) and 3) behavior and psychological factors (including smoking status and fear towards PA).

2.7 Data collection

Telephone-based interviews were performed by two interviewers from the 5th to the 20th of June 2009. Each interview lasted from 10 to 15 minutes.
2.8 Data coding

The outcome variables of the study are the level of adherence to physicians' instructions for PA (poorly=1, fairly=2, well=3) and the proportion of patients reportedly receiving instructions for PA (Table 1). The adherence score to physicians' instructions for PA was created based on the means of six physical activities types such as walking, running, weight lifting, swimming, gardening, and working capacity. As the result according to the natural break the cut point for adhering poorly, fairly and well was between 1.00 to 2.20, 2.25 to 2.75 and 2.80 to 3.00 respectively. However in bivariate and multivariate logistic models adherence score to physicians' instructions was categorized into two categories (fairly/well) 2.25 to 3.00 as a better adherence and 1.00 to 2.20 as a poor adherence in order to handle distribution of independent variables with statistical limitations. Based on natural break, the participants' age was divided into two categories: 42-54 years and 55–68 years. Body Mass Index (BMI) was calculated by dividing body mass by height squared (kg/m²). A BMI of less than 25 kg/m² was classified as normal weight, from 25 kg/m² and higher as overweight/obesity weight. Highest educational level was coded as university/postgraduate, college and the lowest educational level was coded as a secondary school completed or not completed. For SES, the sample was divided into 2 groups: less than or equal to 50000 and greater than 50000 AMD's. Participants also reported about their beliefs towards PA, in which the variable was collapsed into three categories: agree, neither agree nor disagree and disagree. Self-perceived health status of participants was coded into 3 categories: good, fair and poor. Social support was coded into two categories: first category included any family members or best friends, with the second category including neither support from family members nor best friends. Some variables were collapsed because of small numbers in some cells did not allow statistical testing.
3. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the American University of Armenia. Participants of the study were provided oral consent before starting the telephone-based interview. The interviewees were informed about the purpose of the study, expected risks or discomforts and benefits from participation. The only discomfort for the interviewees was the time spent on the interview. Participants were informed about the confidentiality of data collection procedures and the voluntary nature of the study. The list of information on names and phone numbers was kept in separate locked room to which only the head nurse of the department and the study's student investigator have access. This list was linked with the survey data form by an identification number with no personal identifiers included on the form itself. All reporting of the results were in aggregate form. The list with personal identifiers and the data forms will be destroyed after 6 months following the study termination. There are no risks and no direct benefits for participants.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

Data entry and recoding was being done by the SPSS 11.0 statistical package. All univariate statistical, bivariate and multivariate analysis was performed by means of the SPSS 11.0 software package.

5. RESULTS

5.1 Response Rate Calculation

A total of 110 interviews were completed out of 135 attempts (with 10 refusals, nine wrong numbers and six persistently busy lines), producing a response rate of 81% (110/135); the response rate was computed as the percent of completed interviews out of the total number of attempts based on the sampling frame.
5.2 Socio-demographic Data

Of the 110 completed interviews, 82.7% (91/110) were males and 17.3% (19/110) were females (see Table 2). The mean age of the participants was 55 years old with a standard deviation of six years. Out of all participants, 5.5% (6/110) had not completed secondary education, 15.5% (17/110) had complete secondary education with no further education, 35.5% (39/110) were college graduates and 43.6% (48/110) had higher levels of education (institute, university and post graduate). The percent for higher levels of education was higher than expected; according to the 2001 census, only 27% of the Yerevan population had higher levels of education (37). More than half of the study population was employed 51.2% (57/110), very similar to the 2001 census of 52.0% of employment among adults in Yerevan (37).

A little more than three-quarters of the study population, 75.5% (83/110), reported monthly household expenses from 50,001 to 200,000 AMD, 15.4% (17/110) reported expenditures of 25,000 to 50,000 AMD per month and only 9.1% (10/110) reported spending more than 200,001 AMD monthly (Table 2).

Results are reported separately in distinct section. Results for the analyses of the first outcome variable (level of adherence to physicians’ instructions for PA) are provided in section 5.3. Results for the analyses of the second outcome variable (receiving instructions for PA) are provided in section 5.4.

5.3 Bivariate analyses results with the primary dependent variable of “level of adherence to physician’s instructions for physical activity” and independent factors

Based on the results, 21.8% (24/110) of the study population reported adhering poorly, 52.7% (58/110) reported adhering fairly and 25.5% (28/110) reported adhering well to physicians’ instructions for PA. Out of all independent factors, only four bivariately were statistically-significantly associated with level of adherence to physicians' instructions for PA.
(Table 3): 1) age of participants was found to be a statistically significant (unadjusted p=0.003) – with older patients reportedly adhering better to physician’s instructions for PA than younger patients, 2) gender was found to be marginally statistically significant (unadjusted p=0.100) – with male adhering better to the physicians' instructions for PA than females, 3) tobacco smoking status was identified as statistically significant (unadjusted p=0.035), where smokers were adhering better to the physicians' instructions for PA than non-smokers, and 4) finally, fear that PA may cause another MI was also statistically significant (unadjusted p=0.003), with those MI patients who did not have fear were adhering better than those who had fear.

