

1 **A Novel Intervention to Increase Postpartum Primary Care Engagement:**
2 *A Randomized Clinical Trial*

3
4 Mark A. Clapp, MD MPH^{1,2}
5 Alaka Ray, MD^{1,2}
6 Pichliya Liang, BS¹
7 Kaitlyn E. James, PhD MPH^{1,2}
8 Ishani Ganguli, MD MPH^{2,3}
9 Jessica Cohen, PhD⁴

10
11 ¹ Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA
12 ² Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
13 ³ Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston MA
14 ⁴ Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA

15
16 Corresponding Author:
17 Mark A Clapp, MD MPH
18 Massachusetts General Hospital
19 mark.clapp@mgh.harvard.edu
20 617-724-4531

21
22 Word count
23 Abstract: 335
24 Main text: 3,171

25 **ABSTRACT**

26 Importance: Over 30% of pregnant people have at least one chronic medical condition, and
27 nearly 20% develop gestational diabetes or pregnancy-related hypertension, increasing the risk
28 of future chronic disease. While these individuals are often monitored closely during pregnancy,
29 they face significant barriers when transitioning to primary care following delivery, due in part to
30 a lack of health care support for this transition.

31 Objective: To evaluate the impact of an intervention designed to improve postpartum primary
32 care engagement by reducing patient administrative burden and information gaps.

33 Design: Individual-level randomized controlled trial.

34 Setting: One hospital-based and five community-based outpatient obstetric clinics affiliated with
35 a large academic medical center.

36 Participants: Participants included English- and Spanish-speaking pregnant or recently
37 postpartum adults with obesity, anxiety, depression, diabetes mellitus, chronic hypertension,
38 gestational diabetes, or pregnancy-related hypertension, and a primary care clinician (PCP)
39 listed in their electronic health record (EHR).

40 Intervention: A behavioral economics-informed intervention bundle, including default scheduling
41 of postpartum PCP appointments and patient messages and reminders with tailored language.

42 Main Outcome: Completion of a PCP visit for routine or chronic condition care within 4 months
43 of delivery.

44 Results: 360 patients were randomized (Control: N=176, Intervention: N=184). PCP visit
45 completion within 4 months occurred in 22.0% (95% confidence interval (CI) 16.4-28.8%) in the
46 control group and 40.0% (95%CI 33.1-47.4%) in the intervention group. In regression models
47 accounting for randomization strata, the intervention increased PCP visit completion by 18.7
48 percentage points (95%CI 10.7-29.1). The intervention also significantly decreased postpartum
49 readmissions, increased receipt of blood pressure, weight, and mood screenings, and increased
50 PCP-documented plans for contraception and mental health.

51 Conclusions and Relevance: The current lack of support for postpartum transitions to primary
52 care is a missed opportunity to improve recently pregnant individual's short- and long-term
53 health. This study found that default PCP visit scheduling, tailored messages, and reminders
54 can substantially improve postpartum primary care engagement for individuals with or at high
55 risk for chronic disease. Efforts to reduce patient administrative burdens may be relatively low-
56 resource, high-impact approaches to improving postpartum health and wellbeing.

57 Trial Registration: NCT05543265.

58 INTRODUCTION

59 Although the chronic disease burden in pregnancy is high and growing in the U.S., most
60 people with chronic conditions do not effectively transition to primary care management
61 following delivery.¹⁻⁹ Over 30% of pregnant people have diabetes, hypertension, or obesity, and
62 11-22% have anxiety or depression.¹⁰⁻¹² Furthermore, common pregnancy-related conditions
63 (e.g., gestational diabetes and pregnancy-related hypertension) confer an increased risk of
64 developing chronic disease.¹³⁻¹⁸ Strong evidence underpins the benefits of managing chronic
65 conditions through primary care and of managing these conditions earlier in life.¹⁹⁻²² However,
66 while pregnant people with these conditions are often carefully monitored during pregnancy,
67 many receive no routine care after their pregnancy, and nearly half of those with chronic
68 conditions do not see their primary care clinician (PCP) at all in the postpartum year.²³ The
69 abrupt drop off from high health system engagement and motivation during pregnancy to limited
70 or no health care encounters postpartum has been termed a “postpartum cliff.”²⁴ Low rates of
71 postpartum primary care engagement reflect a missed opportunity to improve the prevention
72 and management of chronic disease.

