Evidence-based community interventions for diabetes prevention and control

GLOBAL HEALTH CONSORTIUM GHC 9th INTERNATIONAL GLOBAL HEALTH CONFERENCE

Edward W. Gregg, PhD Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics School of Public Health, Imperial College London

Outline

- Diabetes as a public health problem
- The Central role of communities in prevention
- Evidence for action to prevent complications
- Evidence for action to prevent diabetes
- Needs and the way forward

Diabetes as a Public Health Problem

High and growing prevalence

- Extensive and diverse social determinants
- Diverse comorbidity and complex care
- Difficult and varying barriers to both care and prevention
- Beyond what health care can provide alone

What should prevention look like?

- Have multiple avenues of public health action, including health systems, health promotion, and population-wide policies:
- Include both a high-risk and population approach.

Classic Public Health Avenues for Chronic Disease Prevention



What should prevention look like?

Behaviora

Health

Promotion

- Have multiple avenues of public health action, including health systems, health promotion, and population-wide policies:
- Include both a high-risk and population approach.
- Be multi-tiered using risk stratification approaches to link interventions to risk level.
- Consider short-term and long-term time horizons.

Diabetes Pyramid of Prevention



Range of Potential Public Health Priorities for Diabetes

Normal	Risk	IFG / IGT	Type 2 DM	Complications	
	Factors			Disability	Death
			 Glycer Blood Lipid c Tobacc Self-m Retino Foot c CKD s 	nic control pressure contro ontrol co counseling gt education pathy screening are / screening creening	Integrated Team-based Care

The eHealth Enhanced Chronic Care Model (eCCM)



Effectiveness of quality improvement strategies on the management of diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Andrea C Tricco, Noah M Ivers, Jeremy M Grimshaw, David Moher, Lucy Turner, James Galipeau, Ilana Halperin, Brigit te Vachon, Tim Ramsay, Braden Manns, Marcello Tonelli, Kaveh Shojania



