Title: Evaluation of the WHO HEARTS hypertension control package in primary care clinics of rural Bangladesh: a quasi-experimental trial

Short Title: The Bangladesh HEARTS hypertension control trial

Authors: Ahmad Abrar¹, Jubaida Akhtar¹, Xiao Hu², Shamim Jubayer¹, Mohammad Noor Nabi Sayem¹, Sarmin Sultana¹, Mohammad Abdullah Al Mamun¹, Mahfuzur Rahman Bhuiyan¹, Fazilatun-nesa Malik¹, Mohammad Robed Amin³, Abdul Alim³, Reena Gupta^{4,5}, Di Zhao², Margaret Farrell⁴, Bolanle Banigbe,⁴ Kunihiro Matsushita², Daniel Burka⁴, Lawrence J. Appel², Andrew E. Moran^{4,6}, Sohel Reza Choudhury¹

Author Affiliations:

- 1. National Heart Foundation Hospital and Research Institute, Dhaka, Bangladesh
- 2. Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, U.S.A.
- 3. Non-communicable Diseases Control Program, Directorate General of Health Services, Dhaka, Bangladesh
- 4. Resolve to Save Lives, New York, NY, U.S.A.
- 5. University of California at San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, U.S.A.
- 6. Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, NY, U.S.A.

Corresponding Author:

Professor Sohel Reza Choudhury Department of Epidemiology and Research, National Heart Foundation Hospital and Research Institute Plot 7/2, Dhaka 1216, Bangladesh Sohel_r_choudhury@hotmail.com +8801713037254

Key words:

Hypertension Primary health care Team-based care

Counts:

Abstract word count: 297 (max 300) Main body text word count: 4,293 words (not including title page, abstract, references, tables and figure legends) References: 16 (max 50) Tables: 2 Figures: 4 (max tables and figures = 8)

1 Abstract:

2	Background: The World Health Organization (WHO) promotes the HEARTS technical package for
3	improving hypertension control worldwide, but its effectiveness has not been rigorously evaluated.
4	Methods: A matched-pair cluster quasi-experimental trial in Upazila Health Complexes (UHCs; primary
5	healthcare facilities) was conducted in rural Bangladesh. A total of 3,935 patients (mean age 52.3 years,
6	70.5% female) with uncontrolled hypertension (blood pressure [BP] ≥140/90 mm Hg regardless of
7	treatment history) were enrolled: 1,950 patients from 7 UHCs implementing HEARTS and 1,985 patients
8	from 7 matched usual care UHCs. WHO-HEARTS package intervention components were 1) simplified
9	treatment protocol, 2) reliable medication supply, 3) team-based care, 4) standardized follow-up, and 5)
10	a digital information system to track patients' BP and monitor program performance. The primary
11	outcome was systolic BP at six months measured at the patient's home; secondary outcomes were
12	diastolic BP, hypertension control rate (<140/90 mm Hg), and loss to follow-up. Multivariable mixed-
13	effect linear and Poisson models were conducted as appropriate.
14	Results: Baseline mean systolic BP was 158.4 mm Hg in the intervention group and 158.8 mm Hg in the
15	usual care group. At six months, the primary outcome was obtained in 95.5% of participants. Compared
16	to usual care, the intervention significantly lowered systolic BP (-23.7 mm Hg vs20.0 mm Hg; net
17	difference -3.7 mm Hg, p<0.001) and diastolic BP (-10.2 mm Hg vs8.3 mm Hg; net difference -1.9 mm
18	Hg, p<0.001) and improved hypertension control (62.0% vs. 49.7%, net difference 12.3%, p<0.001). The
19	occurrence of missed clinic visits was lower in the intervention group (8.8% vs. 39.3%, p<0.001).
20	Conclusions: In rural Bangladesh, WHO-HEARTS package implementation significantly lowered BP and
21	improved hypertension control. These results support scale up of the WHO-HEARTS hypertension control
22	package in Bangladesh and its implementation in other low- and middle-income countries.
23	[clinicaltrials.gov registration ID NCT04992039]

24 Clinical Perspective:

25	•	The Global Hearts Initiative is implementing a standard World Health Organization (WHO)
26		HEARTS package for hypertension control in primary care clinics of 32 low- and middle-income
27		settings. This quasi-experimental trial was completed alongside HEARTS program expansion in
28		rural Bangladesh and is the first to rigorously assess the complete HEARTS package for
29		hypertension.
30	•	Compared with usual care, the WHO-HEARTS package significantly lowered blood pressure and
31		improved hypertension control in hypertensive patients.
32	•	WHO-HEARTS package implementation was feasible and effectively improved hypertension
33		control in rural Bangladesh. The WHO-HEARTS is a standard and effective approach to
34		improving hypertension control in low- and middle-income countries.
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		

46 Introduction

High blood pressure (BP) is the leading preventable cause of death worldwide, accounting for over 10
million annual preventable deaths. Four out of every five hypertension patients live in low- and middleincome countries (LMICs).¹ According to the 2018 National STEPS Survey of NCD Risk Factors in
Bangladesh, of the estimated 21 million adults with hypertension, 54% were unaware of their
hypertension, 18% were diagnosed but untreated, 17% were treated but uncontrolled, and only 11% had
BP controlled <140/90 mm Hg.²

53 To improve hypertension control worldwide, the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2016 developed the HEARTS technical package,³ a practical, public health approach to scaling up national 54 hypertension control programs that is consistent with WHO hypertension treatment guidelines.⁴ HEARTS 55 56 recommends 1) simple treatment protocols with specific antihypertensive medications and doses, 2) 57 strategies to ensure a reliable supply of affordable, quality-assured antihypertensive medications, 3) 58 team-based care including non-physician health workers, 4) a patient-centered approach including 59 community-based hypertension care services, and 5) a robust health information system for tracking 60 hypertension patients and program performance over time. By 2022, over 12 million patients were 61 enrolled in HEARTS hypertension treatment programs in 32 countries,⁵ yet the complete HEARTS 62 package has never been rigorously evaluated. To increase hypertension detection and control in 63 Bangladesh, the Bangladesh Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MOHFW) and the National Heart 64 Foundation of Bangladesh (NHF-B) in collaboration with Resolve to Save Lives (RTSL) developed and 65 launched the Bangladesh Hypertension Control Initiative (BHCI), a HEARTS-based hypertension control 66 program in four health care facilities in 2018. In the context of an expansion in 2020 of the HEARTS 67 program to new health care facilities in rural Bangladesh, this study tested the effects of the WHO 68 HEARTS package implementation on hypertension outcomes.