73 Postpartum transitions from obstetric to primary care are encouraged by guidelines yet
74 stymied by numerous barriers. Specifically, obstetric clinical guidelines recommend that
75 obstetric care providers counsel patients on the importance of primary care follow-up. Yet, a
76 range of systemic, financial, and behavioral barriers often prevent postpartum people from
77 effectively transitioning to primary care.²⁵⁻²⁹ Patient administrative burden (e.g., appointment
78 scheduling, information seeking, insurance/billing issues) is increasingly recognized as a barrier
79 to accessing care.³⁰ In a recent survey, 33% of patients reported that they delayed or did not
80 seek health care because of the administrative burden, with women having greater odds of
81 performing tasks and experiencing burdens.³⁰ The effects of this burden may be amplified in the
82 postpartum period when new parents are sleep-deprived and face many competing demands,
83 including caring for their newborn and family. This study aimed to increase patient engagement

84 in primary care after the immediate postpartum period for pregnant individuals with conditions
85 that convey a long-term health risk by reducing administrative burden and motivating continued
86 health activation through an intervention based on insights from behavioral economics.

87

88 **METHODS**

89 **Study Design**

90 This study was an individual-level, two-group, 1:1 stratified randomized controlled trial of
91 the effectiveness of a behavioral economics-informed intervention to increase rate of
92 postpartum primary care visit completion. The study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov
93 (NCT05543265) on September 6, 2022, and conducted from November 3, 2022, to October 11,
94 2023. The Mass General Brigham Human Subjects Committee approved this study. The
95 Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) guidelines were followed in reporting
96 the study and its results.

97

98 **Patient Eligibility**

99 Patients who had obesity (pre-pregnancy body mass index (≥ 30 kg/m²)), anxiety or
100 depressive mood disorder, type 1 or 2 diabetes mellitus, chronic hypertension, gestational
101 diabetes, or pregnancy-related hypertension listed in their medical record were eligible to
102 participate. Patients at risk for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, as determined by the US
103 Preventative Services Task Force guidelines for prescribing low-dose aspirin, were also
104 included. Patients with these conditions were prioritized for inclusion in the study as they were
105 more likely to have ongoing care needs after pregnancy. Also, this study was limited to patients
106 who had a PCP listed or identified in their medical record, as the barriers and solutions to post-
107 delivery primary care re-engagement are different than establishing care with a new PCP; a
108 preliminary analysis of patients receiving obstetric care at the study institution revealed that 90%
109 had a PCP listed in the EHR. Other eligibility criteria included: 1) pregnant or postpartum within

110 two weeks of their estimated delivery date (EDD), 2) receipt of prenatal care at the study
111 institution or its affiliated clinics, 3) enrolled and elected to receive messages in the study
112 institution's EHR patient portal, 4) primary language of English or Spanish, 5) age \geq 18 years at
113 the time of enrollment, and 6) not actively undergoing a work-up for, or known to have, fetal
114 demise at the time of enrollment.

115

116 **Enrollment and Randomization**

117 Eligible patients were approached in person and via telephone during the eligibility
118 window (up to two weeks after their EDD). Those who consented to participate in the study were
119 also asked to consent to receive text (SMS) messages separately. Individuals were randomized
120 using a randomization table created by the statistician (KEJ) and uploaded directly into the
121 REDCap randomization module, which was blinded to the primary investigators and study staff.
122 The assignment sequence was stratified by two variables that were determined a priori to be
123 important to ensure balance: 1) visit with a PCP within 3 years before the EDD and 2) site of
124 prenatal care (hospital campus vs. community-based obstetric clinic). Patients were randomized
125 after they consented and completed a baseline survey.

126

127 **Study Intervention**

128 The intervention was designed to increase the rate of postpartum primary care visit
129 completion within 4 months after the patient's EDD. The bundle included a targeted introduction
130 message about the importance of seeing their PCP after delivery and informed them that, to
131 support them in this, a study staff member would be making an appointment on their behalf;
132 they were allowed to opt-out or communicate about scheduling preferences. For those who did
133 not opt-out, the study staff called the PCP office and requested that "health care maintenance"
134 or "annual visit" be scheduled within the target 4-month window. If a patient had already seen
135 their PCP for an annual visit within the year, they were scheduled for this visit when they were

136 next eligible, even if outside the 4-month study follow-up period. For those who had
137 appointments scheduled, study-specific appointment reminders were sent approximately 1
138 month after the EDD and 1 week before the scheduled appointment via the EHR patient portal
139 and SMS, both used salient labeling to describe the visit; examples are shown in Appendix
140 (eFigure 1). If the PCP worked in the same health system and an appointment was scheduled,
141 an electronic message was sent to the PCP from the study staff about the appointment
142 scheduled by the study staff. For those for whom an appointment could not be scheduled,
143 similar reminders were sent on the importance of PCP follow-up and encouraged the patient to
144 contact their PCP's office directly to schedule. Reminders included best practice wording from
145 behavioral economic nudge "mega-studies," including that the appointment had been "reserved
146 for you."³¹ Using salient labeling, the appointment was described as the "Postpartum-to-Primary
147 Care Transition Appointment."

