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Abstract

**Background:** We recently reported the largest randomized trial of home-based pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) for Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) in the USA that showed improvement in all domains of quality of life, accelerometry-measured physical activity, and self-management. We aimed for an in-depth understanding of how patients experience complex, multi-component programs like to help uncover factors related to behavior change and to inform program scale-up in other populations. In addition, we used a theoretical framework to provide a structure for understanding patient experience in the larger context of behavior change interventions for patients with COPD.

**Study Design and Methods:** The parent trial was conducted with patients diagnosed with COPD who received care at an academic medical center and a community health system in the upper Midwest. The 12-week PR intervention included three video-guided exercises to be practiced daily, activity monitors, and weekly telephonic health coaching. Trial participants were eligible to participate in an individual interview about their experience if they completed the intervention within the prior 12 months. Individual interviews were conducted by telephone using a semi-structured guide. Analysis of verbatim transcripts followed an inductive thematic approach followed by deductive categorization and interpretation using a theoretical model (Capability, Opportunity, Motivation, Behavior [COM-B]) developed for linking intervention functions to aspects of behavioral change.

**Results:** Among 32 eligible program participants, 32 were approached, and 15 completed interviews between October 19th, 2021, and January 13th, 2022. The COM-B model and recommendations for program improvement were observed in the primary findings.
**Capability** included the knowledge and physical ability by participating in the program, including participants’ understanding of the exercises and their confidence in doing them despite physical limitations and fear of COPD exacerbation.

**Opportunity** included the perceptions that the program was convenient due to being self-paced and in a home-based setting. Health coaching also provided support, social influence, and accountability.

**Motivation** included a desire to feel better, improve health, and become more active and independent. Improvements in skills, mood, and attitudes from program participation further bolstered confidence and motivation, especially among participants concerned about completing the program at enrollment.  **Recommendations for improvement** included varying activities/exercises to maintain interest.

**Discussion:** Participants provided unique insights into how they engaged with program components and the ways that the program fostered behavior change. It highlighted ways that health coaching bolstered skills and confidence among participants with the poorest function at program enrollment and how improved physical function and mood led to motivation. It also highlighted the roles of technology and telephonic support in a home-based program. Suggestions for improvement, including exercise variations, are consistent with efforts to design complex interventions that can meet diverse patients’ needs.
Introduction

Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) is a prevalent lung condition in the USA, resulting in 15.4 million physician visits, 1.5 million emergency department (ED) visits, and 726,000 hospitalizations each year. Pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) has proven to be an effective means of improving the quality of life (QoL) and management of symptoms for patients living with COPD. However, adherence to these programs remains low. Traditional PR programs involve leaving one’s home and traveling to a wellness facility; attending center-based PR programs can be especially challenging.

Home-based programs have been proposed as an alternative for individuals that cannot participate in traditional programs, and have proved feasible, effective, and possibly non-inferior to center-based PR. However, the remote nature of these home-based programs may limit social interactions related to the modeling aspect of behavioral change.

This group initially reported the feasibility and effect size of a home-based PR program that significantly improved the QoL and the self-management abilities of people with moderate to severe COPD. A larger confirmatory study testing an updated home-based rehabilitation program, which included telephonic health coaching and remote monitoring to the activity-based program, showed significant improvement in patients' breathlessness, disease-specific QoL, measured daily physical activity, sleep, self-management, and depression-related symptoms.

A deeper understanding of how patients experience health behavior change interventions—especially complex, multi-component programs—is needed to untangle how diverse patients interact with programs and the factors related to behavior change. While previous qualitative research has provided insights into patient satisfaction with home-based
programs, this study not only provides insights on the patient experience but also uses a theory-based approach to understanding ways in which a specific home PR program — found to be effective in the largest home PR trial in the US — was experienced by individual patients.