Lancet, 2012

	Number of trials	Mean difference (95% CI)	Post-Intervention reduction in LDL (mmol/I
Promotion of self-management	25	0-18 (0-10 to 0-26)	
Team changes	17	0.17 (0.07 to 0.27)	
Facilitated relay	9	0.16 (0.06 to 0.25)	
Clinician reminders	7	0-14 (0-04 to 0-25)	
Patient education	20	0-14 (0-04 to 0-23)	
Case management	22	0.11 (0.02 to 0.21)	_ _
Clinician education	4	0.11 (-0.12 to 0.33)	•
Electronic patient register	12	0.09 (-0.01 to 0.18)) +
Audit and feedback	3	0.03 (-0.04 to 0.10)	• •
Patient reminders	12	0.01 (-0.04 to 0.07)	i 🔶
Continuous quality improvements	1	-0.21 (-0.55 to 0.14)	< • • • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
All Interventions	47	0-10 (0-05 to 0-14)	
			-0-30 -0-23 0 0-23 0
c	Number	Mean difference	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm His
C	Number of trials	Mean difference (95% CI)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm He
C Case management	Number of trials 25	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-62 (1-52 to 7-73)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hi
C Case management Team changes	Number of trials	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-62 (1-52 to 7-73) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hy
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay	Number of trials 25 27 12	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-62 (1-52 to 7-73) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hy
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education	Number of trials 25 27 12 28	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-62 (1-52 to 7-73) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hy
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self-management	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hi
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self-management Electronic patient register	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28 28 14	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-62 (1-52 to 7-73) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04) 3-35 (1-55 to 5-14)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hy
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self- management Electronic patient register Clinician education	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28 28 14 18	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-62 (1-52 to 7-73) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04) 3-35 (1-55 to 5-14) 2-56 (0-00 to 5-11)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hy
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self- management Electronic patient register Clinician education Audit and feedback	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28 28 14 18 8	Mean difference (95% C) 4-62 (1-52 to 7-73) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04) 3-35 (1-55 to 5-14) 2-56 (0-00 to 5-11) 2-52 (1-00 to 4-04)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hy
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self-management Electronic patient register Clinician education Audit and feedback Financial incentives	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28 14 18 8 1 1	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04) 3-35 (1-55 to 5-14) 2-56 (0-00 to 5-11) 2-52 (1-00 to 4-04) 2-00 (-2-73 to 6-73)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hi
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self-management Electronic patient register Clinician education Audit and feedback Financial incentives Patient reminders	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28 14 18 8 1 12	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04) 3-35 (1-55 to 5-14) 2-56 (0-00 to 5-11) 2-52 (1-00 to 4-04) 2-00 (-2-73 to 6-73) 1-82 (0-29 to 3-36)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hy
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self-management Electronic patient register Clinician education Audit and feedback Financial incentives Patient reminders Continuous quality improvements	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28 14 18 8 1 12 12 1	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04) 3-35 (1-55 to 5-14) 2-56 (0-00 to 5-11) 2-52 (1-00 to 4-04) 2-00 (-2-73 to 6-73) 1-82 (0-29 to 3-36) 1-00 (-2-66 to 4-66)	Favours control Favours Intervention Post-Intervention reduction in SBP (mm Hy
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self-management Electronic patient register Clinician education Audit and feedback Financial Incentives Patient reminders Continuous quality improvements Clinician reminders	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28 14 18 8 1 12 1 12 12 12	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-62 (1-52 to 7-73) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04) 3-35 (1-55 to 5-14) 2-56 (0-00 to 5-11) 2-52 (1-00 to 4-04) 2-00 (-2-73 to 6-73) 1-82 (0-29 to 3-36) 1-00 (-2-66 to 4-66) 0-65 (-1-14 to 2-44)	Favours control Favours Intervention
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self- management Electronic patient register Clinician education Audit and feedback Financial incentives Patient reminders Continuous quality improvements Clinician reminders All interventions	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28 14 18 8 1 12 12 12 12 65	Mean difference (95% C) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 577) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04) 3-35 (1-55 to 5-14) 2-56 (0-00 to 5-11) 2-52 (1-00 to 4-04) 2-00 (-2-73 to 6-73) 1-82 (0-29 to 3-36) 1-00 (-2-66 to 4-66) 0-65 (-1-14 to 2-44) 3-13 (2-19 to 4-06)	Favours control Favours Intervention
C Case management Team changes Facilitated relay Patient education Promotion of self-management Electronic patient register Clinician education Audit and feedback Financial incentives Patient reminders Continuous quality improvements Clinician reminders All interventions	Number of trials 25 27 12 28 28 14 18 8 1 12 1 12 12 65	Mean difference (95% CI) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-32 (2-51 to 6-12) 4-31 (2-85 to 5-77) 4-02 (2-52 to 5-52) 3-69 (2-34 to 5-04) 3-35 (1-55 to 5-14) 2-56 (0-00 to 5-11) 2-52 (1-00 to 4-04) 2-00 (-2-73 to 6-73) 1-82 (0-29 to 3-36) 1-00 (-2-66 to 4-66) 0-65 (-1-14 to 2-44) 3-13 (2-19 to 4-06)	Favours control Favours Intervention

Tricco et al., Lancet, 2012



The Community Guide

www.thecommunityguide.org

WHAT WORKS

Diabetes Prevention and Control

Evidence-Based Interventions for Your Community

- Team-based care interventions to help patients manage type 2 diabetes nd improve ABCs.
- Case management interventions to coordinate and provide care.
- Engage community health workers in care and prevention to improve glycemic control and weight-related outcomes.
- Intensive lifestyle interventions for patients with type 2 diabetes to improve glycemic control, dietary, PA, and weight management.
- Implement telehealth interventions to assist in efficient interaction between providers and patients to improve dietary practice.

Range of Potential Public Health Priorities for Diabetes

2 DM Disability	
Complications Death	
Slycemic control Blood pressure control ipid control obacco counseling OSME Retinopathy screening oot care / screening CKD screening	Integrated Team-based Care
C	CKD screening





Range of Options for Prevention

Individual-Focused:

- Structured, multi-disciplinary lifestyle
- Metformin and other drugs
- Nutrition and education referral
- Low intensity, high reach counseling approaches
- Worksite wellness

How effective were lifestyle interventions in real-world settings that were modeled on the Diabetes Prevention Program?