Each of these four factors was also associated with other covariates, which may be potential confounders for these four factors. Spearman’s non-parametric correlation test was used to check for colinearity between binary independent variables; as a result none of the correlation coefficients of the independent variables had coefficients more than 0.4 and -0.4. Thus, age was associated with self-perceived health conditions of the participant – young participants have better self-perceived health conditions than older participants (unadjusted p=0.035). The age of participants was found to be associated with employment status as well – younger patients were more employed than older p< 0.0005. Gender was associated with smoking and socio-economic status. The associations between gender and these last two factors was statistically significant (p<0.0005 and p= 0.005 respectively); males were much more likely to smoke than women and socio-economic status of females were lower than males. Smoking status of participants was also statistically significantly (p=0.006) associated with the type of occupation – more smokers were working manually than non-smokers. Smoking was also associated with self-perceived health conditions – smokers had worse self-perceived health conditions than non-smokers (p=0.003).
The factor fear that PA may cause another MI was associated with both social support and belief that PA is good for health. Those MI patients who had fear that PA may cause another MI had more social support than those MI patients who had no fear (p= 0.030). Marginal statistically significant association was found between belief that PA is good for health and fear that PA may cause MI (p=0.064). MI patients who did not have fear to PA had more belief to PA than those who had fear to PA.

In further analysis, a multivariate logistic regression model was used to test the associations between independent factors and the primary outcome variable poor adherence to physicians’ instructions for PA, controlling for potential confounding. The factor adherence to physicians' instructions for PA was categorical (with three categories) variable in bivariate analysis and dichotomous in sub-analysis with logistic regression. Out of the independent variables only age and socio-economic status were changed into the continuous variables; all other factors remained the same as in bivariate analysis.

The covariates which were included in the final multivariate logistic regression were age, gender and smoking status (Table 5). Covariate were tested in a multivariate logistic regression if they were near statistically significant with the outcome variable in bivariate analysis. Covariates were retained in the final model if they had statistical significance (p<0.05), borderline statistical significance (p<0.10), or were substantial confounders for these variables. Out of the covariates included in the final model, age was found to be statistically significantly associated with the level of adherence to physicians’ instructions for PA (adjusted OR=1.12, p=0.009) and current smoking status was found to have borderline statistical significance (adjusted OR=2.91, p=0.072). Gender substantially confounded smoking, tested by removing (OR for smoking=3.70, p=0.017 adjusting only for age) and including gender (OR for smoking=2.91, p=0.072 adjusting for age and gender), thus was retained in the final model. The Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test was run to test if the
covariates in the final model for the first outcome variable – level of adherence to physicians’ instructions- fits the logistic regression adequately. The result was equal to a non-significant p=0.61, indicating that model is a good fit.

5.4 Bivariate analyses results comparing independent factors with the secondary dependent variable “Number of MI patients reportedly receiving instructions for PA from their physicians”

Out of the entire study population, 72.7% (80/110) reported that they received instructions for physical activity from their physicians, with only 27.3% (30/110) of participants not reporting receiving such instructions. However, the follow-up questions triggered the memory of those 27.3%, indicating that they did receive some instructions from their physician for PA; out of six PA domains in the study instrument, the mean number of domains where physicians provided instructions on PA for those participants who had initially reported receiving no instructions on PA, was 2.43 as compared to 3.12 for those who had initially reported receiving instructions (not on table).

Out of all study variables, two were statistically significantly associated and one was marginally statistically significantly associated with the second dependent variable receiving instruction for PA from their physicians in bivariate analysis (Table 4). In the bivariate analysis, age statistically significantly (unadjusted p=0.003) increased the likelihood of reporting no instructions, along with older MI patients (55-68 years-of-age) as compared to younger MI patients (42-54 years-of-age). The factor self-perceived health condition was also statistically significant (unadjusted p=0.015). Those MI patients who had better self-perceived health conditions reported receiving instructions for PA from physicians more often than those who had poor self-perceived health conditions. Gender had border-line statistically significant for receiving instructions for PA (unadjusted p=0.087). Males reported receiving instructions on PA more often than females.
Based on these bivariate results, these factors were included in a multivariate logistic regression model along with potential confounders to clarify the associations between these three independent variables and the second dependent variable receiving instruction for PA from their physicians (Table 6).

In this final model only age was found to be statistically significantly associated with receiving instructions for PA from their physicians (adjusted OR= 0.90, p=0.028). The other variables in the final model were included for their confounding effects. A Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test statistic was equal to a non-significant p=0.65, indicating that the elected final model for the outcome receiving instructions for PA was a good fit for logistic regression.

6. DISCUSSION

First outcome variable – level of adherence to physicians instructions for PA

The current study examined the prevalence of adherence, factors associated with adherence to physicians' instructions for physical activity and factors associated with receiving instructions from physicians for PA by MI survivors. There is no cardiac rehabilitative program in Armenia and rehabilitative PA is promoted only through physicians' instructions; it is important to know the profile of non-adhering patients to physicians' instructions for physical activity and the factors which lead to poor adherence to these instructions for PA for the protection of the public health of MI survivors.

Adherence to physicians' instructions for physical activity depends on two major interdependent variables, physician and patient factors (38). Accordingly, further discussions of findings are related to these factors.

The current study revealed that 21.8% (24/110) of the study population reported adhering poorly, 52.7% (58/110) reported adhering fairly and 25.5% (28/110) reported adhering well to physicians’ instructions for PA. According to the Eurobarometer large Scale
Healthy Population studies, the level of adherence for recommendations of physical activity was 66% among European Union countries; almost the same figure was observed (63%) for adherence to physical activity recommendations among Swedish adults (39, 40). Other research suggests that the prevalence of adherence to physical activity regimens in various countries fluctuates from 31.7% to 61.7% among patients who are seeking care at tertiary hospitals (41). These estimates are similar to the findings from the current study of MI survivors. However a study on compliance for taking prescribed medications conducted in Nork Marash Medical Hospital found that compliance rates for following physicians’ instructions for taking medication was 69% (42). Adherence for following instructions for PA from physicians by MI patients in the current study was relatively similar, with 53.7% reportedly adhering fairly and another 25.5% adhering well. The compliance for taking medications study found that 8.1% of study participants reportedly perceive their health condition as fair or poor, as compared with the findings of this current PA adherence study where 71.8% of study participants reportedly had fair health condition and 6.4% with poor health condition. This may be explained by the fact that shortly after stent or CABG procedures, patients feel much improved, whereas MI patients can have protracted periods of feeling poorly. The medication compliance study also found that more risk factors decreased compliance, whereas in the current PA adherence study of MI patients, more risk factors increased adherence. The perception of patients towards medications as compared to physical activity may differ, influencing their adherence or compliance to directions; this open question requires further study.

