



American Diabetes Association

# 1. Improving Care and Promoting Health in Populations: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2019*

*Diabetes Care* 2019;42(Suppl. 1):S7–S12 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc19-S001>

The American Diabetes Association (ADA) “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes” includes ADA’s current clinical practice recommendations and is intended to provide the components of diabetes care, general treatment goals and guidelines, and tools to evaluate quality of care. Members of the ADA Professional Practice Committee, a multidisciplinary expert committee, are responsible for updating the Standards of Care annually, or more frequently as warranted. For a detailed description of ADA standards, statements, and reports, as well as the evidence-grading system for ADA’s clinical practice recommendations, please refer to the Standards of Care Introduction. Readers who wish to comment on the Standards of Care are invited to do so at [professional.diabetes.org/SOC](http://professional.diabetes.org/SOC).

## DIABETES AND POPULATION HEALTH

### Recommendations

- 1.1 Ensure treatment decisions are timely, rely on evidence-based guidelines, and are made collaboratively with patients based on individual preferences, prognoses, and comorbidities. **B**
- 1.2 Align approaches to diabetes management with the Chronic Care Model, emphasizing productive interactions between a prepared proactive care team and an informed activated patient. **A**
- 1.3 Care systems should facilitate team-based care, patient registries, decision support tools, and community involvement to meet patient needs. **B**
- 1.4 Efforts to assess the quality of diabetes care and create quality improvement strategies should incorporate reliable data metrics, to promote improved processes of care and health outcomes, with simultaneous emphasis on costs. **E**

Population health is defined as “the health outcomes of a group of individuals, including the distribution of health outcomes within the group”; these outcomes can be measured in terms of health outcomes (mortality, morbidity, health, and functional status), disease burden (incidence and prevalence), and behavioral and metabolic factors (exercise, diet, A1C, etc.) (1). Clinical practice recommendations for health care providers are tools that can ultimately improve health across populations; however, for optimal outcomes, diabetes care must also be individualized for each patient. Thus, efforts to improve population health will require a combination of system-level and patient-level approaches. With such an integrated approach in mind, the American Diabetes Association (ADA) highlights the importance of *patient-centered care*, defined as care that is respectful of and responsive to individual patient preferences, needs, and values and that ensures that patient values guide all clinical decisions (2). Clinical practice recommendations, whether based on evidence or expert opinion, are

*Suggested citation: American Diabetes Association. 1. Improving care and promoting health in populations: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2019. Diabetes Care 2019;42(Suppl. 1): S7–S12*

© 2018 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. More information is available at <http://www.diabetesjournals.org/content/license>.

intended to guide an overall approach to care. The science and art of medicine come together when the clinician is faced with making treatment recommendations for a patient who may not meet the eligibility criteria used in the studies on which guidelines are based. Recognizing that one size does not fit all, the standards presented here provide guidance for when and how to adapt recommendations for an individual.

### Care Delivery Systems

The proportion of patients with diabetes who achieve recommended A1C, blood pressure, and LDL cholesterol levels has increased in recent years (3). The mean A1C nationally among people with diabetes declined from 7.6% (60 mmol/mol) in 1999–2002 to 7.2% (55 mmol/mol) in 2007–2010 based on the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), with younger adults less likely to meet treatment targets than older adults (3). This has been accompanied by improvements in cardiovascular outcomes and has led to substantial reductions in end-stage microvascular complications.

Nevertheless, 33–49% of patients still did not meet general targets for glyce-mic, blood pressure, or cholesterol control, and only 14% met targets for all three measures while also avoiding smoking (3). Evidence suggests that progress in cardiovascular risk factor control (particularly tobacco use) may be slowing (3,4). Certain segments of the population, such as young adults and patients with complex comorbidities, financial or other social hardships, and/or limited English proficiency, face particular challenges to goal-based care (5–7). Even after adjusting for these patient factors, the persistent variability in the quality of diabetes care across providers and practice settings indicates that substantial system-level improvements are still needed.