Methods

Setting and Intervention

The parent trial was conducted with adult patients with a diagnosis of COPD who received care at an academic medical center and a community health system in the upper Midwest. The home-based PR program included three key components and was conducted over 12 weeks: 1) three daily mindfulness-based exercise practices guided by a recording on a computer tablet: two slow 6-minute walking (or balance) practices, and an upper extremity flexibility practice that could be completed either seated or standing; 2) remote monitoring using an activity monitor, an oximeter and a computer tablet for communication, exercises practices to follow and reports on steps, and patient-reported outcomes and accountability of daily exercises; and 3) weekly telephonic health coaching with a health coach trained in motivational interviewing (MI) and mindfulness. The health coaching sessions of the intervention specifically included mindfulness by cultivating the coach's ability to be present in the moment of coaching and to listen deeply.

Interview Recruitment

Trial participants were eligible to participate in an individual interview about their experience if they completed the 12-week PR intervention and completed post-intervention
measurements (filling out questionnaires and wearing an activity monitor) within the prior 12 months. Eligible participants were sent a letter and asked to contact study staff to express their interest in participating. Participants were provided $40 remuneration after the interview.

Data Collection

Interviews were conducted via telephone by members of the study team unaffiliated with the parent program delivery (JLR and WM) using a semi-structured interview guide developed to elicit information about motivations for participation, program experience (including the various components of the program), expected benefits or concerns, and recommendations for improvements (see Box 1 for topics and Supplementary file A for the full interview guide). The study team met weekly during data collection to discuss impressions and inform any necessary changes to the interview guide or sampling approach. Weekly reflections were also used to decide whether adequate interviews had been conducted to answer the research question (i.e., a high degree of data redundancy with each new interview), such that recruitment and data collection could stop. This study was approved by the Mayo Clinic Institutional Review Board (17-009449).

Data Analysis

Interviews were transcribed, de-identified, and reviewed for accuracy. Data analysis followed an inductive thematic approach to coding followed by categorization and interpretation using the Capability, Opportunity, Motivation, Behavior (COM-B) model, which was developed to provide a framework for connecting program functions to aspects of individual behavior change \(^{14}\). The COM-B model proposes that behavior, in this case, completion of home-based
PR, is the result of an interaction between a person’s capability (knowledge or skills), opportunity (societal influences or environmental resources), and motivation (emotion or beliefs and intentions) \(^ {15} \). This model was selected for its potential to understand how patients with varying social and health contexts experienced a home-based intervention with both technical and social components. In doing so, it identified ways the program can be used or improved to affect change. The COM-B model posits that behavior change is a result of an interaction between three components: psychological (knowledge) or physical (skills) capabilities; social (social support) or physical (environmental resources) opportunities; and automatic (emotion) or reflective (beliefs, intentions) motivation. A team of four investigators reviewed four transcripts to identify topics and created a coding framework and codebook with definitions and examples. The coding framework was independently applied to transcripts, coding was resolved through discussion, and transcripts were entered into qualitative analysis software (NVivo, QSR International) to assist with organization and analysis. Two investigators reviewed coding summaries and wrote analytic memos. Interpretation of findings was organized around the COM-B model \(^ {15} \).

**Results**

Thirty-two eligible trial participants were approached to participate, and between October 19\(^ {th} \), 2021, and January 13\(^ {th} \), 2022, 15 individuals consented and completed interviews. The mean duration was 46 minutes (range 24 to 84 minutes). Patient characteristics are shown in Table 1. Participants differed in COPD severity and daily activity, with daily steps ranging from 1,062 to 14,215. At the time of their participation in the program, none of the patients were active smokers. Participants also varied in their places of residence (some lived in private homes while others lived in assisted living facilities) and working status (most patients were retired).
Qualitative findings are summarized below and in Figure 1 by constructs in the COM-B model. Table 2 provides additional exemplar quotations from participants by constructs in the model. Results are focused on the three aspects (capability [C], opportunity [O], and motivation [M]) that impact behavior change, in this case, engagement with the PR intervention. Recommendations for program improvement are also summarized below.