148 Patients in the control group received 1 message within 2 weeks of the EDD with a
149 generic recommendation for PCP follow-up after delivery.

150

151 **Study Measures**

152 The primary outcome was completing a primary care visit for routine or chronic condition
153 care within 4 months of the patient's EDD. Specifically, we considered the outcome to have
154 occurred if the patient attended a "health care maintenance" (i.e., "annual exam") visit or a
155 "problem-based visit" in which obesity, anxiety/depression, diabetes, or hypertension were
156 addressed with a primary care provider within 4 months after their EDD. This definition was
157 chosen to include visits most likely to reflect primary care re-engagement after delivery instead
158 of a visit for an acute illness or issue. This time frame was selected for two reasons: 1) to
159 capitalize on the increased health activation and motivation that has been noted during
160 pregnancy and 2) because these patients were more likely to have conditions that required

161 ongoing and active management outside of the traditional postpartum period (up to 12 weeks
162 after delivery).

163 Alternate specifications for the primary outcome were compared in sensitivity analyses:
164 1) self-reported PCP visits within 4 months after the EDD, obtained from a survey sent
165 approximately 5 months after the EDD; 2) primary outcome restricted to visits with the patient's
166 designated PCP; 3) primary outcome restricted to patients whose PCP was affiliated with the
167 study institution's health system, 4) primary outcome expanded to include any PCP visit (not
168 only routine or chronic condition care) within 4 months after a patient's EDD, and 5) primary
169 outcome expanded to include any completed or scheduled PCP visit within 1 year of a patient's
170 EDD.

171 We examined secondary outcomes measuring unscheduled care: obstetric triage visit,
172 emergency room or urgent care use, and readmission within 4 months after the delivery.
173 Secondary outcomes also included measures of the content of care that occurred at any PCP
174 visit within 4 months: weight screening, blood pressure screening, mood screening, plan for
175 diabetes screening, plan for mental health care, and contraception planning. Content of care
176 outcomes were also compared within population subgroups related to the eligibility health
177 condition. All outcomes are defined in detail in Appendix (eTable 1).

178 The primary and most secondary outcomes were ascertained directly by reviewing the
179 patient's medical record approximately 5 months after their EDD. Study staff that performed the
180 chart review were blinded to the group assignment. Secondary self-reported outcomes were
181 obtained by an electronic survey sent to patients approximately 5 months after their EDD.

182

183 **Sample Size Calculation**

184 Based on a historical cohort, we estimated that 33% of the targeted study population
185 would have a PCP visit within 4 months of delivery. We estimated the intervention would
186 increase the rate of PCP visit attendance by at least 15 percentage points, a conservative

187 estimate based on a prior study that examined the impact of default scheduling of postpartum
188 obstetric care appointments (24 percentage point increase).³² Assuming an alpha of 0.05 and
189 power of 80% and using a two-sided z-test, 334 patients were needed to detect a 15-
190 percentage point difference. To account for individuals who may be lost to follow-up or withdraw,
191 we planned to randomize 360 patients.

192

193 **Statistical Analysis**

194 Patients were analyzed by intention-to-treat. Patients who were lost to follow-up (i.e.,
195 transferred obstetric care before delivery) or withdrew before the outcome assessment were
196 excluded. Baseline patient characteristics and the percentage of patients who accessed the
197 study messages in the EHR patient portal were reported. Primary and secondary outcomes
198 were compared using chi-squared, t-tests, and Fisher's exact test, where appropriate. The
199 percentage point difference in outcomes between the two groups was estimated using a linear
200 probability regression model that included two indicator terms for the randomization strata,
201 which were defined *a priori*.

202 A heterogeneity analysis was performed to understand the potential impact of the
203 intervention among patient factors known or hypothesized to be disproportionately affected by
204 administrative burdens. The primary outcome was compared among subgroups based on site of
205 prenatal care (hospital- vs. community-based clinic), chronic conditions (anxiety/depression,
206 diabetes, hypertension, obesity, and multi-morbidity, defined as >1 of the listed conditions), race
207 (self-described Asian, Black, White, Other or multiple races), ethnicity (self-described Hispanic
208 or non-Hispanic), individual earnings/income (<\$30,000, \$30-75,000, or >\$75,000), primary
209 payer for delivery hospitalization (Medicaid or Private/Other), and self-reported physical and
210 mental health status at time of enrollment.^{30,33}

211 Stata 16.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX) was used for the analysis. P-values <0.05
212 were considered statistically significant.