Diabetes poses a significant financial burden to individuals and society. It is estimated that the annual cost of diagnosed diabetes in 2017 was \$327 billion, including \$237 billion in direct medical costs and \$90 billion in reduced productivity. After adjusting for inflation, economic costs of diabetes increased by 26% from 2012 to 2017 (8). This is attributed to the increased prevalence of diabetes and the increased cost per person with diabetes. Ongoing population

health strategies are needed in order to reduce costs and provide optimized care.

### Chronic Care Model

Numerous interventions to improve adherence to the recommended standards have been implemented. However, a major barrier to optimal care is a delivery system that is often fragmented, lacks clinical information capabilities, duplicates services, and is poorly designed for the coordinated delivery of chronic care. The Chronic Care Model (CCM) takes these factors into consideration and is an effective framework for improving the quality of diabetes care (9).

**Six Core Elements.** The CCM includes six core elements to optimize the care of patients with chronic disease:

1. Delivery system design (moving from a *reactive* to a *proactive* care delivery system where planned visits are coordinated through a team-based approach)
2. Self-management support
3. Decision support (basing care on evidence-based, effective care guidelines)
4. Clinical information systems (using registries that can provide patient-specific and population-based support to the care team)
5. Community resources and policies (identifying or developing resources to support healthy lifestyles)
6. Health systems (to create a quality-oriented culture)

Redefining the roles of the health care delivery team and empowering patient self-management are fundamental to the successful implementation of the CCM (10). Collaborative, multidisciplinary teams are best suited to provide care for people with chronic conditions such as diabetes and to facilitate patients' self-management (11–13).

### Strategies for System-Level Improvement

Optimal diabetes management requires an organized, systematic approach and the involvement of a coordinated team of dedicated health care professionals working in an environment where patient-centered high-quality care is a priority (7,14,15). While many diabetes processes of care have improved nationally in the past decade, the overall quality of care for patients with diabetes remains

suboptimal (3). Efforts to increase the quality of diabetes care include providing care that is concordant with evidence-based guidelines (16); expanding the role of teams to implement more intensive disease management strategies (7,17,18); tracking medication-taking behavior at a systems level (19); redesigning the organization of the care process (20); implementing electronic health record tools (21,22); empowering and educating patients (23,24); removing financial barriers and reducing patient out-of-pocket costs for diabetes education, eye exams, diabetes technology, and necessary medications (7); assessing and addressing psychosocial issues (25,26); and identifying, developing, and engaging community resources and public policies that support healthy lifestyles (27). The National Diabetes Education Program maintains an online resource ([www.betterdiabetescare.nih.gov](http://www.betterdiabetescare.nih.gov)) to help health care professionals design and implement more effective health care delivery systems for those with diabetes.

The care team, which centers around the patient, should avoid therapeutic inertia and prioritize timely and appropriate intensification of lifestyle and/or pharmacologic therapy for patients who have not achieved the recommended metabolic targets (28–30). Strategies shown to improve care team behavior and thereby catalyze reductions in A1C, blood pressure, and/or LDL cholesterol include engaging in explicit and collaborative goal setting with patients (31,32); identifying and addressing language, numeracy, or cultural barriers to care (33–35); integrating evidence-based guidelines and clinical information tools into the process of care (16,36,37); soliciting performance feedback, setting reminders, and providing structured care (e.g., guidelines, formal case management, and patient education resources) (7); and incorporating care management teams including nurses, dietitians, pharmacists, and other providers (17,38). Initiatives such as the Patient-Centered Medical Home show promise for improving health outcomes by fostering comprehensive primary care and offering new opportunities for team-based chronic disease management (39).

Telemedicine is a growing field that may increase access to care for patients with diabetes. Telemedicine is defined as the use of telecommunications to

facilitate remote delivery of health-related services and clinical information (40). A growing body of evidence suggests that various telemedicine modalities may be effective at reducing A1C in patients with type 2 diabetes compared with usual care or in addition to usual care (41). For rural populations or those with limited physical access to health care, telemedicine has a growing body of evidence for its effectiveness, particularly with regard to glycemic control as measured by A1C (42–44). Interactive strategies that facilitate communication between providers and patients, including the use of web-based portals or text messaging and those that incorporate medication adjustment, appear more effective. There is limited data available on the cost-effectiveness of these strategies.