- 26 studies of 3797 high risk adults:
- Diverse settings: 12 community (recreation, faith) 11 health care
- Mean weight change: 4%
- Every 4 sessions attended: 1% percentage point added weight loss



First Author-	Weight
(Year of Publication)	Change (95% CI)
Medical and Allied Health Professionals	
Aldena-(2005)	-5 50 (-13 14 2 14)
Davis Smith (2007	
Siddel (2008)	-4.00(-19.10, 9.90) 5 10 (11 18 0 08)
MCDride (2008)	-5.10(-11.10, 0.90)
NICDFIDE-(2008)	-4.10(-10.57, 2.57)
Pagoto-(2008)	-4.60 (-8.52, -0.88)
Boltri-(2008)	-0.50 (-5.40, 4.40)
Viatvienko-(2009)	-6.10 (-15.51, 3.51)
Amundson-(2009)	-6.70 (-9.64, -3.76)
McTigue-(2009)	-4.80 (-9.90, 0.30)
Whittemore-(2009)	-4.80 (-13.42, 3.82)
Kramer- (2009)	-2.20 (-6.32, 1.92)
Kramer-(2009)	-4.50 (-10.77, 1.77)
Vanderwood-(2010)	-7.90 (-10.06, -5.74)
Kramer-(2010)	-6.60 (-15.81, 2.61)
Almeida-(2010)	-1.60 (-2.38, -0.82)
Vadheim-(2010)	-8.60 (-15.46, -1.74)
Bersoux-(2010)	-2.90 (-7.60, 1.80)
Jaber-(2011)	-5.70 (-11.58, 0.18)
Boltri-(2011)	-0.85 (-3.79, 2.09)
Subtotal	-4.27 (-5.85, -2.70)
Lay Community Members	
Ackerman-(2008)	-6.00 (-14.62, 2.62)
Parikh-(2010)	-4.30 (-10.96, 2.36)
Mau-(2010)	-1.50 (-3.34, 0.34)
Faridi-(2010)	-1.60 (-4.34, 1.14)
Katula-(2011)	-7.40 (-11.71, -3.09)
Subtotal	-3.15 (-5.46, -0.83)
Electronic-Media Assisted	
Tate-(2005)	-5.10 (-12.16, 1.96)
Estabrooks-(2008)	-2.60 (-8.48, 3.28)
McTigue-(2009)	-4 70 (-10 97, 1.57)
Kramer- (2010)	-5.60 (-15.20, 4.00)
Subtotal	-3.00(-13.20, 4.00)
Subtotal	-4.20 (-7.02, -0.77)
Overall	-3.99 (-5.16 -2.83)
overali 🗸	-5.77 (-5.10, -2.05)
1 1 1 1	5 10 15
-15 -10 -5 0	5 10 15
Percentage weig	sht change
Favors Intervention N	lo intervention effect
ravors intervention 1	winter without circer

Systematic Review: Cost-effectiveness of individual-level T2DM Prevention

Group	Study, n	Median (range), \$/QALY, healthcare perspective
Prevention strategy: Lifestyle	11	\$12,557 (CS-\$23,957)
Metformin	2	\$17,153
Time horizon: < 10 years	5	\$19,686 (\$6,235-\$45,530)
>=10 years	8	\$13,127 (CS-\$23,957)
Modality: In-person	6	\$10,930 (CS-\$22,516)
Virtual	3	\$12,557 (CS-\$13,155)
Combination	2	\$10,768
Delivery setting: One-to-one	3	\$19,686 (CS-\$22,516)
Group	2	\$7,126
Combination of both	1	\$13,844
Provider type: Health professionals	3	\$19,686 (CS-\$23,957)
PCP + trained lay health workers	3	\$8,016 (\$6,235-\$13,844)

Siegel, Zhuo, Ng, Jawands, Zhang, Zhang, Under Review, 2018

Relación de la Hb-a1c (eje de las x) y la Incidencia de Diabetes a 10 años (eje de las y). El tamaño del círculo representa la proporción de los casos de diabetes a lo largo de 10 años.