Out of the independent variables which were tested in a multivariate logistic regression model, adjusting for confounders, with the primary outcome variable of level of adherence to physicians’ instructions, age was found to be statistically significantly associated and smoking with borderline statistically significantly associated with adherence to physicians’ instructions for PA (adjusted OR=1.12, p=0.009 and adjusted OR=2.91, p=0.072 respectively); one year increase
in the age of patients on the average increased the odds of adhering to physicians’ instructions by 12%. Current smoking increased the odds for adherence to physicians’ instructions for PA by almost threefold. According to the published literature, those CHD patients with more risk factors (such as smoking and age) for recurrent adverse events are more adherent to physicians’ instructions for PA than those CHD patients with fewer risk factors (43, 44). A study of adherence to heart-healthy behaviors among patients with coronary heart disease found that the highest age quintile was associated with improved adherence to physical activity (45). The findings of this current study, which showed that older patients were adhering better than younger and smokers were more likely to adhere to instructions than non-smokers, was consistent with this general trend in the published literature.

**Second outcome variable – proportion of receiving instructions from physicians for PA among MI Patients**

Findings presented in this section cover physicians’ advice to MI patients for PA. Health professional counseling their patients about physical activity protects the health of these patients. Physicians' advice to exercise has been shown to increase the duration of physical activity (46). Good adherence to physicians' recommendations for PA is consistently associated with better health outcomes (47, 48).

According to the study findings, 72.7% (80/110) reported that they received instructions for physical activity from their physicians and only 27.3% (30/110) of participants reported not receiving such instructions. Based on one study, 99% of U.S. patients reported receiving instructions for PA from their physician (49). From another study, during check-up visits 56% of all patients were asked about their physical activity and only 34% reported receiving any instructions for PA (50). The findings of current study suggest that the most common recommendations by physicians in the Institute of Cardiology in Armenia were given on walking, weight lifting and working capacity. A total of 91.8%,
82.7% and 70.0% of the study population reported receiving instructions on walking, weight lifting and working capacity respectively.

Out of all variables tested in multiple logistic regression, age was found to be the only statistically significantly associated covariate with the second outcome variable of receiving instructions for PA from physicians (adjusted OR=0.90, p=0.028). This indicated that one year increase in age on average decreases the odds of reportedly receiving instructions by 10%. In other words older MI patients were less likely to recall receiving instructions for PA from physicians than younger MI patients. However, in contrast when older patients reported receiving instructions from their physician, they adhered better to these instructions than younger patients. It is possible that older patients may have received instructions for PA from their physician, but were less likely to recall those instructions because of their advanced age. Another explanation may be related to physicians’ tendency to more often provide instructions to younger patients than older patients. In other countries, findings have shown that 22% to 48% of older people received instructions for PA from their physicians (51). Literature also suggested that physicians are more likely to counsel younger patients for PA than older patients (52). In addition, according to the literature, patients with more risk factors (other than age) are more likely to receive instructions for PA than those patients with fewer risk factors for health (53); if younger MI patients had more risk conditions (other than age) than older MI patients, then this would further provide an explanation for this association.

7. STUDY LIMITATIONS

A study by Kjaer et al. suggested that indicators for adherence may be somewhat susceptible to bias (54). In this study, the factors adherence to physicians' instructions and receiving instructions from physicians were both based on patient recall, which could be a source of some recall bias.
In addition, the present study was cross-sectional in design, where temporality between dependent and some independent variables could not be determined. Finally, there might be some unknown confounders, which were not adjusted for during the analysis.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

More than half of the study population reportedly adhered fairly to physicians’ instructions, with roughly equal numbers of the rest divided between adhering poorly and adhering well. The factors found to be associated with the level of adherence to physicians' instructions were age and smoking status. In the literature, age is a consistent predictor of adherence to physicians' recommendations for PA. Surprisingly, smoking status was found to be positively associated (borderline statistical significance) with the level of adherence to physicians' instructions for PA. Study findings suggest that those MI patients who have more risk factors were reportedly adhering better to physicians' instructions for PA than those MI patients with fewer risk factors.

A little more than a quarter of the patients reported not receiving instructions for PA from their physician. The only factor, which was associated with receiving instructions for PA was age. More often older patients reported receiving no instructions for PA from their physician than younger patients. This could be due to recall problems by older patients or it is also possible that physicians counseled younger patients more often.