Successful diabetes care also requires a systematic approach to supporting patients' behavior change efforts. High-quality diabetes self-management education and support (DSMES) has been shown to improve patient self-management, satisfaction, and glucose outcomes. National DSMES standards call for an integrated approach that includes clinical content and skills, behavioral strategies (goal setting, problem solving), and engagement with psychosocial concerns (26). For more information on DSMES, see Section 5 "Lifestyle Management."

In devising approaches to support disease self-management, it is notable that in 23% of cases, uncontrolled A1C, blood pressure, or lipids were associated with poor medication-taking behaviors ("medication adherence") (19). At a system level, "adequate" medication taking is defined as 80% (calculated as the number of pills taken by the patient in a given time period divided by the number of pills prescribed by the physician in that same time period) (19). If medication taking is 80% or above and treatment goals are not met, then treatment intensification should be considered (e.g., uptitration). Barriers to medication taking may include patient factors (financial limitations, remembering to obtain or take medications, fear, depression, or health beliefs), medication factors (complexity, multiple daily dosing, cost, or side effects), and system factors (inadequate follow-up or support). Success in overcoming

barriers to medication taking may be achieved if the patient and provider agree on a targeted approach for a specific barrier (12).

The Affordable Care Act has resulted in increased access to care for many individuals with diabetes with an emphasis on the protection of people with preexisting conditions, health promotion, and disease prevention (45). In fact, health insurance coverage increased from 84.7% in 2009 to 90.1% in 2016 for adults with diabetes aged 18–64 years. Coverage for those  $\geq 65$  years remained near universal (46). Patients who have either private or public insurance coverage are more likely to meet quality indicators for diabetes care (47). As mandated by the Affordable Care Act, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality developed a National Quality Strategy based on the triple aims that include improving the health of a population, overall quality and patient experience of care, and per capita cost (48,49). As health care systems and practices adapt to the changing landscape of health care, it will be important to integrate traditional disease-specific metrics with measures of patient experience, as well as cost, in assessing the quality of diabetes care (50,51). Information and guidance specific to quality improvement and practice transformation for diabetes care is available from the National Diabetes Education Program practice transformation website and the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases report on diabetes care and quality (52,53). Using patient registries and electronic health records, health systems can evaluate the quality of diabetes care being delivered and perform intervention cycles as part of quality improvement strategies (54). Critical to these efforts is provider adherence to clinical practice recommendations and accurate, reliable data metrics that include sociodemographic variables to examine health equity within and across populations (55).

In addition to quality improvement efforts, other strategies that simultaneously improve the quality of care and potentially reduce costs are gaining momentum and include reimbursement structures that, in contrast to visit-based billing, reward the provision of appropriate and high-quality care to achieve metabolic goals (56) and incentives that

accommodate personalized care goals (7,57).

## TAILORING TREATMENT FOR SOCIAL CONTEXT

### Recommendations

- 1.5** Providers should assess social context, including potential food insecurity, housing stability, and financial barriers, and apply that information to treatment decisions. **A**
- 1.6** Refer patients to local community resources when available. **B**
- 1.7** Provide patients with self-management support from lay health coaches, navigators, or community health workers when available. **A**

Health inequities related to diabetes and its complications are well documented and are heavily influenced by social determinants of health (58–62). Social determinants of health are defined as the economic, environmental, political, and social conditions in which people live and are responsible for a major part of health inequality worldwide (63). The ADA recognizes the association between social and environmental factors and the prevention and treatment of diabetes and has issued a call for research that seeks to better understand how these social determinants influence behaviors and how the relationships between these variables might be modified for the prevention and management of diabetes (64). While a comprehensive strategy to reduce diabetes-related health inequities in populations has not been formally studied, general recommendations from other chronic disease models can be drawn upon to inform systems-level strategies in diabetes. For example, the National Academy of Medicine has published a framework for educating health care professionals on the importance of social determinants of health (65). Furthermore, there are resources available for the inclusion of standardized sociodemographic variables in electronic medical records to facilitate the measurement of health inequities as well as the impact of interventions designed to reduce those inequities (66–68).