**Capability:**

The analysis identified physical and psychological capabilities relevant to starting and continuing the program. Several reported having tried other rehabilitation programs in the past with mixed results. There were differences in how capable participants said they felt about doing the activities described to them, including the breathing exercises and walking exercises. Some reported feeling confident and described the program as “doable.” As described by one patient who was using a wheelchair at the time of enrollment: “*When he told me I could do a six-minute walk, and it was like a snail, I thought, I can do that…. I was so excited to just find a way to start moving again.*” (Patient 6). Other patients had concerns about starting the program and being able to do the exercises because of their breathing issues. Those patients reported mostly sedentary lives due to shortness of breath, limited energy, and fears of exacerbations at enrollment. For patients concerned about the challenges of participating, some noted the possibility for improvement in their QoL as a reason to join despite reservations. In both cases, participants described study staff providing information about the exercises and the reasons they were developed specifically to support people with COPD. That knowledge helped engage participants whether they found the program doable or challenging.

Patients also described improved moods and attitudes. For example, before beginning the program, one patient explained, “*I fell into a negative depressional spiral. And this program*
really helped me emotionally, mentally, and motivationally to come out of it, and to really reclaim my life and my independence” (Patient 3). Many patients also reported approaching exercise and a healthy lifestyle with a positive mindset following the program. That combination of improved physical and psychological capacity impacted motivation to continue, especially among patients for whom the goal for participating was to feel and breathe better.

Both physical and psychological capabilities were reported as being supported by the health coach. Participants reported the impact of health coaching on their confidence to do the exercises and adapt exercises to meet their needs. The following patient (Patient 3), who reported being severely depressed and experiencing panic attacks due to fear of COPD exacerbations when she entered the program, described in the interview how the personal health coaching approach made her feel “empowered:” “And so, I'd have to say she [my health coach] was a very large influence. And she was very powerful in helping me to help myself. She empowered me. She's a great person.”.

**Opportunity:**

There were both physical and social aspects of opportunity described by participants in this study. Most notably, patients reported being excited about doing a PR program from the comfort of their homes. One patient described their home as a “comfort zone” because of their physical limitations and the threat of a COVID infection. She would only leave her home to attend doctors' appointments and pick up medications from a pharmacy. This patient stated: "And so, you know, he explained to me that... I wouldn't have to worry about anybody coming in... it'll be done virtually. And that just seemed like the perfect thing for me... I didn't have to get in the truck and go anywhere” (Patient 1). Another patient recalled being unable to attend PR in person because of their work schedule.
Given that the program was remote and asynchronous, patients could vary the time of day and the number of times exercises were completed. Patients collaborated with their health coach to discover a personalized approach to the program that worked best for them. Additionally, many patients commented that they were pleased to discover the opportunity to do the program on their own time and at their own pace (i.e., able to take breaks when/if needed). For example, one interviewee lived in a large, assisted living facility and used the long hallways for the walking practice. Another patient reported, “I have a very large railing around ... the Living Center. So, I could hit the pause button on the tablet and take a break” (Patient 3). Other patients lived in private residences that varied in how suitable they were for walking practice due to space limitations.

The interviews provided insight into how participants relied on their health coach. When asked about their health coach, one patient stated, “It's hard to make yourself get out and do exercises when you're alone. If you've got somebody doing them with you, [it's] a lot easier” (Patient 1). Many patients appreciated the check-in with their health coach. They found their health coach very respectful, enjoyed their conversations, and valued their bond and partnership. For example, one patient stated, "I loved talking to [my health coach] every week. She was, you know, very attentive and very helpful. And very encouraging" (Patient 6). Several patients mentioned that they felt emotionally empowered to invest time in their self-care and daily physical activity, which gave them hope and a sense of gratitude. Specifically, there were reports that the program gave them hope for themselves and their condition.

**Motivation:**
A common motivation described by participants was a desire to improve physical health and daily physical activity. When reflecting on living with COPD, one patient stated, “well, I mean, when you have a hard time breathing... anything that you think could help you, you're willing to try it” (Patient 11). Additional comments regarding patient motivations included wanting to breathe better, do things without losing their breath, and engage more in social activities, such as spending time with family and friends. Additionally, many patients expressed goals and expectations to improve endurance, strength, and walking distance. Even when expectations for outcomes were low, some patients thought that adding lower-intensity exercise to their day would not hurt and could help. Those who started and kept up the routine for a few weeks found the program was easier than anticipated, and they could create a daily routine to complete their practice.