213

214 **RESULTS**

215 Initially, 574 patients were identified as likely to be eligible based on pre-defined eligibility
216 filters within the EHR (Figure 1). Upon chart review, 35 were determined ineligible. Of those
217 confirmed eligible, 77 could not be contacted and 102 declined. 360 patients were randomized:
218 176 to the control group and 184 to the intervention group. Six patients were excluded from the
219 final analysis because they transferred their care to another institution before delivery (3 in each
220 group). One patient in the intervention group withdrew from the study before the end of the
221 follow-up period. The final number of patients analyzed in each group was 173 in the control
222 group and 180 in the intervention group. Among study participants, 345/353 (97.7%) accessed
223 study-related messages in the online patient portal. The proportion of patients in the intervention
224 group who received each component of the intervention bundle is included in the Appendix
225 (eTable 2); the study staff scheduled appointments for 137 participants (76.1%), of whom only 6
226 (4.4%) did not present for or cancel their appointment. Of all participants, 61.8% completed the
227 online electronic survey 5 months after the EDD.

228 The intervention and control groups were balanced in all baseline patient characteristics
229 (Table 1). Of the eligibility conditions, which were not mutually exclusive, 75.8% of all
230 participants had anxiety or depression, 15.9% had a chronic or pregnancy-related hypertensive
231 disorder, 19.8% had pre-existing or gestational diabetes, and 40.4% had a pre-pregnancy BMI
232 ≥ 30 kg/m². Medicaid was the primary payer for the delivery encounter for 21.9% of patients.
233 When surveyed, 11.6% reported their physical health and 19.6% reported their mental health as
234 “fair” or “poor” condition. At enrollment, 34.3% had not seen any PCP within the prior 3 years,
235 and 29.2% were receiving obstetric care at one of the hospital’s satellite or affiliated health
236 center clinics.

237 Table 2 shows the effects of the intervention on completion of a primary care visit for
238 routine or chronic condition care within 4 months of the patient’s EDD. This primary outcome

239 occurred in 40.0% (95% confidence interval (CI) 33.1-47.4%) of the intervention group and
240 22.0% (95%CI 6.4-28.8%) of the control group ($p<0.001$). When adjusting for pre-specified
241 randomization strata, the intervention increased the primary outcome by 18.7 percentage points
242 (pp) (95%CI 9.1-28.2 pp). The effects on the primary outcome were similar in the sensitivity
243 analyses (Table 3). For other measures of care utilization, there were no statistically significant
244 effects on obstetric triage visits (16.2 vs 15.6%, $p=0.87$) or emergency or urgent care use (11.1
245 vs. 13.3% ($p=0.53$)). However, the intervention group had fewer postpartum readmissions: 1.7%
246 vs. 5.8% ($p=0.04$).

247 Figure 2 compares the secondary outcomes related to the content or provision of care
248 between the two groups. Among all patients, the intervention increased the number of
249 individuals who had a weight (42.8 vs. 38.3%, $p=0.005$), blood pressure (42.8 vs. 27.7%,
250 $p=0.003$), or mood (32.8 vs. 16.8%, $p<0.001$) screening performed at a PCP visit. The
251 intervention also increased the number of individuals who had a plan documented about their
252 mental health (37.2 vs. 23.1%, $p<0.001$) and for contraception (18.2 vs 9.5%, $p=0.02$) at a PCP
253 visit. There was no difference in a documented plan for diabetes screening between the two
254 groups. Comparisons of the secondary outcomes related to the content of care among
255 subgroups of health conditions are shown in eTable 3 in the Appendix, though many were
256 limited by small sample sizes.

257 eTable 4 in the Appendix shows treatment effect heterogeneity across health conditions,
258 demographic characteristics, and baseline self-reported physical and mental health. While the
259 study was not designed to detect outcomes within subgroups, the intervention led to significant
260 increases in PCP visits among nearly all subgroups examined.