In addition to verbal instructions from physicians concerning PA for MI patients, written instructions for supporting PA adherence (for example, instructions for PA written in discharge forms) would further improve adherence for cardiac rehabilitation among MI patients; these written instructions, with possible follow-up by physicians, would further assure that older patients would receive and recall receiving instructions from their physicians. Moreover, to increase adherence by patients with fewer risk factors, physicians...
should emphasize the importance of adherence to PA for all patients. Follow-up programs outside of the medical institution to support patients in adherence to these instructions would potentially lower the rates of complications, reducing the risk of recurrent MI’s and to prolong life. Finally, it is important to conduct further studies to better understand the dynamics of these factors in adherence and to design effective programs and interventions to meet these needs.
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### APPENDIX 1. TABLES

#### Table 1. Code list of all study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Mode of measurement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adherence to physicians' instructions for PA</strong></td>
<td>How well are you following physicians' instructions for PA?</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= poorly (1.00-2.20)</td>
<td>poorly/fairly/well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= fairly (2.25-2.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= well (2.80-3.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of people who recalled receiving instructions for PA from physicians</strong></td>
<td>Do you recall that your physician give you instructions for PA?</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes, 0=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Mode of measurement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>What was your age on your last birthday?</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Males=0, Females=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td>What is your level of education?</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= Incomplete / Complete secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= College (2 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= Institute/ university/ Postgraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SES</strong></td>
<td>On average how much money does your household spend monthly?</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= Below 25 000 dramas/25,001 to 50,000 dramas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= 50 001 to 200 000 dramas/ More than 200 001 dramas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work occupation</strong></td>
<td>Are you occupied?</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes, 0=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td>What is your marital status?</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= Divorced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=Widowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief towards PA</strong></td>
<td>Please indicate if you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement:</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Strongly agree /Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= Disagree/Strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity is beneficial for health</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking status</td>
<td>Are you currently smoking?</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes, 0=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-perceived health status</td>
<td>Which of the following best describes your health today?</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= very good/good, 2= fairly, 3= bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>What is your weight/height?</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weight/height² score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= &lt;18.5-24.99, 2= 25.0&gt;30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear to PA</td>
<td>Are you afraid currently that PA might cause MI?</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=Yes, 0=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>Is there anybody who can help you to adhere to physicians instructions' for PA?</td>
<td>Dichotomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1=all family members i.e. wife, husband, son, daughter and e.c. also best friends, 2= Neither family members nor best friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Descriptive Characteristics of the Study Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent (Count) or Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of adherence to physicians' instructions for PA</td>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>21.8% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>53.7% (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>25.5% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall that your physician gave you instructions for PA?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.7% (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.3% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82.7% (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.3% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>5.5% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>15.5% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>35.5% (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>43.6% (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute/university/post graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51.8 % (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.2 % (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household monthly expenses</td>
<td>25000-50000</td>
<td>15.4 % (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50001-200000</td>
<td>75.5 % (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;2000000</td>
<td>9.1 % (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4.5% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>86.4% (95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4.5% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4.5% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>28.2% (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥25&lt;30</td>
<td>54.5% (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>17.3% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-perceived health condition</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21.8% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>71.8% (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>6.4% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA is good for health?</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53.6% (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>39.1% (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>7.3% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful that PA can cause another MI?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.6% (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>46.4% (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking tobacco?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44.5% (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55.5% (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>30.9% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family members, best friends</td>
<td>69.1% (76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Bivariate chi square analysis with first outcome variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>The level of adherence to physicians' instructions for PA, % (count)</th>
<th>P value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>poorly</td>
<td>fairly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-54</td>
<td>31.3(15)</td>
<td>58.3(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-68</td>
<td>14.5(9)</td>
<td>48.4(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>18.7(17)</td>
<td>53.8(49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>36.8(7)</td>
<td>47.4(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Complete/Incomplete</td>
<td>21.7(5)</td>
<td>47.8(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>20.5(8)</td>
<td>48.7(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute/university/post-graduate</td>
<td>22.9(11)</td>
<td>58.3(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.6(14)</td>
<td>50.9(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.9(10)</td>
<td>54.7(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household monthly expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤50.000</td>
<td>17.6(3)</td>
<td>52.9(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50.000</td>
<td>22.6(21)</td>
<td>52.7(49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smoking status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.2(6)</td>
<td>65.3(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29.5(18)</td>
<td>42.6(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25 (normal)</td>
<td>29.0(9)</td>
<td>48.4(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥25&lt;30 (overweight)</td>
<td>20.0(12)</td>
<td>53.3(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30 (obese)</td>
<td>15.8(3)</td>
<td>57.9(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief that PA is good for health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22.0(13)</td>
<td>45.8(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>20.9(9)</td>
<td>65.1(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>25.0(2)</td>
<td>37.5(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fearful that PA may cause MI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.3(12)</td>
<td>66.1(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23.5(12)</td>
<td>37.3(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-perceived health condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33.8(8)</td>
<td>54.2(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>17.7(14)</td>
<td>51.9(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>28.6(2)</td>
<td>57.1(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>26.5(9)</td>
<td>47.1(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members and best friends</td>
<td>19.7(15)</td>
<td>55.3(42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on Chi square test
Table 4. Bivariate chi square analysis with second outcome variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Number of MI patients who reported receiving instruction for PA from their physicians, % (count)</th>
<th>P value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>87.5 (42)</td>
<td>12.5 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-54</td>
<td>62.9 (39)</td>
<td>37.1 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-68</td>
<td>76.9 (70)</td>
<td>23.1 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>57.9 (11)</td>
<td>42.1 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>73.9 (17)</td>
<td>26.1 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>76.7 (26)</td>
<td>33.3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td>79.2 (38)</td>
<td>20.8 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Complete/Incomplete College graduate</td>
<td>66.7 (26)</td>
<td>33.3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute/university/post-graduate</td>
<td>73.7 (42)</td>
<td>26.3 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td>73.6 (49)</td>
<td>26.4 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.6 (12)</td>
<td>29.4 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74.2 (69)</td>
<td>25.8 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household monthly expenses</strong></td>
<td>75.5 (37)</td>
<td>24.5 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤50,000</td>
<td>72.1 (44)</td>
<td>27.9 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50,000</td>
<td>77.4 (24)</td>
<td>26.6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smoking status</strong></td>
<td>70.0 (42)</td>
<td>30.0 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78.9 (15)</td>
<td>21.1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79.7 (47)</td>
<td>20.3 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMI</strong></td>
<td>69.8 (30)</td>
<td>30.2 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25 (normal)</td>
<td>50.0 (4)</td>
<td>50.0 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥25&lt;30 (overweight)</td>
<td>72.9 (43)</td>
<td>27.1 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30 (obese)</td>
<td>74.5 (38)</td>
<td>25.5 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belief that PA is good for health</strong></td>
<td>70.8 (17)</td>
<td>29.2 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>78.5 (62)</td>
<td>21.5 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree disagree</td>
<td>28.6 (2)</td>
<td>71.4 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fearful that PA may cause MI</strong></td>
<td>67.6 (23)</td>
<td>32.4 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76.3 (58)</td>
<td>67.6 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74.5 (38)</td>
<td>25.5 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-perceived health condition</strong></td>
<td>79.7 (47)</td>
<td>20.3 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>69.8 (30)</td>
<td>30.2 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>50.0 (4)</td>
<td>50.0 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>72.9 (43)</td>
<td>27.1 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social support</strong></td>
<td>74.5 (38)</td>
<td>25.5 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>70.8 (17)</td>
<td>29.2 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members and best friends</td>
<td>78.5 (62)</td>
<td>21.5 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.6 (2)</td>
<td>71.4 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.6 (23)</td>
<td>32.4 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.3 (58)</td>
<td>67.6 (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on Chi square test
Table 5. The final multivariate logistic model for the first outcome variable - the level of adherence to physicians’ instructions for PA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Adjusted Odds Ratio (OR)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smoking status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. The final multivariate logistic model for the second outcome variable - the proportion of MI patients reported receiving instructions for PA from their physicians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Adjusted Odds Ratio (OR)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current smoking status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-perceived health condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2. QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH AND ARMENIAN)