Adaptado de Zhang et al., 2010; Zhuo et al., 2012; Gregg et al., 2013

The National Diabetes Prevention Program: A Public-private partnership to scale the translated model of the DPP.

Congress authorized CDC to establish the NATIONAL DIABETES



to achieve a greater impact on reducing type 2 diabetes

The core of the National DPP is a CDC-recognized, year-long lifestyle change program that offers participants:



Elements of the National DPP Lifestyle Change Program



http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/prevention/pdf/ndpp_infographic.pdf

National DPP Strategic Goals

- Increase *supply* of quality programs.
- Build *workforce* to deliver program
- Increase *coverage* among public and private payers
- Increase *referrals* from healthcare providers
- Increase *demand* for the National DPP among people at risk
- Maintain *quality standards* through a recognition program and registry.

CDC Diabetes Prevention Recognition Program



- 1557 CDC-recognized programs across 50 states/territories.
- >10,300 coaches (lay people; health professionals) trained.
- Serving 156,935 eligible participants.
- 65 commercial health plans providing some coverage for 3M in 11 states

A National Effort to Prevent Type 2 Diabetes: Participant-Level Evaluation of CDC's National Diabetes Prevention Program Elizabeth K. Ely,¹ Stephanie M. Gruss,¹ Elizabeth T. Luman,¹ Edward W. Gregg,¹ Mohammed K. Ali,^{1,2} Kunthea Nhim,¹ Deborah B. Rolka,¹ and Ann L. Albright¹

Diabetes Care 2017;40:1331–1341 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.2337/dc16-2099

Participants' attendance and percent body weight lost (unadjusted) by number of sessions attended among eligible*	participants enrolledt in the lifestyle change program
Percent of body weight lost from first to last session attended	

among those reporting at least 2 weights (94.2% of 14,747)

	All eligible participants, n = 13,893§	Percent achieving weight	Percent achieving physical activity goal of 150 min/week,	
	Median (25th, 75th)	loss goal of ≥5%, n = 13,893§	11 - 12,525+	
Total	3.1 (0.8, 6.7)	35.5	41.8	
Sex				
Male**	38(1174)	40.0	52.3	
Female	3.0 (0.7, 6.5)	34.5	39.2	
Age group (years)				
18-44**	2 2 (0 3 5 4)	27.5	34.3	
45-64	31(08,67)	35.0	40.2	
65+	4.1 (1.4, 7.6)	43.1	50.9	
Race/ethnicity				
Hispanic	2.5 (0.5, 5.9)	30.8	47.3	
Non-Hispanic/white only**	4.1 (1.4, 7.8)	43.2	48.6	
Non-Hispanic/black only	2.2 (0.3, 5.3)	27.1	39.9	
Other	2.6 (0.4, 5.7)	29.1	30.7	
Baseline BMI (kg/m ²)				
<25**	2.8 (0.8, 6.0)	30.8	54.8	
25-29	3.4 (0.9, 6.8)	37.2	46.6	
≥30	3.1 (0.8, 6.8)	35.9	39.8	
Eligibility category				
Entered program with blood				
test/history of GDM**	3.2 (0.8, 6.8)	36.1	42.2	
Entered program on risk test only	3.0 (0.7, 6.6)	34.6	41.0	

Evaluation of 117 NDPP Sites Based on Interviews and Surveys

Keys to *enrollment success* include:

- Offering multiple class locations.
- Using multiple recruitment strategies.
- Information sessions.

• Keys to *retention success* include:

- Monitoring early logistical challenges related to space, timing.
- Non-financial incentives, such as gym memberships, cookbooks, athletic gear, transportation.
- Lifestyle coach training & background
- Cultural adaptation for curricula, including cultural themes, images, language, dietary restrictions.

Challenges / Barriers to Individual-Targeted Approaches

- Structure, reimbursement, scalability
- Engagement, Participation, Sustainability
- Too late in the pathogenesis of diabetes?
- Diabetes is a common-source epidemic rooted in culture and society?
- Risk factor levels of the general population remain high.
- Over long time horizon, the general population contributes most cases.