261

262 **DISCUSSION**

263 Among pregnant people with common comorbidities, a behavioral economics-informed
264 intervention bundle, including opt-out appointment scheduling, tailored messaging, and nudge

265 reminders, increased PCP visit completion within 4 months postpartum by approximately 20
266 percentage points, a nearly 2-fold increase. The primary finding was robust to multiple
267 definitions or variations of the primary outcome, including self-reported PCP visit attendance.
268 The effects on the primary outcome appeared largely consistent among population subgroups,
269 though small sample sizes limited power in these comparisons. Not only did the intervention
270 increase PCP visit completion, but it also resulted in more individuals receiving important
271 screening tests and services; however, larger studies are needed to examine many condition-
272 specific measures of the content of primary care. There were no observed changes in emergent
273 or urgent care visits between the two groups; however, any potential effects of facilitated
274 primary care engagement on emergent care use are more likely to occur later in the postpartum
275 year or beyond, and we intend to measure longer-term care utilization and outcomes in future
276 studies. Interestingly, the bundled intervention did decrease postpartum readmissions.

277 Our results suggest that behavioral economic-informed interventions that reduce patient
278 administrative burden have the potential to be relatively low-resource, high-impact approaches
279 to increasing primary care use, a critical priority in the context of declining and inequitable
280 primary care engagement in the U.S.^{34,35} Behavioral economics research examines how people
281 make predictable decision errors and tests interventions that leverage these insights to remove
282 behavioral barriers (“nudges”).^{36–46} These interventions often try to make it easier for people to
283 make choices they already want to undertake but are not. In-kind, the underlying hypothesis of
284 the present study was that many postpartum individuals with or at high risk for chronic
285 conditions who have a PCP assigned want to be under the care of their PCP but face multiple
286 barriers to primary care engagement in the postpartum period, including identifying who their
287 PCP is and scheduling with them. Our study design was built to address two common
288 behavioral barriers, namely, inattention and status-quo bias, and demonstrated how default
289 primary care appointment scheduling, a salient label for the appointment, and tailored SMS
290 messages and appointment reminders can increase postpartum primary care engagement.

291 Similar approaches have effectively motivated other health behaviors, including in obstetric and
292 postpartum care.^{46–50}

293 This study builds on prior efforts to improve postpartum health and wellbeing.^{51–58} Our
294 study is most closely aligned with the intervention research on postpartum care navigation, in
295 which patient navigators identify and holistically address patient-level barriers to care and assist
296 with care coordination.^{51,59} Although obstetric care navigators hold great promise for improving
297 postpartum health care use, that level of intervention intensity and cost may not be necessary
298 for most postpartum people needing primary care. Results from this study suggest that reducing
299 some patient administrative barriers may be a relatively resource-conscious but highly effective
300 approach to encouraging postpartum primary care transitions. Specifically, we demonstrated
301 this intervention could be delivered consistently, with the successful scheduling of an “annual
302 visit” appointment for 76% of participants and a low “no-show” appointment rate of only 4%.

303 The strengths of this study are its robust randomized controlled trial design and the
304 augmentation of observed outcomes within the EHR with self-reported outcomes. The study had
305 several limitations. We observed health care encounters within a single health system, though
306 the health system is large (>1,300 PCPs). We could not observe PCP visits for clinicians who do
307 not use or are not affiliated with the health system’s common EHR (Epic); as an alternate
308 measure, we did examine self-reports of PCP visits. This study focused on individuals who had
309 an identified PCP at enrollment; given the limited availability of PCPs in certain areas, the effect
310 of the intervention may be lessened for individuals seeking to establish care with a new PCP.
311 Last, the study was not powered to detect differences in many secondary outcomes related to
312 the content of primary care within health conditions, and larger studies are needed to ascertain
313 the impact of the intervention on the quality of primary care for specific conditions.

314 In conclusion, a behavioral economics-informed intervention to improve postpartum
315 transitions to primary care substantially increased postpartum primary care visit completion for
316 patients with or at risk for common comorbidities. Targeting a vulnerable population at a critical

317 time, this intervention represents a potentially scalable approach to increasing primary care
318 engagement and ongoing health condition management in the postpartum months and beyond.
319 Ongoing follow-up related to this study seeks to analyze the intervention's impact on condition-
320 specific management (i.e., the content and quality of care provided in the postpartum period)
321 and its long-term impact on health outcomes.

322 Disclosures: Dr. Clapp is a scientific medical advisor and has private equity for Delfina Care,
323 which is not related and was not involved in this study. Dr. Ganguli received consulting fees from
324 F-Prime for advising unrelated to this work.