69 Methods

70 Study design

71	The Bangladesh HEARTS Trial, a matched-pair cluster quasi-experimental trial, was conducted in 14
72	primary healthcare facilities named Upazila Health Complexes (UHCs) in rural Bangladesh to assess the
73	effectiveness of the WHO HEARTS package. Seven UHCs that had planned to implement the HEARTS
74	package under ongoing expansion of the BHCI program were selected as intervention sites. Six UHCs in
75	the geographically separated Jamalpur district plus one geographically similar UHC in Habiganj district
76	served as the usual care (control) UHCs. The seven intervention sites and the seven usual care sites were
77	matched on population size and literacy. Geographically isolated UHCs were purposely selected to be
78	intervention sites to reduce the risk of cross-facility contamination.
79	
80	Study participants
81	Inclusion criteria were age 18 years or older, diagnosis of hypertension (known prior diagnosis or a new
82	diagnosis), and a baseline systolic BP ≥140 mm Hg or diastolic BP ≥90 mm Hg (i.e., "uncontrolled
83	hypertension") regardless of whether the person was taking antihypertensive medication. Exclusion
84	criteria were current pregnancy, current treatment of an acute illness, terminal illness, or unwillingness
85	to provide informed consent.
86	
87	Recruitment
88	An identical opportunistic hypertension screening protocol was implemented in intervention and usual
89	care sites. All patients aged 18 years and older who presented to the outpatient reception desk of the
90	UHC for a non-emergency visit had their BP measured with an "arm in" automated oscillometric digital
91	BP device (A&D TM 2657P). For patients found to have systolic BP ≥130 or diastolic BP ≥80 mm Hg on the
92	first measurement, a second BP was measured by a nurse after an interval of two minutes. If the second

93 BP was systolic ≥140 or diastolic ≥90 mm Hg, the patient was referred to a medical officer on the same

94 day for a third, confirmatory BP. A hypertension diagnosis was made if the third, confirmatory BP by a 95 UHC medical officer was systolic \geq 140 or diastolic \geq 90 mm Hg. In some instances, due to staffing shortages, trained field research staff measured 2nd and 3rd BP in place of a UHC nurse and Medical 96 97 Officer; this was occasionally required in both intervention and usual care UHCs. Both the 2nd and 3rd BP measurements were performed using a validated desktop oscillometric digital BP measurement device 98 99 (Omron Model HBP-1120). Patients diagnosed with HTN were provided information about the HEARTS 100 trial, and for those agreeing to participate in the trial, informed consent was obtained. All eligible 101 patients were invited to enroll, irrespective of their antihypertensive medication use at baseline. Age, 102 sex, history of comorbidities, prior hypertension treatment were self-reported at baseline. 103 **Hypertension management** 104 105 Consented patients with confirmed hypertension at the intervention sites received hypertension care 106 according to the WHO HEARTS technical package. As shown in Supplementary Table 1, key components 107 of the HEARTS intervention were 1) use of a three-step, drug-and dose-specific hypertension treatment 108 protocol (Figure 1), 2) standardized inventory and procurement practices to ensure a reliable supply of 109 protocol medications, 3) team-based care involving Medical Officers (physicians), nurses and medical 110 assistants, 4) a standardized approach to follow-up and retain patients in care, and 5) a digital health 111 information system (the Simple mobile application, www.simple.org) for registering patients into a secure database and tracking patient hypertension management and program performance over time.⁶ 112 113 Intervention UHC patients who missed a scheduled follow-up visit were contacted by phone and advised to attend the UHC at earliest convenience. 114 115 Usual care site patients received the less structured hypertension management services commonly 116 provided in UHCs outside of the HEARTS program (Supplementary Table 1). Specifically, there was no

117	standardized treatment protocol, no expanded team-based care, no schedule of systematic patient
118	follow-up, and there were no added efforts to improve adherence and retention in care.
119	There were some features similar in both the intervention and usual care sites. Nurses were trained on
120	BP measurement and to use the Simple app to record BP measurements and medication data. Both
121	intervention and usual care site patients had access to hypertension medications free of charge.
122	
123	Endline blood pressure outcomes
124	The primary outcome was the difference between the intervention and usual care sites in change of
125	systolic BP from the baseline measurement to a follow up measurement six months later. Because of
126	severe flooding at several sites at approximately six months, follow-up was extended in both groups by
127	two months, if needed, in order to complete the follow-up visit to assess endline BP. The mean length of
128	observation time (±standard deviation) from baseline to endline measurement was 238.9±26.4 days in
129	intervention group and 233.5±29.0 days in usual care group. The research team decided to obtain
130	endline BP in homes, instead of the UHC clinics, to obtain high ascertainment of trial outcomes and
131	minimize the potential impact of differential loss-to-follow-up in the usual care and intervention sites.
132	At the six month follow-up visit, research staff obtained triplicate measures of BP in the participants'
133	homes in both the intervention and usual care clusters using standard technique and the same Omron
134	Model HBP-1120 used during the baseline assessment. The average of the 2 nd and 3 rd readings
135	represented each participant's endline BP.
136	
137	Secondary outcomes were between-group difference in change of diastolic BP, hypertension control rate

139 number of enrolled patients with controlled BP (systolic BP <140 and diastolic BP <90 mm Hg) measured

at six months, loss to follow-up, and early follow-up rate. Hypertension control rate was defined as the

138

140 in the community at six months divided by the number of enrolled patients who completed the 6-month

follow up visit. Loss to follow-up rate was defined as the number of enrolled patients with no clinic visit through the entire 6-month follow up period divided by the number of enrolled patients who completed the 6-month follow up visit. Early follow-up rate was defined as enrolled patients with clinic visit within the first 3 months after enrollment divided by the number of enrolled patients who completed the 6month follow up visit.