Proportion of Non-diabetic Adults Meeting Key Healthy Targets for Diabetes Risk Reduction, NHANES 2007-2012

	Men	Women	Total
Vegetables	26	27	27
Dairy	18	9	13
Whole Grains	29	23	26
Added Sugars	26	27	26
Saturated Fats	42	45	43
Leisure-Time Phys Activity	40	32	36

Siegel et al., presented at ADA 2016 Scientific Sessions

Range of Options for Prevention

Individual-Focused:

- Structured, multi-disciplinary lifestyle
- Metformin and other drugs
- Nutrition and education referral
- Low intensity, high reach counseling approaches
- Worksite wellness
- Population-wide
 - Fiscal Food and crop policies
 - Incentives for Healthy foods in food deserts
 - Community / urban re-design for physical activity
 - Food and menu labeling
 - School food and physical education policies
 - Broad awareness and social marketing

Promising Targets for Population-Wide Food Policies to Influence Cardiometabolic Risk

12 August 2011 Last updated at 06:44 ET

434 🔀 Share 🧗 📘 🗠 🖨

Cutting salt 'should be global priority'

By Matt McGrath Science reporter, BBC World Service

Soft Drink and Juice Consumption and Risk of Physician-diagnosed Incident Type 2 Diabetes

The Singapore Chinese Health Study

Fruit and vegetable intake and incidence of type 2 diabetes mellitus: systematic review and meta-analysis

Patrice Carter, research nutritionist,¹ Laura J Gray, research associate in medical statistics,² Jacqui Troughton, senior research associate,³ Kamlesh Khunti, professor of primary care diabetes and vascular medicine,² Melanie J Davies, professor of diabetes medicine¹

OPEN O ACCESS Freely available online

PLOS MEDICINE

BMI

Whole Grain, Bran, and Germ Intake and Risk

of Type 2 Diabetes: and Systematic Revi

Jeroen S. L. de Munter^{1,2}, Frank B. Hu^{1,3,4}, Donna

Reduction in the Incidence of Type 2 Diabetes With the Mediterranean Diet

Results of the PREDIMED-Reus nutrition intervention randomized trial

JORDI SALAS-SALVADÖ, MD, PHD^{1,2} MONICA EULIÖ, ISC, PHD^{1,2} NANCF BABO, ISC, PHD^{1,2} MICULI, AWAIL MARTÍNIZ-GONZÁLIZ, MD, PHD^{2,3} NÚBIA IRARROLA-JURADO, RD^{1,2} JORF BASDRA, MD^{1,2,4} RAMON ESTRUCIJ, MD, PHD^{2,3} MARIA ISABIL COVAS, DIPLARM, PHD^{2,0} DOLORIS CORBLLA, DIPLARM, PHD^{2,7} FIRNANDO ARÓS, MD, PHD^{2,8} VALINTINA RUIZ-GUITIBREZ, DIPLARM, PHD⁹ EMILIO ROS, MD, PHD^{2,10} FOR THE PREDIMED STUDY INVESTIGATORS The increasing incidence of type 2 diabetes throughout the world, closely linked to westernized dietary patterns, physical inactivity, and ratising rates of obesity, is a challenging health problem. Lifestyle changes are effective measures to prevent diabetes, and weight loss is the main predictor of success (1). Pive clinical trials that examined the effects of



Summary of the cost-effectiveness of fiscal policies to prevent T2DM

Category	Intervention	Study, n	CE outcome
Fiscal policy			
SSB tax	20%, penny-per-ounce, 10%, or \$0.5/L tax on SSB	9	CS
Sugar tax	\$0.99/100mL ice cream; \$0.9/100g other products	1	CS
Subsidy	30% or 0.15/100g subsidy for fruit/veg consumption	4	CS to worse heatlh
Combination tax and subsidy	Tax SSB, sat fat., sodium, sugar; subsidy fruit/veg	1	CS
Environmental change			
Fresh food in low-income area	Open supermarket	1	CS
Workplace healthy food	Provide healthy food in cafeteria	1	CS
Enhanced phys act access	Increase facilities for physical activities		\$36k/QALY
Health promotion			
Campaign	Community-wide, mass media, or internet campaign to promote physical activity	4	\$87k/QALY to CS
Healthy eating education in low-income community	Diet education and cooking classes	1	More QALY but no change in cost
Social support PA promotion	Use organized groups to promote physical activity	3	\$35 – 50k/QALY
Physical activity promotion for targeted population	Encourage walking and reduce car use using tailored educational information	2	\$17,658/QALY – CS