Questionnaire

ID

Date of the interview ______________ (Day/Month/Year)
Start time of the interview ______________ (Hour/Minute)
End time of the interview ______________ (Hour/Minute)

Well, now we will speak about following to physicians' instructions for Physical Activity, consider Physical Activity as at least being 10 minutes whether in moderate or vigorous motions, such as washing a car/ window or shoveling the snow respectively.

Check only one option that applies (refers to all questions)

1. Have you ever had a Myocardial Infarction?
   1.□ Yes, 0.□ No, 90.□ Don't know, 99.□ Refusal (if "NO" stop the interview)

2. Do you recall your physician giving you instructions on Physical Activity?
   1.□ Yes, 0.□ No, 90.□ Don't know, 99.□ Refusal

3.1 Has your physician ever given you instructions on "Walking"?
   1.□ Yes, 0.□ No, 90.□ Don't know, 99.□ Refusal

3.2 What exactly did your physician tell you about walking?
   ……………………………

3.3 How well are you following the instructions on walking?
   1.□ Poorly, 2.□ Fairly, 3.□ Well, 90.□ Don't know 99.□ Refusal,

3.4 Has your physician ever told you to walk no more than 5 km.
   1.□ Yes, 0.□ No, 90.□ Don't know, 99.□ Refusal (if "yes" skip question 3.5)

3.5 How many km exactly did your physician tell you to walk?
   ………………………………………………………………………

3.6 How well are you following the instructions on walking no more than X km?

4.1 Has your physician ever given you instructions on "Running"?
   1.□ Yes, 0.□ No, 90.□ Don't know, 99.□ Refusal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 What exactly did your physician tell you about running?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3 How well are you following the instructions on running?</strong></td>
<td>1. Poorly, 2. Fairly, 3. Well, 90. Don't know, 99. Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1 Has your physician ever given you instructions on &quot;Lifting&quot;?</strong></td>
<td>1. Yes, 0. No, 90. Don't know, 99. Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2 What exactly did your physician tell you about weight lifting?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3 How well are you following the instructions on weight lifting?</strong></td>
<td>1. Poorly, 2. Fairly, 3. Well, 90. Don't know, 99. Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.4 Has your physician ever told you to do any weight lifting no more than 5kg?</strong></td>
<td>1. Yes, 0. No, 90. Don't know, 99. Refusal (if &quot;yes&quot; skip question 5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.5 How much kg exactly did your physician tell you to lift?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.6 How well are you following the instructions to do weight lifting no more than 5kg?</strong></td>
<td>1. Poorly, 2. Fairly, 3. Well, 90. Don't know, 99. Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.1 Has your physician ever given you instructions on &quot;Swimming&quot;?</strong></td>
<td>1. Yes, 0. No, 90. Don't know 99. Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.2 What exactly did your physician tell you about swimming?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.3 How well are you following the instructions on swimming?</strong></td>
<td>1. Poorly, 2. Fairly, 3. Well, 90. Don't know, 99. Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.1 Has your physician ever given you instructions on &quot;Working&quot;?</strong></td>
<td>1. Yes, 0. No, 90. Don't know, 99. Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.2 What exactly did your physician tell you about Working?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.3 How well are you following the instructions on Working?</strong></td>
<td>1. Poorly, 2. Fairly, 3. Well, 90. Don't know, 99. Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.1 Has your physician ever given you instructions on &quot;Gardening&quot;?</strong></td>
<td>1. Yes, 0. No, 90. Don't know 99. Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.2 What exactly did your physician tell you about gardening?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.2.1 Do you have a garden?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. □ Yes, 0. □ No, 90. □ Don't know 99. □ Refusal (if No go to question 9)

8.3 How well are you following the instructions on gardening?

Note: In case of all "NO" answers on questions x.1 stop the interview

9.1 What else did your physician tell you to do?
...........................................................................................................