146

147 Endline questionnaire

148 Along with measuring the endline BP, patients were also invited to provide verbal responses to a 149 standard questionnaire (Supplemental Material appendix 1). The endline questionnaire included medication information including dose and dosage frequency, medication adherence for the last 7 days, 150 experience of medicine-related adverse effects, incident hypertension-related complications or 151 152 hospitalizations, and other implementation outcomes. Questionnaire responses assessed between-153 group differences in implementation outcomes between the HEARTS intervention and usual care groups. 154 In response to the questions related to level of satisfaction with the quality of hypertension care 155 received at the UHC in the past six months, those who responded 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' were 156 categorized as satisfied. Responses indicating 'agree' or 'strongly agree' to the question on self-perceived 157 improvement in hypertension self-management were classified as 'improved ability'. Responses from 158 participants expressing 'definitely yes' or a 'possibly' about the intention to visit UHC again for continued 159 hypertension treatment were classified as 'again'. Participants who received treatment for hypertension 160 elsewhere before visiting the study UHC were asked to compare their experience about out-of-pocket 161 expenditure for hypertension treatment. A response with 'yes' was considered as spending 'less money' since coming to UHC for hypertension treatment. Participants reporting they were unable to pay any 162 163 medical bills in past 12 months were defined as having had a 'bill problem'.

164

165 A medication intensity score was calculated by standardizing use of multiple antihypertensive drugs with 166 different doses and dosage frequencies to assess the between-group difference in use of medication at 167 endline. The endline questionnaire collected names, dosage and frequency of 17 antihypertensive 168 medicines. To calculate the medication intensity score for one medicine, the prescribed daily dose for 169 this medicine was set as the numerator. The denominator was the daily standard dose, as sourced from 170 UpToDate (uptodate.com) and MayoClinic.org. For example, the standard dose for amlodipine is 5 mg 171 (Supplementary Table 1). If a participant was taking amlodipine once a day with a 10 mg dosage each 172 time, the score for amlodipine would be 10 mg $^{1/5}$ mg =2. If a medicine listed was not used by a 173 participant, the score for this medicine was simply 0. This score was calculated for each individual 174 medicine and summed up for all of the patient's medicines to derive a total score, used as the medication intensity score for that participant. The score was computed for each participant who 175 176 completed the endline questionnaire. Adherence to the medication was assessed by self-reported 177 missing one or more days of medication in the week prior to the endline follow-up visit. 178 Given the unexpected flooding, in the questionnaire, participants were also asked whether flooding 179 prevented them from visiting the UHC or getting a refill of medication in the past 2 months. 180

181 Statistical analysis

A sample size of 2,100 was estimated to provide a minimal detectable difference of 5 mm Hg in systolic BP between the intervention and usual care groups with 150 participants in each cluster, assuming a type I error of 5%, power of 80%, mean (SD) systolic BP of 148 (20) mm Hg at baseline, intra-cluster correlation coefficient of 0.01,⁷ follow-up rate of 50% (based on experience in an initial pilot), and a coefficient of variation of cluster size of 0.65.⁸ This sample size was planned for enrollment over a threemonth period. Observing an overwhelming response from patients seeking to be enrolled into

hypertension care at both HEARTS intervention and usual care sites, researchers decided to continue the
enrollment for three months as planned even after the initial sample size goal was reached. The final
enrollment number was 3,935.

191 Descriptive statistics summarized baseline characteristics of the intervention and usual care sites. To evaluate the effect of intervention on the changes of systolic and diastolic BP over follow-up, we used 192 193 linear mixed effect models with a three-level hierarchical approach. The first level represents within-194 person variation with multiple BP measurements over time. The second level represents the variation of 195 BP across participants, and the third level represents the variation across clusters. Between group 196 differences (95% confidence intervals [CI]) in BP change over six months were evaluated from the 197 interaction term between the intervention group and the visit (follow-up vs baseline). Given the small number of clusters, we adopted unmatched analysis as the main statistical analytical method.⁹ 198 199 We also evaluated the effect of intervention on hypertension control rate, follow-up rate and patient-200 reported features of care, including the quality of hypertension care, reported improved BP 201 management, planning to visit UHC again to receive ongoing treatment, spending less money coming to 202 UHC compared to seeking treatment elsewhere, and having billing problems. We used mixed-effects 203 Poisson regression with robust variance to estimate the incidence rate ratio (IRR) and 95% CI for these 204 outcomes comparing intervention vs. usual care group. Additionally, we calculated the marginally 205 adjusted rate of these outcomes for each group and the mean differences. 206 For all analyses, we used a intention-to-treat analysis approach and adjusted for individual-level

207 confounders including intervention group, age, sex, baseline assessment of history of heart attack,
208 stroke, chronic kidney disease, diabetes, prior hypertension treatment, whether a severe flooding event
209 that occurred at about six month's follow up affected medication refill, as well as cluster-level

210 coi	nfounders ii	ncluding po	pulation size	e, area size	, and literacy	y rate. For	outcomes of	BP chan	ges over
---------	--------------	-------------	---------------	--------------	----------------	-------------	-------------	---------	----------

- time, we also incorporated interaction terms between visit and these baseline individual-level covariates.
- 212 We conducted subgroup analyses in strata defined by age, sex, baseline BP, hypertension medication
- use, and diabetes. For sensitivity analyses, we used two-level mixed effect models at the individual to
- estimate the differences in BP change within each matched cluster pair, then pooled the estimates from
- all cluster pairs together using meta-analysis random-effect model.
- 216

217 Ethical considerations:

218 IRB approval was obtained from the National Ethics Review Committee of the Bangladesh Medical

219 Research Council (BMRC) and the internal review board of Vital Strategies (the organization that Resolve

to Save Lives was part of at that time). This trial was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov. (Trial registration ID