Siegel, Zhuo, Ng, Jawands, Zhang, Zhang, Under Review, 2018

Key Considerations in Design of Prevention Strategy

- Prevalence/Burden of Diabetes
- Prevalence/burden of undiagnosed diabetes.
- Current status/trajectory of environmental/cultural risk.
- Capacity of health system to manage diabetes.
- Potential of communities and insurers to support high risk individuals.
- Political context/will for population-wide intervention.
- Time horizon of public health goals

High Prevalence / High Income Countries



High Prevalence / Low- and Mid-income

<u>Goal</u>: Prioritize

- Integrated team-based care and
- 2) Population-wide interventions

Pivotal Factors:

- Size of undiagnosed population
- Health system capacity
- Community structure
- Political will



Summary

- Diabetes demands a multi-tiered strategy to reduce complications, progression of high risk individuals, and population-wide risk.
- Science base to prevention complications and individual-targeted prevention approaches is strong, from RCTs and CE modeling.
- Science base for *population-wide policies* is encouraging and growing, with need for rigorous natural experiments of real-world policies.
- High income, high prevalence countries should invest in all areas, depending on the political and health care insurance context.
- Low and middle income countries should prioritize team-based integrated care and population-wide approaches, with individualtargeted approaches under optimal settings.

extras

Prioritizing our Core Science Base

- Systematic reviews of trials
- Randomized controlled clinical and community trials
- Well-designed natural experiments
- Rigorously designed modeling efforts
- Prospective cohorts

Long-term Sustainability of Diabetes Prevention Approaches A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials

Table. Random-Effects Meta-analyses Exploring RR for Diabetes Among LSM and Medication Studies After Treatment Withdrawal

Source	Intervention	Active Intervention, y	End of Active Intervention, RR (95% CI)	Follow-up ^a	End of Follow-up, RR (95% CI)
LSM Trials					
Swinburn et al, ⁴⁰ 2001	Reduced-fat diet	1.0	0.76 (0.25-2.34)	5.0 y	0.70 (0.26-1.88)
DPP, ^{33,34} 2002, 2009 ^b	Diet and physical activity	2.8	0.48 (0.41-0.58)	5.7 y	0.68 (0.63-0.73)
DPS, ^{35,36} 2001, 2013	Diet and physical activity	4.0	0.44 (0.29-0.68)	9.0 y	0.63 (0.54-0.73)
Da Qing, ^{37,38} 1997, 2008	Diet and physical activity	6.0	0.68 (0.54-0.85)	9.4 y	0.86 (0.81-0.92)
Pooled estimate			0.55 (0.43-0.70)		0.72 (0.60-0.86)
Medication Trials					
Eriksson et al, ⁶⁵ 2006	Glipizide	0.5	0.41 (0.01-11.3)	52 wk	0.20 (0.03-1.53)
DREAM, ^{22,72} 2006, 2011	Rosiglitazone	3.0	0.43 (0.37-0.48)	10 wk	1.07 (0.88-1.32)
DREAM, ^{22,57} 2006, 2011 ^b	Ramipril	3.0	0.93 (0.82-1.04)	10 wk	1.08 (0.89-1.33)
DPP, ^{21,33} 2002, 2003	Metformin	2.8	0.76 (0.66-0.88)	2 wk	0.76 (0.68-0.85)
STOP-NIDDM, ⁶⁹ 2002	Acarbose	3.0	0.78 (0.68-0.90)	12 wk	1.46 (0.90-2.36)
ORIGIN, 67 2012	Insulin glargine	6.2	0.79 (0.67-0.94)	14 wk	0.86 (0.74-0.99)
Pooled estimate			0.71 (0.55-0.92)		0.95 (0.79-1.14)