Social determinants of health are not always recognized and often go undiscussed in the clinical encounter (61). A

study by Piette et al. (69) found that among patients with chronic illnesses, two-thirds of those who reported not taking medications as prescribed due to cost never shared this with their physician. In a more recent study using data from the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), Patel et al. (61) found that half of adults with diabetes reported financial stress and one-fifth reported food insecurity (FI). One population in which such issues must be considered is older adults, where social difficulties may impair their quality of life and increase their risk of functional dependency (70) (see Section 12 “Older Adults” for a detailed discussion of social considerations in older adults). Creating systems-level mechanisms to screen for social determinants of health may help overcome structural barriers and communication gaps between patients and providers (61). In addition, brief, validated screening tools for some social determinants of health exist and could facilitate discussion around factors that significantly impact treatment during the clinical encounter. Below is a discussion of assessment and treatment considerations in the context of FI, homelessness, and limited English proficiency/low literacy.

### Food Insecurity

FI is the unreliable availability of nutritious food and the inability to consistently obtain food without resorting to socially unacceptable practices. Over 14% (or one of every seven people) of the U.S. population is food insecure. The rate is higher in some racial/ethnic minority groups, including African American and Latino populations, in low-income households, and in homes headed by a single mother. The risk for type 2 diabetes is increased twofold in those with FI (64) and has been associated with low adherence to taking medications appropriately and recommended self-care behaviors, depression, diabetes distress, and worse glycemic control when compared with individuals who are food secure (71,72). Risk for FI can be assessed with a validated two-item screening tool (73) that includes the statements: 1) “Within the past 12 months we worried whether our food would run out before we got money to buy more” and 2) “Within the past 12 months the food we bought just didn’t last and we didn’t have money

to get more.” An affirmative response to either statement had a sensitivity of 97% and specificity of 83%.

### Treatment Considerations

In those with diabetes and FI, the priority is mitigating the increased risk for uncontrolled hyperglycemia and severe hypoglycemia. Reasons for the increased risk of hyperglycemia include the steady consumption of inexpensive carbohydrate-rich processed foods, binge eating, financial constraints to the filling of diabetes medication prescriptions, and anxiety/depression leading to poor diabetes self-care behaviors. Hypoglycemia can occur as a result of inadequate or erratic carbohydrate consumption following the administration of sulfonylureas or insulin. See **Table 9.1** for drug-specific and patient factors, including cost and risk of hypoglycemia, for treatment options for adults with FI and type 2 diabetes. Providers should consider these factors when making treatment decisions in people with FI and seek local resources that might help patients with diabetes and their family members to more regularly obtain nutritious food (74).

### Homelessness

Homelessness often accompanies many additional barriers to diabetes self-management, including FI, literacy and numeracy deficiencies, lack of insurance, cognitive dysfunction, and mental health issues. Additionally, patients with diabetes who are homeless need secure places to keep their diabetes supplies and refrigerator access to properly store their insulin and take it on a regular schedule. Risk for homelessness can be ascertained using a brief risk assessment tool developed and validated for use among veterans (75). Given the potential challenges, providers who care for homeless individuals should be familiar with resources or have access to social workers that can facilitate temporary housing for their patients as a way to improve diabetes care.

### Language Barriers

Providers who care for non-English speakers should develop or offer educational programs and materials in multiple languages with the specific goals of preventing diabetes and building diabetes awareness in people who cannot easily read or write in English. The National

Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services in Health and Health Care provide guidance on how health care providers can reduce language barriers by improving their cultural competency, addressing health literacy, and ensuring communication with language assistance (76). The site offers a number of resources and materials that can be used to improve the quality of care delivery to non-English-speaking patients.