221 NCT04992039). All participants provided written informed consent.

- 222
- 223 Results
- 224 Participant enrollment at baseline and follow-up at six months

Among 9,056 adults screened for eligibility (5,692 in intervention group, 3,364 in usual care),

5,121 participants did not meet the inclusion criteria (3,742 in intervention group, 1,379 in usual care)

- (Figure 2). The study population therefore included 3,935 participants (1,950 in intervention group,
- 1,985 in usual care group). The number of patients lost-to-follow up at the time of the six-month endline
- visit was 47 (2.4% of enrolled) in intervention group and 81 (4.1% of enrolled) in usual care group.
- 230 Twelve patients had discontinued hypertension treatment at UHCs (5 in intervention group and 7 in

231	usual care group). There were 37 deaths during follow up (16 in intervention group and 21 in usual care
232	group). Finally, 3,758 participants (95.5%) remained in the analysis [1882 in intervention group (96.5%),
233	1876 in usual care group (94.5%)] after excluding those who were not available for the follow-up at the
234	six month endline visit for above reasons.

235 Participant characteristics

At baseline, mean (±SD) age of the participants was 52.3±12.4 years, and 70.5% were female; less than 1% had a history of heart attack, stroke, or chronic kidney disease. Baseline characteristics were generally similar in the intervention and usual care groups; however, the intervention group had higher use of antihypertensive medication at baseline (92.2% vs 68.8%) and a higher prevalence of diabetes (19.4% vs 7.5%; **Table 1**).

241 BP change and hypertension control at six months

242 At the six-month follow-up visit, mean adjusted systolic BP was 23.7 (95% CI, 22.7 to 24.7) mm 243 Hg lower than baseline in the intervention group and by 20.0 (95% CI, 19.1 to 21.0) mm Hg lower than 244 baseline in the usual care group. The intervention group experienced a greater systolic BP reduction 245 than the usual care group (net adjusted difference of -3.7 (95% CI, -2.2 to -5.1) mm Hg; Figure 3a). Mean 246 adjusted diastolic BP was reduced by 10.2 (95% CI, 9.7 to 10.8) mm Hg in the intervention group and by 247 8.3 (95% CI, 7.8 to 8.9) mm Hg in the usual care group. The intervention group experienced a greater 248 diastolic BP reduction than the usual care group (net adjusted difference of -1.9 (95% CI, -1.1 to -2.7) mm 249 Hg; Figure 3b). At six months, hypertension control was 62.0% (95% CI, 59.3 to 64.8%) in the intervention 250 group and 49.7% (95% CI, 46.7 to 52.6%) in the usual care group (net adjusted difference of 12.4% (95% 251 Cl, 8.0 to 16.8%); Figure 3c). In comparison with primary adjusted analyses, results of the crude analyses 252 showed slightly lesser differences in BP and hypertension control (Supplemental figures 2a, 2b, and 2c).

253

254 Subgroup analyses

255 In pre-specified subgroup analyses of systolic BP, diastolic BP, and hypertension control (Figures 256 4a, 4b, and 4c), the effect of the intervention group was always greater than that of the usual care group; in several instances, the subgroup difference in between-group outcomes was statistically 257 258 significant. The subgroups that appeared to have greater benefits from the intervention group were 259 persons older than age 55 years, men, and those not on medication at baseline. 260 Implementation outcomes at six months 261 262 Compared to patients in the usual care group (Table 2), patients in the HEARTS intervention group 263 were less likely to miss scheduled clinic visits (incidence rate ratio [IRR] 0.22, 95% CI: 0.15 to 0.32), and 264 more likely to have a clinic visit within the first 3 months after enrollment (IRR 1.67, 95% CI: 1.49 to 265 1.87). The medication intensity score at endline, standardized for dose and frequency, was higher in the 266 intervention group patients compared to the patients in the usual care group (1.52, 95% CI: 1.48 to 1.56) 267 vs. 1.01, 95% CI: 0.97 to 1.05). (Supplementary Table 4) 268 Patients in the intervention group were more satisfied with the quality of hypertension care 269 received at the HEARTS program UHCs (91.9% vs. 81.4%, p=0.002), felt they had improved their ability to

270 manage their hypertension (81.2% vs. 64.8%, p=0.011), and spent less money for their hypertension care

compared with usual care patients (88.6% vs 65.0%, p<0.001) (**Table 2**). Patients in the intervention

272 group had higher self-reported medication adherence and were more likely to be taking hypertension

273 medications at follow-up (i.e. taking antihypertensive medication at endline 95.4% in the intervention

274 group and 75.7% in usual care group, p<0.001, and missing at least 1 day of medication in the last week

was 41.2% in the intervention group and 99.9% in the usual care group, p<0.001) (supplementary table

276 7).

During the study, there was an unexpected severe flooding event that impacted both intervention and usual care groups, which occurred towards the end of follow-up. The intervention group was more affected by the flooding than the usual care group. Specifically, compared to patients in the usual care group, those in the intervention group reported that flood prevented them to attend one or more clinic visits (30% vs 8%, P<0.001) and flood prevented them to receive at least one medication refill (27% vs 9%, P<0.001).

283 Discussion

In this matched-pair cluster, quasi-experimental trial conducted in primary healthcare facilities in rural Bangladesh, we documented that implementation of the WHO-HEARTS hypertension control package significantly lowered both systolic and diastolic BP, and improved hypertension control compared with usual care. The HEARTS package appeared effective in all pre-specified groups, with some evidence of greater benefits in older persons, men, those with newly diagnosed hypertension, and those not taking anti-hypertensive medication at baseline.