Haw et al., JAMA Intern Med 2018



Diabetes Prevention: Interventions Engaging Community Health Workers

Community Preventive Services Task Force Finding and Rationale Statement Ratified August 2016

- Screening and health education—CHWs deliver individual or group education on diabetes self-management, provide adherence support for medications, and monitor patients' blood pressure as recommended by the American Diabetes Association.
- Outreach, enrollment, and information—CHWs reach out to individuals and families who are eligible for medical services, help them apply for these services, and provide them with proactive follow-up and monitoring, such as appointment reminders and home visits.
- Member of a care delivery team—CHWs partner with the patient, their primary care provider, and other health professionals to improve coordination of diabetes care, education, and support.
- Patient navigation—CHWs help individuals and families navigate complex medical service systems and processes to improve their access to care.
- Community organization—CHWs facilitate self-directed change and community development by serving as liaisons between the community and healthcare systems.

Figure 15. A schematic diagram showing how to use diabetes centres, diabetes teams and diabetes registers to integrate professional education, research and practice with linkage of register data to other databases to identify root causes, evaluate care standards, monitor clinical outcomes, perform surveillance of prevalence (burden) and incidence (intervention) of diabetes and its complications to inform practices and policies.



HEALTH CARE REFORM Impact of Pharmacist Care in the Management of Cardiovascular Disease Risk Factors

A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Trials

Valérie Santschi, PharmD, PhD; Arnaud Chiolero, MD, MSc; Bernard Burnand, MD, MPH; April L. Colosimo, MSc, MLIS; Gilles Paradis, MD, MSc



Risk factors for type 2 diabetes mellitus: an exposure-wide umbrella review of meta-analyses

Hip circumference	0.57	0.48	0.68			
Serum vitamin D	0.62	0.54	0.70			
Total physical activity	0.65	0.59	0.71			
Coffee	0.70	0.65	0.75			
Whole grains	0.74	0.70	0.78			
Alcohol consumption	0.74	0.67	0.82			
Leisure-time physical activity	0.75	0.70	0.79			
Healthy dietary pattern	0.80	0.76	0.84			
Smoking (former)	1.14	1.10	1.19		+	
Age at menarche	1.25	1.15	1.35			
Dietary heme iron	1.28	1.16	1.41			
Sugar-sweetened beverages	1.30	1.21	1.41			
Smoking (current)	1.39	1.33	1.44		+	
Processed meat consumption	1.41	1.25	1.59			
Educational status	1.41	1.28	1.55			
Major depressive disorder	1.48	1.28	1.71			
Preterm birth	1.51	1.33	1.72			
Smoking cessation	1.54	1.36	1.75			
Serum uric acid	1.60	1.44	1.78			
Psoriasis	1.69	1.50	1.89			
Serum CRP	1.79	1.51	2.13			
Sedentary time	1.91	1.66	2.19			
Bipolar disorder	1.98	1.62	2.41			
BMI (overweight)	2.93	2.33	3.68			
SerumGT	3.07	2.22	4.23			
Metabolic syndrome	3.35	2.75	4.08			
Metabolically healthy obesity	4.40	2.83	6.84			
BMI (obese)	6.88	5.39	8.78			
Gestational diabetes	7.43	4.79	11.51			
Metabolically unhealthy obesity	9.50	7.48	12.08			
				0.6	20 4	0 60 80 100 120

Bellou et al, PLOS One, 2018

Low Prevalence / Low- and Mid-income

<u>Goal</u>: Prioritize Prioritize 1) population-wide interventions to reduce complications and prevent rise in incidence; 2) Integrated team-based care. <u>Pivotal Factors</u>:

- Health system capacity
- Community structure
- Recognizing opportunity.



Figure 13. A meta–analysis of 181 trials (N = 135,112) showing the effects of multi–component integrated care on mean difference (MD) in A1c, systolic blood pressure (SBP) and LDL-C in different regions and patient groups compared to usual care with team change, facilitated patient relay and patient education/self management having the largest effect size (Lim LL et al Diabetes Care 2018).