### Community Support

Identification or development of community resources to support healthy lifestyles is a core element of the CCM (9). Health care community linkages are receiving increasing attention from the American Medical Association, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, and others as a means of promoting translation of clinical recommendations for lifestyle modification in real-world settings (77). Community health workers (CHWs) (78), peer supporters (79–81), and lay leaders (82) may assist in the delivery of DSMES services (66), particularly in underserved communities. A CHW is defined by the American Public Health Association as a “frontline public health worker who is a trusted member of and/or has an unusually close understanding of the community served” (83). CHWs can be part of a cost-effective, evidence-based strategy to improve the management of diabetes and cardiovascular risk factors in underserved communities and health care systems (84).

### References

1. Kindig D, Stoddart G. What is population health? *Am J Public Health* 2003;93:380–383
2. Institute of Medicine Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. *Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century* [Internet], 2001. Washington, DC, The National Academies Press. Available from <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10027>. Accessed 22 October 2018
3. Ali MK, Bullard KM, Saaddine JB, Cowie CC, Imperatore G, Gregg EW. Achievement of goals in U.S. diabetes care, 1999–2010. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368:1613–1624
4. Wang J, Geiss LS, Cheng YJ, et al. Long-term and recent progress in blood pressure levels among U.S. adults with diagnosed diabetes, 1988–2008. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1579–1581
5. Kerr EA, Heisler M, Krein SL, et al. Beyond comorbidity counts: how do comorbidity type and severity influence diabetes patients’ treatment priorities and self-management? *J Gen Intern Med* 2007;22:1635–1640