325
326 Presentations: Initial results from this study were presented at the University of Pennsylvania
327 Center for Health Incentives and Behavioral Economics Research Conference (October 30,
328 2023; Philadelphia, PA), the 2023 Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management
329 (APPAM) Fall Research Conference (November 9-11, 2023; Atlanta, GA) and the American
330 Economic Association Annual Meeting (January 5-7, 2024; San Antonio, TX). The study has
331 been submitted for presentation at the 2024 American Society for Health Economists
332 conference (June 16-19, 2024; San Diego, CA).

333
334 Previous Publication: A version of this manuscript was posted on the preprint server medrxiv.org
335 (<https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.21.24301585>) so that it could be referenced in a recent grant
336 proposal.

337
338 Funding: This study was funded by the National Institute on Aging via the MIT Roybal Center for
339 Translational Research to Improve Health Care for the Aging (P30AG064190) and the NBER
340 Roybal Center for Behavior Change in Health (P30AG034532). Dr. Ganguli was supported by
341 K23AG068240 from the National Institute on Aging. Additional support was provided by the
342 National Academy of Medicine's Health Catalyst Award. The funders had no role in the oversight
343 or conduct of this trial.

344
345 Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Hasan Quadri and Fowsia Warsame for their
346 assistance in conducting this trial.

347 **REFERENCES**

348

349 1. Admon LK, Winkelman TNA, Moniz MH, Davis MM, Heisler M, Dalton VK. Disparities in
350 Chronic Conditions Among Women Hospitalized for Delivery in the United States, 2005-
351 2014. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2017;130(6):1319-1326. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002357

352 2. Bateman BT, Bansil P, Hernandez-Diaz S, Mhyre JM, Callaghan WM, Kuklina EV.
353 Prevalence, trends, and outcomes of chronic hypertension: a nationwide sample of delivery
354 admissions. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2012;206(2):134.e1-8. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2011.10.878

355 3. Bardenheier BH, Imperatore G, Gilboa SM, et al. Trends in Gestational Diabetes Among
356 Hospital Deliveries in 19 U.S. States, 2000-2010. *Am J Prev Med.* 2015;49(1):12-19.
357 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2015.01.026

358 4. Flegal KM, Carroll MD, Kit BK, Ogden CL. Prevalence of Obesity and Trends in the
359 Distribution of Body Mass Index Among US Adults, 1999-2010. *JAMA.* 2012;307(5):491-
360 497. doi:10.1001/jama.2012.39

361 5. Li M, Gong W, Wang S, Li Z. Trends in body mass index, overweight and obesity among
362 adults in the USA, the NHANES from 2003 to 2018: a repeat cross-sectional survey. *BMJ*
363 *Open.* 2022;12(12):e065425. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-065425

364 6. Fisher SC, Kim SY, Sharma AJ, Rochat R, Morrow B. Is obesity still increasing among
365 pregnant women? Prepregnancy obesity trends in 20 states, 2003–2009. *Prev Med.*
366 2013;56(6):372-378. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2013.02.015

367 7. Thomas DT, Benson G, Gan A, Schwager S, Okeson B, Baechler CJ. Fourth Trimester:
368 Assessing Women’s Health Equity and Long-Term Cardiovascular Outcomes in a Large
369 Midwestern Health System in 2021. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes.*
370 2024;17(1):e010157. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.123.010157

371 8. Lewey J, Levine LD, Yang L, Triebwasser JE, Groeneveld PW. Patterns of Postpartum
372 Ambulatory Care Follow-up Care Among Women With Hypertensive Disorders of
373 Pregnancy. *Journal of the American Heart Association.* 2020;9(17):e016357.
374 doi:10.1161/JAHA.120.016357

375 9. D’Amico R, Dalmacy D, Akinduro JA, et al. Patterns of Postpartum Primary Care Follow-up
376 and Diabetes-Related Care After Diagnosis of Gestational Diabetes. *JAMA Network Open.*
377 2023;6(2):e2254765. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.54765

378 10. NVSS - Birth Data. Published April 10, 2023. Accessed May 1, 2023.
379 <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/births.htm>

380 11. Bauman BL. Vital Signs: Postpartum Depressive Symptoms and Provider Discussions
381 About Perinatal Depression — United States, 2018. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.*
382 2020;69. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6919a2

383 12. Rokicki S, Steenland MW, Geiger CK, et al. Trends in postpartum mental health care before
384 and during COVID-19. *Health Serv Res.* 2022;57(6):1342-1347. doi:10.1111/1475-
385 6773.14051