290 The outcomes of the Bangladesh HEARTS trial align with other pragmatic trials of primary care-291 based trials based in LMIC settings testing a public health approach to hypertension control. Although 292 none of these studies specifically tested the WHO-HEARTS package, they often included features similar 293 to WHO-HEARTS, e.g, improved access to medicines, team-based, patient-centered approach, and systematic follow up).¹⁰⁻¹³ In these earlier trials, conducted in Bangladesh/Pakistan/Sri Lanka, Argentina, 294 295 Ghana, and China, the systolic BP change difference between intervention and usual care/control varied 296 between 3.6 and 14.5 mm Hg. Difference in hypertension control at endline varied between 5.2 and 297 32.5 percentage points. Notably, the Bangladesh HEARTS trial observed outcomes only at 6 months, 298 whereas the earlier pragmatic hypertension control trials observed outcomes from between 12 and 24 299 months, and most did not observe substantial intervention benefits until after 6 months of intervention

300 effect. The prior trial reporting the largest effect size, the China Rural Hypertension Control Project trial, 301 90% of intervention participants received free or discount-priced medicines, but not the usual care 302 group had higher out-of-pocket medicine costs, whereas in Bangladesh HEARTS and the other prior 303 trials, participant hypertension medicine costs were similar in intervention and usual care groups. 304 Process measures gathered at six months suggested superior HTN control program performance 305 at HEARTS intervention sites compared with usual care sites. In fact, we observed that the HEARTS 306 program demonstrated improvements in several primary drivers of improved BP control, including 307 higher retention in care and clinic visit frequency, medication adherence, and medicaton treatment 308 intensity score. Visit frequency, treatment intensity, and medication adherence are strongly correlated 309 with improved blood pressure control and likely contributed to the higher hypertension control observed in the intervention sites.^{14,15} A prior costing study established the budget impact of 310 Bangladesh HEARTS program implementation.¹⁶ Nonetheless, even at the intervention sites there is 311 312 ample room for continous quality improvement in these processes for the Bangladesh HEARTS program. 313 The endline survey also suggested superior patient-centered outcomes in the HEARTS program 314 compared with usual care,. Patients in the intervention group reported greater ability to manage their 315 hypertension, higher satisfaction with the quality of care provided from the primary healthcare facilities 316 of rural Bangladesh, and reduced out-of-pocket expenditures for hypertension care. Though between 317 group differences in implementation outcomes were modest, the overall pattern of results was uniformly 318 in favor of the HEARTS intervention.

Limitations of the study include a quasi-experimental design, rather than a randomized trial design. As a result of study design, there were some imbalances in baseline characteristics, with greater number of "hard-to-control" patients (e.g., those with diabetes and uncontrolled BP despite baseline anti-hypertensive medications) in the intervention group compared to the control group. Indeed, results were even strengthened after adjustment for multiple baseline covariates. Interestingly, subgroup

324 analysis showed a much greater systolic BP reduction of -7.5 mm Hg between intervention and usual 325 care participants not on medications at baseline. Second, unexpected severe flooding interrupted 326 delivery of care and medication refills, more so in the intervention sites. Hence, it is possible that 327 without the flooding, there would have been even greater benefits in the intervention group. Third, the 328 follow-up period was relatively short, just six months; nonetheless, the vast majority of patients in the 329 intervention group received treatment and achieved a high level of hypertension control, i.e., 62%. 330 Fourth, the study had different types of BP measurements at baseline (clinic measurements) and at 6 331 months (home measurements). Home measurements were selected because of concern that many 332 patients would not have a clinic visit at six months and that there would be a substantial difference 333 between usual care and intervention sites with the attendant risk of biased ascertainment. As displayed 334 in Table 2, this imbalance in clinic attendance did occur. In this context, the home BP, obtained in the 335 vast majority of participants (>95%) in both intervention and usual care sites, was a more unbiased 336 assessment of trial outcomes (difference between groups); however, use of home-measured BP at six 337 months might overestimate the magnitude of change from baseline.

Strengths of this study include enrollment of a diverse cohort of persons with uncontrolled hypertension
in rural Bangladesh, evaluation of a standardized package of hypertension control services package
recommended by WHO and endorsed by Bangladesh's national government, high retention in clinical
care in the intervention group, and nearly complete follow-up in both the intervention and usual care
sites.

Our study has important policy implications. The WHO has endorsed the HEARTS package for hypertension control since 2018, and by the end of 2022 over 12 million patients from 32 countries had been treated according to the HEARTS approach.⁵ Yet, no study had yet rigorously tested its effectiveness compared with usual hypertension care. To our knowledge, the Bangladesh HEARTS trial is

347	the first to formally evaluated the WHO HEARTS package compared with usual care. Additionally, the
348	results of this study support Bangladesh's plan to offer the WHO HEARTS package in all of Bangladesh's
349	492 UHC's. Our results are also potentially generalizable to rural medical clinics in other countries with a
350	similar system of health care delivery. Future studies should evaluate the HEARTS hypertension control
351	package in different health care and health insurance contexts, in urban vs. rural areas, and in
352	community-based care settings vs. standard clinics, with robust implementation evaluation. In rural
353	Bangladesh, persons typically seek medical care in one of approximately 14,000 community clinics, as
354	opposed to the nearest UHC, which is sometimes located at a considerable distance from patients'
355	homes. Scaling up patient-centered hypertension care in Bangladesh will require additional system
356	changes to provide hypertension care and potentially care for other NCDs in these community clinics,
357	which to date focus mostly on maternal and child healthcare.
358	In conclusion, in rural Bangladesh, the WHO-HEARTS package significantly lowered BP and
359	improved hypertension control. These results provide evidence to scale up the WHO-HEARTS
360	hypertension control package in Bangladesh and support its implementation in other low and middle-
361	income countries.
362	
363	
364	
365	
366	

368 Acknowledgments

369 The authors thank the hypertension patients who participated in the HEARTS program evaluation, and

370 we thank the dedicated health workers who made the HEARTS program and this study possible. We

also thank the Medical Officers and Project Officers of the Bangladesh Hypertension Control Initiative

372 (Bangladesh HEARTS) for their extraordinary efforts to complete this study and to deliver the HEARTS

- package of hypertension care to the people of Bangladesh living with hypertension. Medical Officers: Dr.
- Deb Dulal Dey Parag, Dr. Mahfuja Luna, Dr. Md Abbas Ibn Karim, Dr. Md. Ruhul Amin, and Dr. Md.
- 375 Shahinul Islam. Project Officers: Dr. Iqbal Ahmed Khan, Khondokar Ehsanul Amin, Md. Riasat Razi Ullah,
- and Md. Sazzad Hossain.