6. Fernandez A, Schillinger D, Warton EM, et al. Language barriers, physician-patient language concordance, and glycemic control among insured Latinos with diabetes: the Diabetes Study of Northern California (DISTANCE). *J Gen Intern Med* 2011;26:170–176
7. TRIAD Study Group. Health systems, patients factors, and quality of care for diabetes: a synthesis of findings from the TRIAD study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:940–947
8. American Diabetes Association. Economic costs of diabetes in the U.S. in 2017. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:917–928
9. Stelfox M, Diparine K, Stopka C. The Chronic Care Model and diabetes management in US primary care settings: a systematic review. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2013;10:E26
10. Coleman K, Austin BT, Brach C, Wagner EH. Evidence on the Chronic Care Model in the new millennium. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2009;28:75–85
11. Piatt GA, Anderson RM, Brooks MM, et al. 3-year follow-up of clinical and behavioral improvements following a multifaceted diabetes care intervention: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Educ* 2010;36:301–309
12. Katon WJ, Lin EHB, Von Korff M, et al. Collaborative care for patients with depression and chronic illnesses. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:2611–2620
13. Parchman ML, Zeber JE, Romero RR, Pugh JA. Risk of coronary artery disease in type 2 diabetes and the delivery of care consistent with the chronic care model in primary care settings: a STARNet study. *Med Care* 2007;45:1129–1134
14. Tricco AC, Ivers NM, Grimshaw JM, et al. Effectiveness of quality improvement strategies on the management of diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2012;379:2252–2261
15. Schmittiel JA, Gopalan A, Lin MW, Banerjee S, Chau CV, Adams AS. Population health management for diabetes: health care system-level approaches for improving quality and addressing disparities. *Curr Diab Rep* 2017;17:31
16. O'Connor PJ, Bodkin NL, Fradkin J, et al. Diabetes performance measures: current status and future directions. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1651–1659
17. Jaffe MG, Lee GA, Young JD, Sidney S, Go AS. Improved blood pressure control associated with a large-scale hypertension program. *JAMA* 2013;310:699–705
18. Peikes D, Chen A, Schore J, Brown R. Effects of care coordination on hospitalization, quality of care, and health care expenditures among Medicare beneficiaries: 15 randomized trials. *JAMA* 2009;301:603–618
19. Raebel MA, Schmittiel J, Karter AJ, Konieczny JL, Steiner JF. Standardizing terminology and definitions of medication adherence and persistence in research employing electronic databases. *Med Care* 2013;51(Suppl. 3):S11–S21
20. Feifer C, Nemeth L, Nietert PJ, et al. Different paths to high-quality care: three archetypes of top-performing practice sites. *Ann Fam Med* 2007;5:233–241
21. Reed M, Huang J, Graetz I, et al. Outpatient electronic health records and the clinical care and outcomes of patients with diabetes mellitus. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;157:482–489
22. Cebul RD, Love TE, Jain AK, Hebert CJ. Electronic health records and quality of diabetes care. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:825–833
23. Battersby M, Von Korff M, Schaefer J, et al. Twelve evidence-based principles for implementing self-management support in primary care. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2010;36:561–570
24. Grant RW, Wald JS, Schnipper JL, et al. Practice-linked online personal health records for type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Intern Med* 2008;168:1776–1782
25. Young-Hyman D, de Groot M, Hill-Briggs F, Gonzalez JS, Hood K, Peyrot M. Psychosocial care for people with diabetes: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2126–2140
26. Beck J, Greenwood DA, Blanton L, et al.; 2017 Standards Revision Task Force. 2017 National standards for diabetes self-management education and support. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1409–1419
27. Pullen-Smith B, Carter-Edwards L, Leathers KH. Community health ambassadors: a model for engaging community leaders to promote better health in North Carolina. *J Public Health Manag Pract* 2008;14(Suppl.):S73–S81
28. Davidson MB. How our current medical care system fails people with diabetes: lack of timely, appropriate clinical decisions. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:370–372
29. Selby JV, Uratsu CS, Fireman B, et al. Treatment intensification and risk factor control: toward more clinically relevant quality measures. *Med Care* 2009;47:395–402