Similarly, at the beginning of the exercise program, some patients found it hard to complete the exercises; they experienced sore muscles and had to take breaks. However, after sticking with it, they noticed improvements in their walking endurance and breathing. For example, one patient who identified as incredibly limited, too breathless to leave the house, and experienced panic attacks over fears of feeling shortness of breath before the program explained that "as the weeks went by, I gradually got stronger and was able to walk more and more. And the physical limitations I had started to become less and less... was sitting and doing exercises, to begin with, but towards the end, I was actually standing doing the exercises... for 13 years, I've had a walker that I've walked behind, and I no longer use that walker to walk I can walk on my own.” (Patient 3). Another patient who had to retire from his job due to failing an employment-related health physical found himself leading an inactive lifestyle. However, after
beginning the program, he stated, “it was really a good experience because it kept me in a routine every day” (Patient 4).

Patients also reflected on improvements during the program, which served as motivation to continue. One patient reported returning to everyday activities, such as making the bed, cleaning, and cooking, that they could not do before the program. She commented that these improvements "allowed me to find success in very small places. And that made me feel good about myself. And when I felt better about myself, I think I had better hope for things to come," which led to the comment “I was pretty motivated to keep that going” (Patient 6). Patients referred to an overall sense of improvement in their exercise capacity, mainly walking more and breathing better while performing daily activities. Patients clearly stated that the program motivated them to stay active in their daily routines. Many patients mentioned that benefits appeared with long-term practice. One patient who, at baseline, was only able to take 20 steps before needing to pause and catch their breath reported: “The longer I was doing it, the better I was feeling. You know, it isn't a quick fix... it takes weeks before you start noticing a difference,” (Patient 2). However, after sticking with the program, this patient reported being able to do yard work and taking what he described as “long walks” outdoors.

Patients reported that they found their health coach to be a good motivator and helped encourage them to continue with the program. The coach monitored their progress and helped them progress toward their step goal. Many patients also reported that their health coach held them accountable during the 12-week program. When reflecting on their program experience, one patient mentioned, “the accountability of having the check-in record and then checking in with, with the rehab coach weekly like that, I think that makes a huge difference... I know it would benefit me, and I feel like it would benefit others as well” (Patient 13).
Recommendations for program improvement:

Although most patients reported satisfaction with the exercises, especially their capacity to complete them despite physical challenges, a few patients found the program too easy or monotonous and suggested adding variations to the exercises. For example, one patient who began the program with an average of 6,374 steps per day explained that she “found the exercising to be very boring. It's just not anything that would challenge you, wasn't enough variety to it. So, I just kind of lost interest in that,” (Patient 11). Other patients mentioned that having more exercise options with some moderate-intensity exercise would have been beneficial for them. Also, although the majority found the interactions with their health coach beneficial, a small minority found this partnership less valuable, described it as just another thing to do in the program, and recommended health coaching as an optional component.

Some patients also reported wanting an improved transition after the program, e.g., the possibility of monthly check-ins with the coach for accountability and keeping the tablet to continue with their exercise routine. Although YouTube links to the videos and DVDs are an option, one patient recommended a physical copy of the exercises or even the ability to purchase the tablet or an app with the program on it. Several patients stated that they wanted to keep the tablet after the 12-week intervention and were willing to pay for it, as they felt they needed it to continue doing the exercises, suggesting a feedback loop with perceived capabilities around sustained behavior change. One patient explained that he “struggled” to continue practicing the program exercises after returning the tablet. He described, “yeah, I would have bought it… If I had the tablet, if I had the visual in front of me. And tablet in front of me. I would go back to
"doing those exercises" (Patient 5). This patient suggests that the continuation of the program exercises could have been aided by post-program interaction with the computer tablet.