377 Sources of Funding

- 378 This study was supported by Resolve to Save Lives. Resolve to Save Lives is funded by Bloomberg
- 379 Philanthropies, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and Gates Philanthropy Partners, which is funded
- 380 with support from the Chan Zuckerberg Foundation.

381 Disclosures

382 The authors have no relevant conflicts of interest to declare.

383

384 References:

- Global report on hypertension: the race against a silent killer. In: Geneva: World Health
 Organization; 2023.
 World Health Organization Country Office for Bangladesh. National STEPS survey for non-
- 388 communicable diseases risk factors in Bangladesh 2018. Dhaka; 2018.
- World Health Organization. HEARTS Technical package for cardiovascular disease management in
 primary health care. In: Geneva: WHO; 2016.
- 3914.Al-Makki A, DiPette D, Whelton PK, Murad MH, Mustafa RA, Acharya S, Beheiry HM, Champagne
- 392B, Connell K, Cooney MT, et al. Hypertension Pharmacological Treatment in Adults: A World393Health Organization Guideline Executive Summary. Hypertension. 2022;79:293-301. doi:1011
- 10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.121.18192
 Moran AE, Gupta R, Global Hearts Initiative Collaborators. Implementation of Global Hearts
 Hypertension Control Programs in 32 Low- and Middle-Income Countries: JACC International. J
 Am Coll Cardiol. 2023;82:1868-1884. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2023.08.043
- Burka D, Gupta R, Moran AE, Cohn J, Choudhury SR, Cheadle T, Mullick R, Frieden TR. Keep it
 simple: designing a user-centred digital information system to support chronic disease
 management in low/middle-income countries. *BMJ Health & Care Informatics*.
 2023;30:e100641.
- 402 7. Gulliford MC, Adams G, Ukoumunne OC, Latinovic R, Chinn S, Campbell MJ. Intraclass correlation
 403 coefficient and outcome prevalence are associated in clustered binary data. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
 404 2005;58:246-251. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.08.012

405	8.	Eldridge SM, Ashby D, Kerry S. Sample size for cluster randomized trials: effect of coefficient of
406		variation of cluster size and analysis method. International journal of epidemiology.
407		2006;35:1292-1300.
408	9.	Hayes RJ, Moulton LH. Cluster Randomised Trials. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2009.
409	10.	He J. Irazola V. Mills KT. Poggio R. Beratarrechea A. Dolan J. Chen CS. Gibbons L. Krousel-Wood M.
410		Bazzano LA, et al. Effect of a Community Health Worker-Led Multicomponent Intervention on
411		Blood Pressure Control in Low-Income Patients in Argentina: A Randomized Clinical Trial, JAMA,
412		2017;318:1016-1025. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.11358
413	11.	Ogedegbe G, Plange-Rhule J, Gyamfi J, Chaplin W, Ntim M, Apusiga K, Iwelunmor J, Awudzi KY,
414		Quakyi KN, Mogaverro J, et al. Health insurance coverage with or without a nurse-led task
415		shifting strategy for hypertension control: A pragmatic cluster randomized trial in Ghana. PLoS
416		Med. 2018;15:e1002561. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002561
417	12.	Sun Y, Mu J, Wang DW, Ouyang N, Xing L, Guo X, Zhao C, Ren G, Ye N, Zhou Y, et al. A village
418		doctor-led multifaceted intervention for blood pressure control in rural China: an open, cluster
419		randomised trial. <i>Lancet</i> . 2022;399:1964-1975. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)00325-7
420	13.	Jafar TH, Gandhi M, de Silva HA, Jehan I, Naheed A, Finkelstein EA, Turner EL, Morisky D,
421		Kasturiratne A, Khan AH, et al. A Community-Based Intervention for Managing Hypertension in
422		Rural South Asia. <i>N Engl J Med</i> . 2020;382:717-726. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1911965
423	14.	Bellows BK, Ruiz-Negron N, Bibbins-Domingo K, King JB, Pletcher MJ, Moran AE, Fontil V. Clinic-
424		Based Strategies to Reach United States Million Hearts 2022 Blood Pressure Control Goals. Circ
425		Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes. 2019;12:e005624. doi: 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.118.005624
426	15.	Ordunez P, Campbell NRC, Giraldo Arcila GP, Angell SY, Lombardi C, Brettler JW, Rodriguez
427		Morales YA, Connell KL, Gamarra A, DiPette DJ, et al. HEARTS in the Americas: innovations for
428		improving hypertension and cardiovascular disease risk management in primary care. Rev
429		Panam Salud Publica. 2022;46:e96. doi: 10.26633/RPSP.2022.96
430	16.	Husain MJ, Haider MS, Tarannum R, Jubayer S, Bhuiyan MR, Kostova D, Moran AE, Choudhury SR.
431		Cost of primary care approaches for hypertension management and risk-based cardiovascular
432		disease prevention in Bangladesh: a HEARTS costing tool application. BMJ Open.
433		2022;12:e061467. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-061467
121		
454 125		
435		
430		
437		
430		
435		
440 AA1		
441		
442		
443 AAA		
44 4 445		
446		
440		
448		
<u>440</u>		
450		
450 451		
-T J T		

452 Tables

454 Table 1: Baseline characteristics, the Bangladesh HEARTS trial*

	Total	Intervention	Usual Care	p-value
	N=3,935	N=1,950	N=1,985	
Female	2,775 (70.5)	1,350 (69.2)	1,425 (71.8)	0.079
Age (years)	52.3 (12.4)	53.3 (12.2)	51.3 (12.5)	<0.001
Diagnosis of diabetes	526 (13.4)	378 (19.4)	148 (7.5)	<0.001
Prior heart attack	20 (0.5)	10 (0.5)	10 (0.5)	0.97
Prior stroke	36 (0.9)	19 (1.0)	17 (0.9)	0.70
Prior CKD	6 (0.2)	3 (0.2)	3 (0.2)	0.98
Baseline HTN medication use	3,164 (80.4)	1,798 (92.2)	1,366 (68.8)	<0.001
Baseline SBP (mm Hg)	158.6 (15.2)	158.4 (15.0)	158.8 (15.4)	0.48
Baseline DBP (mm Hg)	92.3 (10.3)	92.3 (10.2)	92.2 (10.3)	0.86

*Data are presented as mean (SD) for continuous measures, and n (%) for categorical measures.