9.2 How well are you following the instructions on that?

10.1 Has your physician ever told you to come for checkups once a month?
1. □ Yes, 0. □ No, 90. □ Don't know 99. □ Refusal (if "yes" skip question 9.2)

10.2 What exactly did your physician tell you about how often to come in for checkups?
...........................................................................................................

10.3 How well are you following the instructions on how often to come in for checkups?

11.1 Has your physician ever given you instructions on work capacity?
1. □ Yes, 0. □ No, 90. □ Don't know 99. □ Refusal

11.2 What exactly did your physician tell you about work capacity?
...........................................................................................................

11.3 How well are you following the instructions on work capacity?

Socio-demographic Questions

Now I am going to ask you some questions regarding your age, etc.

12. What was your age on your last birthday? -------
99. □ Refused to answer

13. What is your level of education?
1. □ Incomplete secondary (up to 8 years)
2. □ Complete secondary (up to 10 years)
3. □ College (2 years)
4. □ Institute/ university (5-6)
5. □ Postgraduate
6. Other (please, specify) ---------
90. □ Don’t know
99. □ Refused to answer
14. Do you have an occupation?
1. □ Yes
0. □ No (go to question 18)
99. □ Refused to answer

15. Is your work manual?
1. □ Yes (if yes go to question 17)
0. □ No
99. □ Refused to answer

16. Is your work in office environment?
1. □ Yes
0. □ No
99. □ Refused to answer

17. What is your occupation?
-----------------------------------
99. □ Refused to answer

18. What is your marital status?
1. □ Single
2. □ Married
3. □ Divorced
4. □ Widowed
99. □ Refused to answer

19. How many people live in your family, including you?
........................................................................
99. □ Refusal

20. Circle gender of respondent (Ask only if unable to identify.)
0. □ Male
1. □ Female

Questions about anticipated factors:

21. What is your average weight in kg?
.................
90. □ Don’t know
99. □ Refusal

22. What is your average height in cm?
.....................
90. □ Don’t know
99. □ Refusal

23. Are you smoking currently?
1. □ Yes
0. □ No (go to question 25)
99. □ Refusal

24. On average, how many cigarettes do you smoke in a day?
.................................
90. □ Don’t know
99. □ Refusal

25. Which of the following best describes your health today?
1. □ Excellent
2. □ Very good
3. □ Good
4. □ Fair
5. □ Poor
90. □ Don’t Know
99. □ Refused to answer

26. Have you ever been afraid that physical activity might cause a myocardial infarction?
1. □ Yes
0. □ NO
90. □ Don't Know
99. □ Refused to answer

27. Are you afraid to do Physical Activity now because it might cause a myocardial infarction?
1. □ Yes
0. □ NO
90. □ Don’t Know
99. □ Refused to answer

28. Please indicate if you strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement:

Physical activity prevents and prolongs the time period to second heart attack.
1. □ Strongly agree
2. □ Agree
3. □ Neither agree nor disagree
4. □ Disagree
5. □ Strongly disagree
90. □ Don't Know
99. □ Refused

29. Is there anybody who supports you to follow the physicians’ instructions for Physical Activity.

.................................................................
90. □ Don't Know
99. □ Refused

30. On average how much money does your household spend monthly?
1. □ Below 25 000 dram
2. □ 25 001 to 50 000 dram
3. □ 50 001 to 200 000 dram
4. □ More than 200 001 dram
90. □ Don’t know
99. □ Refused to answer

This is the end of our conversation.
Thank you very much for your participation
3.3 Ինչպես եք հետևիք գրքին հիմնավորված թերափակիչ հարցերին?
1. վատ, 2.միջին, 3.լավ, 90.չգիտեմ, 99.մերժում,

3.4 Ձեր թերափակիչս քայլեք 5 կմ է դիմ ծանրության բարձրացման հարցի վերաբերյալ ոչ թե ավելի 5 կմ? 1.այո, 0.նմ, 90.չգիտեմ, 99.մերժում (Եթե "այո", այնուհետև 3.6-րդ հարցի)

3.5 Ապահովելություն էք եք ովքեր 5 կմ է դիմ թերափակիչ, որ դիմեց եք։

3.6 Ինչպես եք հետևիք 5 կմ է դիմ բժիշկի հրահանգներին?
1. վատ, 2.միջին, 3.լավ, 90.չգիտեմ, 99.մերժում,

4.1 Ձեր թերափակիչն քայլեք 5 կմ է դիմ ծանրության բարձրացում հարցի վերաբերյալ?
1. այո, 0. ոչ, 90. չգիտեմ

4.2 Ապահովելություն էք ովքեր 5 կմ է դիմ թերափակիչ լսվել է դիմեց?

4.3 Ինչպես եք հետևիք լսվել է դիմեց 5 կմ է դիմ թերափակիչ հրահանգներին?
1. վատ, 2.միջին, 3.լավ, 90.չգիտեմ, 99.մերժում

5.1 Ձեր թերափակիչն քայլեք 5 կմ է դիմ ծանրության բարձրացում հարցի վերաբերյալ?
1. այո, 0. ոչ, 90. չգիտեմ

5.2 Ապահովելություն էք ովքեր 5 կմ է դիմ թերափակիչ ծանրության բարձրացում հարցի վերաբերյալ?