Discussion

This qualitative study provides insights into how patients who completed a home-based PR program experienced it, including reasons for participation and ways that features of the program and behavioral aspects of participation intersected. While all patients completed the program, they varied in several key characteristics potentially related to behavior change, including their physical and emotional readiness at enrollment. Previous research has found patients to express concern about “starting out” and their ability to begin pulmonary rehabilitation after living a rather sedentary lifestyle\textsuperscript{11,16}. We found that knowledge about what to expect in the program, the realization of physical or emotional benefits during participation, and continued motivational support during the program were key to patients’ initial and ongoing involvement in the program.

The health coaching component was key in how participants experienced behavior change. One likely factor for the positive impact of the health coach on the patient experience of PR stems from the use of motivational interviewing\textsuperscript{11,17}, which promotes autonomy. Specifically, the health coach does not tell the patient what to do but instead uses their values to illicit behavior change in the patients\textsuperscript{18,19}. Health coaching involves three aspects of motivational interviewing: an evocation of the patient's reasons to change or do a particular behavior, the sincere cognition of the patient's capabilities (autonomy), and the ability of the coach to be “in people's shoes” (compassion). In addition, this health coaching program adopted mindfulness by cultivating the coach's ability to be present in the moment of coaching despite distractions and to listen deeply. Health coaching has been reported to motivate patients to continue with PR
through social support. In this study, we found that coaching motivated behavior change through empowerment and accountability and that coaches also provided support to adapt exercises to fit participant needs. This further supports the importance of social engagement and partnership with the patients in PR and aligns with our previous findings that health coach engagement can positively impact self-management abilities. Previous studies have found that interactions with peers help patients stay active and compliant with behavior change programs.

The health coaching component of this PR program may provide a sufficient substitute for the lack of interaction with other patients in home-based programs and downplay the absence of a "modeling effect" from peers.

Our findings were also consistent with other research that reported patient appreciation for the home-based nature of the program. The patient experience in this report endorses the positive results of the parent study in QoL, physical activity, and self-management and suggests the importance of adding health coaching in the context of PR behavior change. It also proposes the potential benefit of training PR providers in MI and the science of behavior change. Remote patient monitoring and remote therapy CPT codes could be health coaching and lifestyle monitoring reimbursement options. However, bringing health coaching to daily practice will require providers' and administrators' collaborative effort to bill for it. There may have been additional benefits to this program because it took place during the COVID-19 pandemic, which brought risks to in-person program attendance and disrupted some social opportunities for patients with COPD. Still, patients expressed that the home-based program may require support from a PR provider or health coach to consider how exercises can be done in different home settings and can be maintained (forming a habit).
There are some limitations to this work. This study did not include patients who withdrew from the study or did not complete the intervention. Although their experiences are critical to understanding barriers to participation, those patients were not eligible for inclusion under the parameters of the parent study. The qualitative nature of this inquiry and its sample size also limits generalizability; however, the relatively homogenous study population, focused research question, and use of theory as a systematic guide to analysis and interpretation are consistent with samples of this size. The use of theoretical framework also bolsters the transferability of these findings to other similar settings and interventions. Like the parent trial, this study enrolled a demographically homogenous population. Specifically, these participants were all patients of a midwestern hospital with a primarily white, non-Hispanic, English-speaking patient population. Future research is needed to understand aspects of behavior change, including social norms, socioeconomic status, cultural beliefs, and structural or environmental factors of opportunity that may differ. This investigative team is working on modifying the program to engage minority populations, including the COPD minority groups that experience dramatic issues relating to social determinants of health.

**Conclusion**

This study used a theory-based approach to unpack the experience of patients with COPD who completed a home-based PR program, including their perspectives on factors that may impact program completion and subsequent behavior change. Patients found the program feasible and described improved mood, attitudes, and physical function. Health coaching provides support, motivation, and accountability. Home-based programs like this should consider the unique factors that bolster motivation and self-efficacy to complete the program and structural ways to support initial uptake and sustained use. Our findings may be significant in
informing the growing field of home-based programs for COPD—especially the combination of technical and social aspects—which is critically needed to increase the uptake and adherence of PR, further unveiled by the COVID-19 pandemic.
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Box 1. Example questions from the semi-structured interview guide