Abbreviations: SBP- systolic blood pressure; DBP- diastolic blood pressure, HTN- hypertension, CKD- chronic kidney
 disease.

458 Those with "unknown" for prior disease history were assumed to have no relevant disease history.

470 Table 2: Incidence rate ratio (IRR) for intervention and probability difference comparing

471 intervention and control arm.

	Lost to	Early	Satisfied	Improved	Again	Less	Bill
	follow up	follow up				money	problem
	0.22	1.67	1.13	1.25	1.03	1.36	1.00
IRR for Intervention	(0.15,	(1.49,	(1.05,	(1.05,	(0.99,	(1.19,	(0.76,
	0.32)	1.87)	1.22)	1.49)	1.07)	1.56)	1.32)
Count							
Intervention	150	1667	1731	1563	1773	1296	931
Control	802	919	1526	1188	1706	754	812
Marginal							
probability (%)							
	99/61	85.3	91.9	81.2	94.0	88.6	46.5
Intervention	0.0 (0.1,	(82.2,	(90.3,	(77.6,	(92.8,	(84.3,	(41.9,
	11.4)	88.3)	93.6)	84.8)	95.1)	92.8)	51.1)
	39.3	50.9	81.4	64.8	91.2	65.0	46.4
Control	(33.9,	(45.5 <i>,</i>	(75.3,	(54.8,	(87.8,	(57.4,	(34.2,
	44.7)	56.3)	87.5)	74.8)	94.6)	72.5)	58.6)
	-30.5 (-	34.3	10.5	16.4	2.8 (-	23.6	0.1 (-
Difference	37.3, -	(28.0,	(4.3,	(4.8,	0.8,	(14.3,	12.5,
	23.7)	40.6)	16.8)	28.1)	6.4)	32.8)	12.8)

472

473 Mixed Poisson model with robust variance was used. Model adjusted for intervention, female, age, diabetes, heart attack,

474 stroke, CKD, prior HTN medication use, flood prevent refill, subdistrict area size, subdistrict population size, subdistrict literacy

475 rate. Percent and difference in percent were calculated using marginal probability. Bold font indicates statistical significance
 476 (p-value <0.05).

477

479 **Figures** 480 481 Figure 1: Drug and dose specific hypertension management protocol used in the Bangladesh **HEARTS Hypertension Control Initiative** 482 Bangladesh Hypertension Management Protoco for Primary Health Care Setting* মকা Measure blood pressure of **all adults** \geq 18 years** If SBP is 140-159 mmHg or DBP 90-99 mmHg * \rightarrow Advice for lifestyle modification Review BP after 2 weeks. If SBP is still 140-159 mmHg or DBP 90-99 mmHg, start drug treatment as below.*** Start amlodipine 5 mg ^b once Treatment Target Based on Levels of Blood Pressure daily. Most Patients ≤140/90 mmHg Having Comorbidity Review after 1 month. If treatment target not met, ^c ≤130/80 mmHq (diabetes, ischemic amlodipine 5 mg + heart disease, stroke, chronic kidney disease) losartan ^d 50 mg once daily. High CVD Risk > 30% ≤130/80 mmHg (as per CVD risk prediction chart) Review after 1 month. If treatment target not met, ^c 3 amlodipine 5 mg + For Women of Childbearing Age Who May Become Pregnant losartan^d 50 mg + Step 1: Start amlodipine 5 mg b once daily. hydrochlorothiazide 12.5 mg Step 2: Review after 1 month. If treatment target not met, ^c amlodipine 10 mg once daily. once daily °. Step 3: Review after 1 month. If treatment target not met, ^c refer to specialist. Review after 1 month. If treatment target not met, ^c DO NOT PRESCRIBE losartan or any ACE A inhibitor or ARB to women who may refer to a specialist. become pregnant. Advice for lifestyle modification a. For patients with SBP ≥160 mmHg or DBP ≥ 100 mmHg, start immediate treatment at step 2 (amlodipine 5 mg + losartan 50 mg). b. Consider amlodipine 2.5 mg as a starting dose for the elderly or patients with low body weight. c. Check that the patient has been taking drugs regularly and correctly. d. Before initiating and several weeks after starting losartan, check serum creatinine and serum potassium. Avoid losartan for women of childbearing age who may become pregnant. Avoid alcohol and Exercise tobacco, including 2.5 hr/week Eat a low salt diet Eat a hear (under 1 tsp/day) healthy diet Consider the option of increasing losartan to 100 mg before proceeding to step 3, and continuing the dose of losartan 100 mg for step 3. secondhand smoke If overweight, lose weight. Limit red meat to once or twice per week at most. Eat at least 5 servings of vegetables/fruit per day. Eat fish or other food rich in omega 3 fatty acids at least twice per week. Adapted from National Protocol for Management of Diabetes and Hypertension, NCDC programme, DGHS MOHFW 2018-19. For patients aged ≥ 40 years, decision to treat high blood pressure Use healthy oils, such as sesame (til), olive, safflower, sunflower. may be taken based on total cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk estimation. Avoid added sugar from cakes, cookies, sweets, fizzy drinks. Eat nuts, peas, whole grains and foods rich in potassium like This protocol should not be used for pregnant patients. If patient is pregnant, refer to a specialist. spinach, watermelon, yogurt and RESOLVE TO SAVE LIVES 483



484 Figure 2: Inclusion and exclusion flowchart, the Bangladesh HEARTS trial

510 Figure 3a: Adjusted difference in mean baseline and endline systolic blood pressure and





Figure 3b: Adjusted difference in mean baseline and endline diastolic blood pressure and changes at six months, the Bangladesh HEARTS trial.