30. Raebel MA, Ellis JL, Schroeder EB, et al. Intensification of antihyperglycemic therapy among patients with incident diabetes: a Surveillance Prevention and Management of Diabetes Mellitus (SUPREME-DM) study. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2014;23:699–710
31. Grant RW, Pabon-Nau L, Ross KM, Youatt EJ, Pandiscio JC, Park ER. Diabetes oral medication initiation and intensification: patient views compared with current treatment guidelines. *Diabetes Educ* 2011;37:78–84
32. Tamhane S, Rodriguez-Gutierrez R, Hargraves I, Montori VM. Shared decision-making in diabetes care. *Curr Diab Rep* 2015;15:112
33. Schillinger D, Piette J, Grumbach K, et al. Closing the loop: physician communication with diabetic patients who have low health literacy. *Arch Intern Med* 2003;163:83–90
34. Rosal MC, Ockene IS, Restrepo A, et al. Randomized trial of a literacy-sensitive, culturally tailored diabetes self-management intervention for low-income Latinos: Latinos en control. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:838–844
35. Osborn CY, Cavanaugh K, Wallston KA, et al. Health literacy explains racial disparities in diabetes medication adherence. *J Health Commun* 2011;16(Suppl. 3):268–278
36. Garg AX, Adhikari NKJ, McDonald H, et al. Effects of computerized clinical decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2005;293:1223–1238
37. Smith SA, Shah ND, Bryant SC, et al.; Evidens Research Group. Chronic care model and shared care in diabetes: randomized trial of an electronic decision support system. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2008;83:747–757
38. Stone RA, Rao RH, Sevick MA, et al. Active care management supported by home telemonitoring in veterans with type 2 diabetes: the DiaTel randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:478–484
39. Bojadziewski T, Gabbay RA. Patient-centered medical home and diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1047–1053
40. American Telemedicine Association. About telemedicine [Internet]. Available from <http://www.americantelemed.org/main/about/about-telemedicine/telemedicine-faqs>. Accessed 2 October 2018
41. Lee SWH, Chan KY, Chua SS, Chaiyakunapruk N. Comparative effectiveness of telemedicine strategies on type 2 diabetes management: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Sci Rep* 2017;7:12680
42. Faruque LI, Wiebe N, Ehteshami-Afshar A, et al.; Alberta Kidney Disease Network. Effect of telemedicine on glycosylated hemoglobin in diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *CMAJ* 2017;189:E341–E364
43. Marcolino MS, Maia JX, Alkimm MBM, Boersma E, Ribeiro AL. Telemedicine application in the care of diabetes patients: systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e79246
44. Heitkemper EM, Mamykina L, Travers J, Smaldone A. Do health information technology self-management interventions improve glycemic control in medically underserved adults with diabetes? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2017;24:1024–1035
45. Myerson R, Laiteerapong N. The Affordable Care Act and diabetes diagnosis and care: exploring the potential impacts. *Curr Diab Rep* 2016;16:27
46. Casagrande SS, McEwen LN, Herman WH. Changes in health insurance coverage under the Affordable Care Act: a national sample of U.S. adults with diabetes, 2009 and 2016. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:956–962
47. Doucette ED, Salas J, Scherrer JF. Insurance coverage and diabetes quality indicators among patients in NHANES. *Am J Manag Care* 2016;22:484–490
48. Stiefel M, Nolan K. Measuring the triple aim: a call for action. *Popul Health Manag* 2013;16:219–220
49. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. About the National Quality Strategy [Internet], 2017. Available from <https://www.ahrq.gov/workingforquality/about/index.html>. Accessed 22 October 2018
50. National Quality Forum. Home page [Internet], 2017. Available from <http://www.qualityforum.org/home.aspx>. Accessed 22 October 2018
51. Burstin H, Johnson K. Getting to better care and outcomes for diabetes through measurement [article online], 2016. Available from <http://www.ajmc.com/journals/evidence-based-diabetes-management/2016/march-2016/getting-to-better-care-and-outcomes-for-diabetes-through-measurement>. Accessed 22 October 2018
52. National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases. Practice transformation for physicians & health care teams [Internet]. Available from <https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/health-communication-programs/ndep/health-care-professionals/practice-transformation/Pages/resourcedetail.aspx>. Accessed 22 October 2018