5.3 Ինչպես եք հետևիք ծանրության բարձրացում հարցի վերաբերյալ?
1. վատ, 2.միջին, 3.լավ, 90.չգիտեմ, 99.մերժում,

5.4 Ձեր թերափակիչն քայլեք 5 կմ է դիմ ծանրության բարձրացում հարցի վերաբերյալ?
1. այո, 0. ոչ, 90. չգիտեմ (Եթե "այո", այնուհետև 5.6-րդ հարցի)

5.5 Ապահովելություն էք ովքեր 5 կմ է դիմ թերափակիչ, որ դիմեց է ծանրություն?
5.6 Ինչպես էք հետևում ոչ ավել քան 5 կգ. ծանրություն բարձրացնելու վերաբերյալ բժիշկի հրահանգներին?

1. □ վատ, 2. □ միջին, 3. □ առավոտյան, 90. □ զգտում 99. □ մերժում

6.1 Զկրեք քուրսի մասին նախ ու օրերս իրավագրված լուծամուտ նախադպրակտարման “խորհրդաբար կարճ” վերաբերյալ?

1. □ այո, 0. □ իմանալ, 90. □ զգտում 99. □ մերժում

6.2 Մասնավորորեն ինչ է զեկ այուն քուրսի կարգապահության պահանջների վերաբերյալ?

……………………………

6.3 Ինչպես էք հետևում ուսանողի կարգապահության պահանջների հոդվածառույթների?

1. □ այո, 2. □ միջին, 3. □ առավոտյան, 90. □ զգտում 99. □ մերժում

7.1 Զկրեք քուրսի մասին նախ ու օրերս իրավագրված լուծամուտ նախադպրակտարման “խորհրդաբար կարճ” վերաբերյալ?

1. □ այո, 0. □ իմանալ, 90. □ զգտում 99. □ մերժում

7.2 Մասնավորորեն ինչ է զեկ այուն քուրսի կարգապահության պահանջների վերաբերյալ?

……………………………

7.3 Ինչպես էք հետևում դրա աշխատանքի պահանջների հոդվածառույթների?

1. □ այո, 2. □ միջին, 3. □ առավոտյան, 90. □ զգտում 99. □ մերժում

8.1 Զկրեք քուրսի մասին նախ ու օրերս իրավագրված լուծամուտ հոսքամարման “խորհրդաբար կարճ” վերաբերյալ?

1. □ այո, 0. □ իմանալ, 90. □ զգտում 99. □ մերժում

8.2 Մասնավորորեն ինչ է զեկ այուն քուրսի կարգապահության պահանջների վերաբերյալ?

……………………………

8.2.1 Հոդված այսուհանգերի սահմանում որ չէ?

1. □ այո, 0. □ իմանալ (Եթե "Ու", այդպիսով 9-րդ հաջորդ)
8.3 Ինչպես եք հետևում հողամասից գրավածքի վերաբերյալ բժիշկի հրահանգներին?  
1. □ վատ, 2. □ միջին, 3. □ լավ, 90. □ չգիտեմ 99. □ մերժում

9.1 Այլ հետևագրություն է տրվել թե բժիշկը, որին պետք է հետևեք؟

9.2 Ինչպես եք հետևում բժիշկի այլ հրահանգներին?  
1. □ վատ, 2. □ միջին, 3. □ լավ, 90. □ չգիտեմ 99. □ մերժում

10.1 Վերջին տեղում տեղացի է տեղափոխվում դրախթակի համար “այլ հողամասից գրավածքի վերաբերյալ” ? 
1. □ այո, 0. □ ոչ, 90. □ չգիտեմ 99. □ մերժում

10.2 Առաջինից վերջին է եղել թե ինչ պատրաստած է եղել պահանջելու վերաբերյալ?

10.3 Ինչպես եք հետևում բժիշկի հրահանգներին այսպիսով վերաբերյալ ընդունել?
1. □ վատ, 2. □ միջին, 3. □ լավ, 90. □ չգիտեմ 99. □ մերժում

11.1 Վերջին տեղում տեղացի է տեղափոխվում դրախթակի համար “այլ հողամասից գրավածքի վերաբերյալ”?
1. □ այո, 0. □ ոչ, 90. □ չգիտեմ 99. □ մերժում

11.2 Առաջինից վերջին է եղել թե ինչ պատրաստած է եղել պահանջելու վերաբերյալ?

11.3 Ինչպես եք հետևում բժիշկի հրահանգներին այսպիսով վերաբերյալ պահանջելու?
1. □ վատ, 2. □ միջին, 3. □ լավ, 90. □ չգիտեմ 99. □ մերժում

12. Ամբողջ պատասխան են? .................................
99. □ մերժում
13. Որին է Ձեր կրթության մակարդակը?
1. թերի միջնակարգ (10 տարից պակաս)
2. միջնակարգ (10 տարի)
3. միջնակարգ մասնագիտական (2 տարի)
4. ինստիտուտ/համալսարան (5-6 տարի)
5. հետդիպում (գիտ. Թեկնածու)

6. այլ (հավասար է, ոչ նշել) ・・・・・
90. Չգիտեմ
99. մերժում

14. Ոսին աշխատում եք քան?

1. այո
0. ոչ
(եթե ոչ, ապա անցնել 18-րդ հարցի)
99. մերժում

15. Ձեր աշխատանքը ֆիզիկական է?
1. այո, (եթե այո, ապա անցնել 16-րդ հարցի)
0. ոչ
99. մերժում

16. Ձեր աշխատանքը ավելի երկարության է?
1. այո
0. ոչ
99. մերժում

17. Ինչ եք դուք աշխատում?
..................................................

18. Այս երկն ինտերեսաբար էր դարձել ձեր կարգավիճակի մեջ?
1. այո
2. անհատական
3. անհատականության
4. մերժում
99. մերժում
19. Ձերը հաճախ մարդկուհին մարդիկ է ապրում ձերը ընտանիքում?
................................................................................................................