Table 1. Patient characteristics.
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Figure 1. Themes presented within the COM-B model.
Box 1. Topics covered in the semi-structured interview guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Patient: Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Experience of living with COPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Description of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion of interests, motivations, and goals related to participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns related to participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discussion of rehab routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rehab Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Health Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Activity trackers and technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenges of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Benefits and drawbacks of the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Patient: Post-Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Activity level after the pulmonary rehab intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Changes in health behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Continuation or cessation of program exercises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge gained from the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenges of living with COPD as they relate to the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendations to improve the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Other aspects of the program not covered in the interview questions.

Table 1. Patient characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient ID</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>mMRC Score</th>
<th>FEV1% Predicted</th>
<th>Baseline Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4130.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9318.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2062.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5766.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8960.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Insufficient data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7383.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6374.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8229.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2614.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4825.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Patient quotes categorized using COM-B model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COM-B Constructs</th>
<th>COM-B Sub-constructs</th>
<th>Representative Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>Physical Skills</td>
<td>“And as the weeks went by, I gradually got stronger and was able to walk more and more. And the physical limitations I had started to become less and less… was sitting and doing exercises to begin with, but towards the end, I was actually standing doing the exercises… For 13 years, I've had a walker that I've walked behind, and I no longer use that walker to walk behind I can walk on my own.” (Patient 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Well, the program has helped me to breathe deeper. And that was one of the things that this program has helped me with. And that's helped some with my walking. Being able to breathe deeper and being more conscious of it.” (Patient 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Skills</td>
<td>“I had that negative aspect in my life that I can't do anymore, I'm dying, I'm you know, I fell into a negative depressional spiral. And this program really helped me emotionally mentally and motivationally to come out of it, and to really reclaim my life and my independence.” (Patient 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“But I think, yes, and you become, I became more, it just is another level of awareness. This is who I am, this is where I am. This is where my body is at. It's okay to be here. You know, I'm working at it. I'm working at not getting any...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
worse. I'm working at trying to maybe not heal my disease, but certainly live with it.” (Patient 6)

| Opportunity       | Physical Environment   | “And so, you know, he explained to me that… I wouldn't have to worry about anybody coming in… that it'll be done virtually. And that just seemed like the perfect thing for me…I didn't have to get in the truck and go anywhere.” (Patient 1) |
|-------------------|------------------------| “If I would have had to go and get in the car and go to a setting with other people and so on. I wouldn't have done it.” (Patient 9) |
| Social Influences | “Well, I can say, a very important components for me was my health coach. [She] was so easy to talk to and so down to earth…. We talked to each other, and we treated each other like friends. And she gave me so much inspiration, and hope. And she was always easy to congratulate me on my accomplishments.” (Patient 3) |
|                   | “I loved talking to [my health coach] every week, she was, you know, very attentive and very helpful. And very encouraging.” (Patient 6) |
| Motivation        | Reflective             | “Well, I mean, when you have a hard time breathing... anything that you think could help you, you're willing to try it.” (Patient 11) |
|                   |                        | “I want to live a long time. And I felt that this program would give me some knowledge of how to cope. And how to adjust as my breathing got worse over the years.” (Patient 14) |
“So, there is a mindset that changes through the program, the more you exercise in the morning, follow the program, your mindset changes from always being focused on poor me, and I can't do this too I can't believe that I did it. You're in celebration mode so much. It's a different lifestyle completely.” (Patient 3)

Well, I, I found that I was able to use the pursed lip breathing, I was able to put that into my day. In fact, I almost always pursed lip breath throughout the day.” (Patient 12)
Figure 1. Themes presented within the COM-B model.
QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK: HOME PULMONARY REHAB SYSTEM IN A HISPANIC COHORT

Introduction: We are interested in hearing more about your experience with the home pulmonary rehabilitation program. Your input will help us understand how well the program is working. This information will also help us make any necessary improvements for patients in the future.

The Patient: Baseline
Before I ask you about the program specifically, I’d like to learn more about you and your experience with your lung condition, if that’s okay.