53. National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases. Diabetes care and quality: past, present, and future [Internet]. Available from <https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/health-communication-programs/ndep/health-care-professionals/practice-transformation/defining-quality-care/diabetes-care-quality/Pages/default.aspx>. Accessed 22 October 2018
54. O'Connor PJ, Sperl-Hillen JM, Fazio CJ, Averbek BM, Rank BH, Margolis KL. Outpatient diabetes clinical decision support: current status and future directions. *Diabet Med* 2016;33:734–741
55. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. CMS Equity Plan for Medicare [Internet]. Available from <https://www.cms.gov/About-CMS/Agency-Information/OMH/equity-initiatives/equity-plan.html>. Accessed 22 October 2018
56. Rosenthal MB, Cutler DM, Feder J. The ACO rules—striking the balance between participation and transformative potential. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:e6
57. Washington AE, Lipstein SH. The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute—promoting better information, decisions, and health. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:e31
58. Hutchinson RN, Shin S. Systematic review of health disparities for cardiovascular diseases and associated factors among American Indian and Alaska Native populations. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e80973
59. Borschuk AP, Everhart RS. Health disparities among youth with type 1 diabetes: a systematic review of the current literature. *Fam Syst Health* 2015;33:297–313
60. Walker RJ, Strom Williams J, Egede LE. Influence of race, ethnicity and social determinants of health on diabetes outcomes. *Am J Med Sci* 2016;351:366–373
61. Patel MR, Piette JD, Resnicow K, Kowalski-Dobson T, Heisler M. Social determinants of health, cost-related nonadherence, and cost-reducing behaviors among adults with diabetes: findings from the National Health Interview Survey. *Med Care* 2016;54:796–803
62. Steve SL, Tung EL, Schlichtman JJ, Peek ME. Social disorder in adults with type 2 diabetes: building on race, place, and poverty. *Curr Diab Rep* 2016;16:72
63. World Health Organization Commission on Social Determinants of Health. Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health [Internet], 2008. Geneva, Switzerland, World Health Organization. Available from [http://www.who.int/social-determinants/final\\_report/csdh\\_finalreport\\_2008.pdf](http://www.who.int/social-determinants/final_report/csdh_finalreport_2008.pdf). Accessed 22 October 2018
64. Hill JO, Galloway JM, Goley A, et al. Socioecological determinants of prediabetes and type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2430–2439
65. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. A Framework to Address the Social Determinants of Health [Internet], 2016. Washington, DC, The National Academies Press. Available from <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/21923/a-framework-for-educating-health-professionals-to-address-the-social-determinants-of-health>. Accessed 22 October 2018
66. Institute of Medicine. Capturing social and behavioral domains and measures in electronic health records: phase 2 [Internet], 2014. Washington, DC, The National Academies Press. Available from <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/18951/capturing-social-and-behavioral-domains-and-measures-in-electronic-health-records>. Accessed 22 October 2018
67. Chin MH, Clarke AR, Nocon RS, et al. A roadmap and best practices for organizations to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in health care. *J Gen Intern Med* 2012;27:992–1000
68. National Quality Forum. National voluntary consensus standards for ambulatory care—measuring healthcare disparities [Internet], 2008. Available from [https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2008/03/National\\_Voluntary\\_Consensus\\_Standards\\_for\\_Ambulatory\\_Care%20%80%94Measuring\\_Healthcare\\_Disparities.aspx](https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2008/03/National_Voluntary_Consensus_Standards_for_Ambulatory_Care%20%80%94Measuring_Healthcare_Disparities.aspx). Accessed 22 October 2018
69. Piette JD, Heisler M, Wagner TH. Cost-related medication underuse among chronically ill adults: the treatments people forgo, how often, and who is at risk. *Am J Public Health* 2004;94:1782–1787
70. Laiterapong N, Karter AJ, Liu JY, et al. Correlates of quality of life in older adults with diabetes: the Diabetes & Aging Study. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1749–1753
71. Heerman WJ, Wallston KA, Osborn CY, et al. Food insecurity is associated with diabetes self-care behaviours and glycaemic control. *Diabet Med* 2016;33:844–850
72. Silverman J, Krieger J, Kiefer M, Hebert P, Robinson J, Nelson K. The relationship between food insecurity and depression, diabetes distress and medication adherence among low-income patients with poorly-controlled diabetes. *J Gen Intern Med* 2015;30:1476–1480
73. Hager ER, Quigg AM, Black MM, et al. Development and validity of a 2-item screen to identify families at risk for food insecurity. *Pediatrics* 2010;126:e26–e32
74. Seligman HK, Schillinger D. Hunger and socioeconomic disparities in chronic disease. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:6–9
75. Montgomery AE, Fargo JD, Kane V, Culhane DP. Development and validation of an instrument to assess imminent risk of homelessness among veterans. *Public Health Rep* 2014;129:428–436
76. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Think cultural health [Internet]. Available from <https://www.thinkculturalhealth.hhs.gov/>. Accessed 22 October 2018
77. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Clinical-community linkages [Internet]. Available from <http://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/prevention-chronic-care/improve/community/index.html>. Accessed 22 October 2018
78. Shah M, Kaselitz E, Heisler M. The role of community health workers in diabetes: update on current literature. *Curr Diab Rep* 2013;13:163–171
79. Heisler M, Vijan S, Makki F, Piette JD. Diabetes control with reciprocal peer support versus nurse care management: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;153:507–515
80. Long JA, Jahnle EC, Richardson DM, Loewenstein G, Volpp KG. Peer mentoring and financial incentives to improve glucose control in African American veterans: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;156:416–424
81. Fisher EB, Boothroyd RI, Elstad EA, et al. Peer support of complex health behaviors in prevention and disease management with special reference to diabetes: systematic reviews. *Clin Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;3:4
82. Foster G, Taylor SJC, Eldridge SE, Ramsay J, Griffiths CJ. Self-management education programmes by lay leaders for people with chronic conditions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007;4:CD005108
83. Rosenthal EL, Rush CH, Allen CG; Project on CHW Policy & Practice. Understanding scope and competencies: a contemporary look at the United States community health worker field: progress report of the Community Health Worker (CHW) Core Consensus (C3) Project: building national consensus on CHW core roles, skills, and qualities [Internet], 2016. Available from <http://files.ctctcdn.com/a907c850501/1c1289f0-88cc-49c3-a238-66def942c147.pdf>. Accessed 22 October 2018
84. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Community health workers help patients manage diabetes [Internet]. Available from <https://www.thecommunityguide.org/content/community-health-workers-help-patients-manage-diabetes>. Accessed 22 October 2018