Enhanced motivational interviewing for reducing weight and increasing physical activity in adults with high cardiovascular risk: the MOVE IT three-arm RCT
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People who have a high risk of heart disease can reduce this risk by changing their lifestyles, such as by improving their diets and increasing their physical activity levels. However, there is no good evidence on how best to support people to change and then maintain healthier lifestyles. It is thought that support from others might be helpful. An intervention based on two talking therapies, called motivational interviewing and cognitive–behavioural therapy, to help people make a commitment to living healthier lives was developed. People from the local community with a health-related background were recruited and trained in these skills. Then general practitioners invited patients on their register who were at high risk of heart disease to participate. Those patients who replied and met the study criteria were randomly allocated to one of three arms. Participants received either group- or individual-based intensive lifestyle sessions or usual care. Those who were randomised to the lifestyle course were offered 10 sessions of therapy over 12 months by lifestyle trainers. Two years later, it was found that there were no differences in weight or physical activity levels between the three arms. The lifestyle interventions were not cost-effective compared with usual care. When the possible explanations were studied, it was found that those who could have benefited the most from the therapy (such as those who were most overweight, those from poorer backgrounds and those who were of African Caribbean ethnicity) were less likely to participate. Whether or not the skills of the therapists made a difference could not be properly assessed. Sometimes, patients and their doctors were not sure why they were invited. Future research should focus on people who have lifestyles that can be changed (e.g. more overweight individuals with unhealthy diets), on finding ways of improving the quality of the intervention and on ensuring that patients have more information.
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