- 386 13. Gestational Hypertension and Preeclampsia: ACOG Practice Bulletin, Number 222. *Obstet*
387 *Gynecol.* 2020;135(6):e237-e260. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003891
- 388 14. Vounzoulaki E, Khunti K, Abner SC, Tan BK, Davies MJ, Gillies CL. Progression to type 2
389 diabetes in women with a known history of gestational diabetes: systematic review and
390 meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2020;369:m1361. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1361
- 391 15. Diaz-Santana MV, O'Brien KM, Park YMM, Sandler DP, Weinberg CR. Persistence of Risk
392 for Type 2 Diabetes After Gestational Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Care.* 2022;45(4):864-870.
393 doi:10.2337/dc21-1430
- 394 16. Wang YX, Arvizu M, Rich-Edwards JW, et al. Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy and
395 Subsequent Risk of Premature Mortality. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2021;77(10):1302-1312.
396 doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2021.01.018
- 397 17. Wu P, Haththotuwa R, Kwok CS, et al. Preeclampsia and Future Cardiovascular Health: A
398 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes.*
399 2017;10(2):e003497. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.116.003497
- 400 18. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 190: Gestational Diabetes Mellitus. *Obstet Gynecol.*
401 2018;131(2):e49-e64. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002501
- 402 19. Ashburner JM, Horn DM, O'Keefe SM, et al. Chronic disease outcomes from primary care
403 population health program implementation. *Am J Manag Care.* 2017;23(12):728-735.
- 404 20. Sung NJ, Markuns JF, Park KH, Kim K, Lee H, Lee JH. Higher quality primary care is
405 associated with good self-rated health status. *Fam Pract.* 2013;30(5):568-575.
406 doi:10.1093/fampra/cmt021
- 407 21. Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health.
408 *Milbank Q.* 2005;83(3):457-502. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0009.2005.00409.x
- 409 22. Hughes LS, Cohen DJ, Phillips RL Jr. Strengthening Primary Care to Improve Health
410 Outcomes in the US—Creating Oversight to Address Invisibility. *JAMA Health Forum.*
411 2022;3(9):e222903. doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2022.2903
- 412 23. Bennett WL, Chang HY, Levine DM, et al. Utilization of primary and obstetric care after
413 medically complicated pregnancies: an analysis of medical claims data. *J Gen Intern Med.*
414 2014;29(4):636-645. doi:10.1007/s11606-013-2744-2
- 415 24. Cohen JL, Daw JR. Postpartum Cliffs—Missed Opportunities to Promote Maternal Health in
416 the United States. *JAMA Health Forum.* 2021;2(12):e214164.
417 doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2021.4164
- 418 25. Bellerose M, Rodriguez M, Vivier PM. A systematic review of the qualitative literature on
419 barriers to high-quality prenatal and postpartum care among low-income women. *Health*
420 *Services Research.* 2022;57(4):775-785. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.14008
- 421 26. Ruderman RS, Dahl EC, Williams BR, et al. Provider Perspectives on Barriers and
422 Facilitators to Postpartum Care for Low-Income Individuals. *Womens Health Rep (New*
423 *Rochelle).* 2021;2(1):254-262. doi:10.1089/whr.2021.0009