528 Mixed-effects linear models were used with random intercept for subdistricts and individual and random slope for 529 visit, use REML estimation. Model adjusted for intervention, visit, intervention*visit, female, age, diabetes, heart 530 attack, stroke, CKD, prior antihypertensive medication use, area size, population, literacy rate and interaction 531 between visit and female, age, diabetes, heart attack, stroke, prior antihypertensive medication use, flood prevent

- 532 refill.
- 533
- 534
- 535
- 536
- 537
- 538
- 539

540 Figure 3c: Adjusted difference in hypertension control at six months



544 A Model adjusted for intervention, female, age, diabetes, heart attack, stroke, CKD, prior antihypertensive medication use,

545 flood prevent refill, area size, population, literacy rate

Percentage in intervention and usual care group was calculated using marginal adjusted probabilities that integrate over the

random effects, and their 95% CI was computed by the delta method. Percentage of hypertension under control at baseline is 0for both groups.

- 555 Figure 4: Subgroup analysis results for between group differences in change in systolic BP
- 556 (4A), diastolic BP (4B), and proportion with hypertension control (4C) at the six month follow

557 up visit, the Bangladesh HEARTS trial.

A: SBP

	Inter-	Usual	Inter-	Usual		Difference in \triangle SBP
	vention	Care	vention	Care		(Intervention vs P-value for
Subgroup	count	count	∆SBP	∆SBP		Usual Care) interaction
Age (years)						0.050
≤50	892	993	-23.41	-21.57	-+	-1.84 (-3.81, 0.13)
>50	990	883	-23.81	-18.48	→	-5.34 (-7.48, -3.20)
Sex						0.062
Male	578	515	-26.03	-20.82	_ → _	-5.21 (-7.83, -2.58)
Female	1304	1361	-22.68	-19.73	—	-2.95 (-4.70, -1.21)
Baseline BP (mmHg)						0.162
140-159/90-99	981	933	-16.69	-13.58	→	-3.11 (-4.85, -1.36)
≥160/100	901	943	-31.37	-26.40	→	-4.97 (-7.10, -2.85)
Baseline hypertension m	edication	use				0.048
No	146	579	-28.10	-21.00 —	→	-7.10 (-11.22, -2.99)
Yes	1736	1297	-23.11	-19.91	_ → _	-3.20 (-4.76, -1.64)
Baseline diabetes history	,					0.292
No	1521	1741	-24.02	-20.24	—	-3.78 (-5.34, -2.22)
Yes	361	135	-21.63	-19.47		-2.16 (-6.31, 1.99)

558

B: DBP

	Inter-	Usual	Inter-	Usual		Difference in ADBP	
	vention	Care	vention	Care		(Intervention vs	P-value for
Subgroup	count	count	ΔDBP	ΔDBP		Usual Care) i	interaction
Age (years)						(0.011
≤50	1136	1214	-10.51	-9.35	—	-1.16 (-2.16, -0.16)	
>55	746	662	-9.64	-6.69	—	-2.95 (-4.28, -1.62)	
Sex						(0.006
Male	578	515	-11.53	-8.42	—	-3.10 (-4.64, -1.56)	
Female	1304	1361	-9.68	-8.29	—	-1.40 (-2.33, -0.46)	
Baseline BP (mmHg)						(0.299
140-159/90-99	981	933	-7.38	-5.85	—	-1.53 (-2.55, -0.51)	
≥160/100	901	943	-13.36	-10.79	—	-2.57 (-3.75, -1.40)	
Baseline hypertension m	edication	use				(0.028
No	146	579	-12.72	-8.24		-4.48 (-6.68, -2.29)	
Yes	1736	1297	-10.00	-8.41	—	-1.59 (-2.45, -0.72)	
Baseline diabetes history	,					(0.618
No	1521	1741	-10.38	-8.59	—	-1.80 (-2.66, -0.93)	
Yes	361	135	-9.13	-6.40		-2.73 (-4.84, -0.62)	

C: HTN control at 6-month

Subgroup	Inter- vention count	Usual Care count	Inter- vention %	Usual Care %		Difference in % (Intervention vs Usual Care)	P-value for interaction
Age (years)							0.012
≤50	892	993	62.83	54.04	—	8.8 (5.2, 12.4)	
>50	990	883	60.52	45.43	— •—	15.1 (9.2, 21.0)	
Sex							0.062
Male	578	515	67.95	52.04		15.9 (9.9, 22.0)	
Female	1304	1361	59.33	48.80	—	10.5 (5.8, 15.2)	
Baseline BP (mmHg)							0.316
140-159/90-99	981	933	70.01	60.08		9.9 (4.1, 15.8)	
≥160/100	901	943	53.93	39.04	— •—	14.9 (9.2, 20.5)	
Baseline hypertension medication use							0.261
No	146	579	68.76	52.67	+	16.1 (8.1, 24.1)	
Yes	1736	1297	60.76	49.08	— •—	11.7 (7.1, 16.2)	
Baseline diabetes history							0.954
No	1521	1741	62.17	49.77		12.4 (7.0, 17.8)	
Yes	361	135	61.90	47.62		14.3 (5.5, 23.1)	
				-20 -15 -10 -5 0	5 10 15 20		

For SBP and DBP, mixed-effects linear model with random slope was used (REML estimation). Model adjusted for

all covariates in main analysis (including interaction between covariate and visit):

ΔSBP and ΔDBP change in each group was calculated using marginal effects.

In analysis for DBP, due to "fail to converge" issue, cutoff point of 55years (age) was used instead of 50 (median age) as in SBP analysis.

For hypertension control, a mixed Poisson model with robust variance was used. Model adjusted for intervention, female, age, diabetes, heart attack, stroke, CKD, prior HTN medication use, flood prevent refill, subdistrict area size,

subdistrict population size, subdistrict literacy rate. Percent and difference in percent of hypertension under

control in each group was calculated using marginal probability.