



RESPONSE TO COMMENT ON PALMAS ET AL.

## Results of the Northern Manhattan Diabetes Community Outreach Project: A Randomized Trial Studying a Community Health Worker Intervention to Improve Diabetes Care in Hispanic Adults. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:963–969

*Diabetes Care* 2015;38:e59 | DOI: 10.2337/dc14-2666

Walter Palmas,<sup>1</sup> Sally E. Findley,<sup>2</sup> Jeanne Teresi,<sup>3</sup> Jose A. Luchsinger,<sup>4</sup> and Olveen Carrasquillo,<sup>5</sup> on behalf of the NOCHOP Investigators

The comments by Ramesh and Haldar (1) point out several limitations of the Northern Manhattan Diabetes Community Outreach Project (NOCHOP), several of which we discussed at length in our original article (2). We do agree with their concern regarding the lack of statistical power, which we believe was mostly due to lower-than-expected intervention fidelity. Our participants experienced great difficulty attending the prespecified in-person sessions, therefore the NOCHOP community health workers actively engaged them in follow-up phone calls, which a post hoc analysis showed to be associated with greater HbA<sub>1c</sub> reduction.

There seems to be some confusion between the eligibility criteria and the sample we actually recruited. The NOCHOP inclusion criteria specified that people with poorly controlled diabetes, as determined by a recent HbA<sub>1c</sub>

>8% (64 mmol/mol), were eligible to participate. We did not perform a repeat HbA<sub>1c</sub> measurement after enrollment and before randomization. Therefore, some participants did have an HbA<sub>1c</sub> <8% at their baseline evaluation visit. In retrospect, obtaining a point-of-care HbA<sub>1c</sub> measurement and restricting enrollment to those with elevated HbA<sub>1c</sub> might have been a better approach than the one we took.

NOCHOP was indeed the first randomized controlled trial attempting to extend use of the Small Steps, Big Rewards program from people with prediabetes to those with diabetes. However, if lack of precedence was always viewed as lack of validity, then there would be no innovation in science.

Finally, we also agree that our results and those of other randomized trials of community health worker interventions to improve diabetes care are best

assessed collectively. There have been several well-designed randomized controlled trials published over the past few years in this field, and an updated systematic review and meta-analysis appears warranted.

**Duality of Interest.** No potential conflicts of interest relevant to this article were reported.

### References

1. Ramesh V, Haldar P. Comment on Palmas et al. Results of the Northern Manhattan Diabetes Community Outreach Project: a randomized trial studying a community health worker intervention to improve diabetes care in Hispanic adults. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:963–969 (Letter). *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:e58. DOI: 10.2337/dc14-2307
2. Palmas W, Findley SE, Mejia M, et al. Results of the Northern Manhattan Diabetes Community Outreach Project: a randomized trial studying a community health worker intervention to improve diabetes care in Hispanic adults. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:963–969

<sup>1</sup>Columbia University Medical Center, New York, NY

<sup>2</sup>Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New York, NY

<sup>3</sup>Research Division, Hebrew Home for the Aged at Riverdale, Bronx, NY

<sup>4</sup>Columbia University, New York, NY

<sup>5</sup>Division of General Internal Medicine, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, Miami, FL

Corresponding author: Walter Palmas, wp56@cumc.columbia.edu.

© 2015 by the American Diabetes Association. Readers may use this article as long as the work is properly cited, the use is educational and not for profit, and the work is not altered.