1. Imagining yourself before the rehabilitation program, what was it like to be living with COPD? How were you feeling about what this condition meant for you?
   a. What did you find most challenging regarding your lung disease or condition?
   b. What were you most hopeful to work on regarding your health/lung disease or condition?
2. Prior to the program, what did your average day look like in terms of your activities?
   a. How much of your day-to-day life was affected or impacted by this lung disease or condition?
   b. How did your condition impact activities with others, such as family or coworkers?
3. Can you tell me about the symptoms you were experiencing (most days)?
   a. What challenges, if any, did you have managing symptoms or getting care that you needed?

Program introduction
Thanks for helping me learn about you and understand your experience with this condition. I’d like to ask you some more specific questions about your experience with this home rehabilitation program now, but please feel free to share any information—as we go—that you think would help me understand the program or what it means for you or your condition.

4. How was the program first described to you?
   a. What do you think were the reasons that you were invited to be a part of it?
5. What were some of the reasons you were interested in the program?
   a. Did you have other options for pulmonary rehabilitation that you were also considering? If so, what made you choose this option?
6. Did you have any goals you wanted to achieve in terms of your health or any other aspects of your life (probe for function, quality of life, etc.) before entering the program?
7. What reservations or worries did you have about participating, if any? Why?

Program experience

8. The actual program has several pieces to it. The way each person uses the program, including how much they do most days, might vary, and that’s fine. Can you describe for me what your rehabilitation routine looked like on an average day while you were in the program?

9. As I mentioned, the program has several components, including activity trackers, tablet exercises, and a health coach. Were there parts of the program that you enjoyed more than others or found worked better for you?

10. What did you find hardest about going through the program? And why?
   a. (If an item reflects an aspect of the program itself): What was it about that particular part of the program that made it so specifically challenging?
   b. Were you able to overcome those challenges? If yes, how? If not, why?
      A. [If participant had goals before or during the program] We talked earlier about expectations before you entered the program. As you were going through the program, how did you reflect on those goals, if at all, or adapt or add new goals?
   c. How did you think about success as you were moving through the program?
      A. [If participant had no goals before starting] We talked earlier about expectations before you entered the program, and it sounds like you didn’t have many expectations or goals going in. As you were going through the program, did you develop any new goals?
   d. How did you think about success as you were moving through the program?

11. Now that you have finished the program, how effective do you think the program was for you? (Probe for health behaviors like exercise)

12. Were there any benefits to participating that you didn’t anticipate?

13. How about drawbacks?
The Patient: Post-Intervention

Now that you have officially completed the program, we are interested in how much people continue to use or benefit from the program, if at all.

14. Can you tell me a bit about your day-to-day activities now on an average day? (Probe for daily function and any types of health behaviors/exercise).
   a. What impact (if any) does this program still have on your daily life?
   b. What health behaviors or changes (if any) do you imagine continuing in the future because of the program? Why or why not?

15. Are there aspects of the rehabilitation program that you keep up—either things that were a part of the program or others?
   a. What makes it easier / harder to keep up with the rehabilitation activities you enjoy?

16. This is the first time this program has been available for people with your type of lung condition. Now that you’ve been through the program, what are your thoughts about this type of program for people with your condition?
   a. [If the participant has done other types of rehabilitation program before] How does this program differ from rehabilitation programs you’ve done before, if at all?

17. We talked earlier about what it was like living with COPD prior to your participation in the program. Is there anything new you learned about your lung disease/condition after completing the program?

18. We also talked about what you found most challenging regarding life with your lung disease/condition before the program. Did you find that this program helped you face what you found most challenging?

19. What more could a program like this do for people with your condition?

Closing

20. Given your experience of living with COPD and your expertise of this condition and the rehabilitation program, what would you say to a patient who is considering participating in the program?

21. Given your expertise, what would you say to the program director in charge of this pulmonary rehabilitation program?
   a. Do you have any recommendations to improve the experience of this program for future participants?
   b. Is there anything you think was overlooked by the director or your health coach during this program?
22. What else should I know about your experience with this program?