99. մերձում

20. Ձեր սեռը? (հարցինք սեռի դիմացումը դրմանք)
0. ազատ
1. խախտվում

21. Ձեր միջին քաշը?
................................................................................................................

90. չհայտնի
99. մերձում

22. Ձեր միջին հասակը?
................................................................................................................

90. չհայտնի
99. մերձում

23. Դուք ծխում եք այժմ?

1. ոչ
0. նչ (եթե ոչ ապա անցնել 25-րդ հարցի)
99. մերձում

24. Օրական միջին քանի սիգարետ եք ծխում իր դիմաց?
................................................................................................................
25. Հետեվյալ տարբերակներից, որը էլ լավագույնը բնութագրում է Ձեր առողջական վիճակը այսօր?
1. շատ լավ
2. լավ
3. բավարար
4. վատ
90. չգիտեմ
99. մերժում

26. Դուք երբևից վախեցել եք, որ ֆիզիկական ակտիվությամբ զբաղվելը կարող է սրտի կաթվածք առաջացնել?
1. այո
0. ոչ
90. չգիտեմ
99. մերժում

27. Իսկ Դուք այժմ վախենում եք, որ ֆիզիկական ակտիվությամբ զբաղվելը կարող է սրտի կաթվածք առաջացնել?
1. այո
0. ոչ
90. չգիտեմ
99. մերժում

28. "Ֆիզիկական ակտիվությունը կանխարգելում և երկարացնելու նպատակով պետք է ունենք այս հետաքրքրություն": Համաձայն եք այս մասին հանդիսացած հայտ:
1. լիովին համաձայն եմ
2. համաձայն եմ
3. դժվարանում եմ պատասխանել դա
4. համաձայն չեմ
5. լիովին համաձայն չեմ
90. չգիտեմ
99. մերժում
29. Կա որևէ մեկը, որ Ձեր օգնե հիմնականում հաջողանքով պահանջարկիչ ֆիզիկական ակտիվության վերաբերյալ քայլեր է ուսումնասիրել ուսուցողի ուսուցողին? ..........................

90. չգիտեմ
99. մերժում

30. Միջին հաշվով ամսեկանում այգում կապակցել ձեր ընտանիքի վարկածը է?
1. չու ավելի քան 25 000 դրամ
2. 25 001 - 50 000 դրամ
3. 50 001 - 200 000 դրամ
4. ավելի քան 200 001 դրամ
90. չգիտեմ
99. մերժում

Սա հարցազրույցի վերջն է:
Շնորհակալություն Ձեր մասնակցության համար և Հաջողություն:
APPENDIX 3. CONSENT FORM (ENGLISH AND ARMENIAN)

CONSENT FORM TEMPLATE

**Title of Research Project:** A study of adherence and factors associated with adherence to physicians' instructions for physical activity among patients with first-time acute Myocardial Infarction.

**Explanation of Research Project:**

Hi, I am Mikhayil Melikov, a student of Public Health Department of the American University of Armenia. As a part of my course requirements, The American University of Armenia is conducting a study concerning adherence to physicians' instructions for physical activity among Myocardial infarction patients at the Institute of Cardiology in Yerevan. You are chosen to participate in this study since you were registered in the Institute of Cardiology within the period 2007-2008. You were selected randomly from the list of all Myocardial Infarction patients treating in the Institute of Cardiology. I would be very grateful to you if you answer some questions about your adherence to physicians' instructions for physical activity that I am going to ask. The interview will take from you approximately 15 minutes. Any information that you provide will be coded, held anonymous and will not be linked to your phone number. There is no risk to you. You will not receive any financial or other benefits for participation in this study. Your participation is very important and valuable for the investigation and hopefully it will help to promote physical activity as a cardiac rehabilitation program among Myocardial Infarction patients of the Yerevan. Your participation is voluntary. You can refuse to participate as well as you can refuse to answer any question you do not want to answer. Also you can interrupt the conversation whenever you want and there will be no negative consequences for you and it will not jeopardize future medical care. If you feel that you have been treated unfairly during this study you should contact Yelena Amirkhanyan, chair of Departmental IRB at (010)512592. For more information you can contact Varduhi Petrosyan, Associate Dean, College of Health Sciences: (010) 512564, e-mail: vpetrosi@aua.am or Mikhayil Melikov, studies' student investigator: (094) 077739; (010)563312, e-mail: mikhayil_melikov@edu.aua.am.

Thank you in advance. Do you have any questions?

So, would you like to participate?
Հաւասար տեղակացման ձև

Ուսումնասիրության անվանումը:
Հատուկ ծրագրեր պատրաստում այնպիսի ծրագրեր, որոնք հետաձև են բժշկական հարաբերությունները ֆիզիկական ակտիվության վերաբերյալ և վերջինի հետ պայմանավորված պատասխաններ:

Ուսումնասիրության դիրեկտոր Ռուզանի Ուատրոր

Բարել-դեզ, Ես Միխայիլ Մելիքովնեմ, Ես սովորում եմ Հայաստանի Ամերիկյան Համալսարանի Համալսարանային ֆիզիկական ակտիվության վերաբերյալ և վերջինի հետ պայմանավորված պատասխաններ:

Ավելի մանրամասն տեղեկություններ համար կարող եք դիմել Առողջապահական գիտությունների Քոլեջի փոխդեկան՝ Վարդուհի Պետրոսյանին: (010) 512564, e-mail: vpetrosi@aua.am կամ ուսումնասիրության ուսանող-փորձագետ՝ Միխայիլ Մելիքովին (ինձ), (094) 077739, e-mail: mikhayil_melikov@edu.aua.am

Արդյոք ունեք որևէ պարզաբանման կարիք/հարցեր?: Արդյոք դուք կուզենայք մասնակցել այս հարցմանը?