- 424 27. Admon LK, Daw JR, Interrante JD, Ibrahim BB, Millette MJ, Kozhimannil KB. Rural and
425 Urban Differences in Insurance Coverage at Prepregnancy, Birth, and Postpartum.
426 *Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2023;141(3):570. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000005081
- 427 28. Johnston EM, McMorrow S, Alvarez Caraveo C, Dubay L. Post-ACA, More Than One-Third
428 Of Women With Prenatal Medicaid Remained Uninsured Before Or After Pregnancy. *Health*
429 *Affairs*. 2021;40(4):571-578. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.01678
- 430 29. Saldanha IJ, Adam GP, Kanaan G, et al. Health Insurance Coverage and Postpartum
431 Outcomes in the US: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(6):e2316536.
432 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.16536
- 433 30. Kyle MA, Frakt AB. Patient administrative burden in the US health care system. *Health Serv*
434 *Res*. 2021;56(5):755-765. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.13861
- 435 31. Milkman KL, Patel MS, Gandhi L, et al. A megastudy of text-based nudges encouraging
436 patients to get vaccinated at an upcoming doctor's appointment. *Proceedings of the*
437 *National Academy of Sciences*. 2021;118(20):e2101165118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2101165118
- 438 32. Polk S, Edwardson J, Lawson S, et al. Bridging the Postpartum Gap: A Randomized
439 Controlled Trial to Improve Postpartum Visit Attendance Among Low-Income Women with
440 Limited English Proficiency. *Women's Health Reports*. 2021;2(1):381-388.
441 doi:10.1089/whr.2020.0123
- 442 33. Sav A, Whitty JA, McMillan SS, et al. Treatment Burden and Chronic Illness: Who is at Most
443 Risk? *Patient*. 2016;9(6):559-569. doi:10.1007/s40271-016-0175-y
- 444 34. Ganguli I, Lee TH, Mehrotra A. Evidence and Implications Behind a National Decline in
445 Primary Care Visits. *J GEN INTERN MED*. 2019;34(10):2260-2263. doi:10.1007/s11606-
446 019-05104-5
- 447 35. Rao A, Shi Z, Ray KN, Mehrotra A, Ganguli I. National Trends in Primary Care Visit Use and
448 Practice Capabilities, 2008-2015. *The Annals of Family Medicine*. 2019;17(6):538-544.
449 doi:10.1370/afm.2474
- 450 36. Rice T. The Behavioral Economics of Health and Health Care. *Annual Review of Public*
451 *Health*. 2013;34(1):431-447. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031912-114353
- 452 37. Jenssen BP, Buttenheim AM, Fiks AG. Using Behavioral Economics to Encourage Parent
453 Behavior Change: Opportunities to Improve Clinical Effectiveness. *Acad Pediatr*.
454 2019;19(1):4-10. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2018.08.010
- 455 38. Matjasko JL, Cawley JH, Baker-Goering MM, Yokum DV. Applying Behavioral Economics to
456 Public Health Policy. *Am J Prev Med*. 2016;50(5 Suppl 1):S13-S19.
457 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2016.02.007
- 458 39. Milkman KL, Gromet D, Ho H, et al. Megastudies improve the impact of applied behavioural
459 science. *Nature*. 2021;600(7889):478-483. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-04128-4
- 460 40. Chapman GB, Li M, Colby H, Yoon H. Opting in vs opting out of influenza vaccination.
461 *JAMA*. 2010;304(1):43-44. doi:10.1001/jama.2010.892

- 462 41. Waddell KJ, Mehta SJ. Designing Effective and Appropriate Opt-Out Approaches for Patient
463 Outreach. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2023;183(11):1194-1195.
464 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2023.4628
- 465 42. Mehta SJ, Khan T, Guerra C, et al. A Randomized Controlled Trial of Opt-in Versus Opt-Out
466 Colorectal Cancer Screening Outreach. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2018;113(12):1848-1854.
467 doi:10.1038/s41395-018-0151-3
- 468 43. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; Division of Behavioral and
469 Social Sciences and Education; Board on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences;
470 Committee on Future Directions for Applying Behavioral Economics to Policy. *Behavioral*
471 *Economics: Policy Impact and Future Directions.* (Beatty A, Moffitt R, Buttenheim A, eds.).
472 National Academies Press (US); 2023. Accessed February 16, 2024.
473 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK591019/>
- 474 44. Gelfand SD. The Meta-Nudge - A Response to the Claim That the Use of Nudges During the
475 Informed Consent Process is Unavoidable. *Bioethics.* 2016;30(8):601-608.
476 doi:10.1111/bioe.12266
- 477 45. Ghebreyesus TA. Using behavioural science for better health. *Bull World Health Organ.*
478 2021;99(11):755. doi:10.2471/BLT.21.287387
- 479 46. Sabety A, Gruber J, Bae JY, Sood R. Reducing Frictions in Health Care Access: The
480 ActionHealthNYC Experiment for Undocumented Immigrants. *American Economic Review:*
481 *Insights.* 2023;5(3):327-346. doi:10.1257/aeri.20220126
- 482 47. Bogale B, Mørkrid K, O'Donnell B, et al. Development of a targeted client communication
483 intervention for pregnant and post-partum women: a descriptive study. *Lancet.* 2021;398
484 Suppl 1:S18. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01504-X
- 485 48. South EC, Lee K, Oyekanmi K, et al. Nurtured in Nature: a Pilot Randomized Controlled
486 Trial to Increase Time in Greenspace among Urban-Dwelling Postpartum Women. *J Urban*
487 *Health.* 2021;98(6):822-831. doi:10.1007/s11524-021-00544-z
- 488 49. McConnell M, Rothschild CW, Ettenger A, Muigai F, Cohen J. Free contraception and
489 behavioural nudges in the postpartum period: evidence from a randomised control trial in
490 Nairobi, Kenya. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2018;3(5):e000888. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000888
- 491 50. Triebwasser JE, Lewey J, Walheim L, Sehdev HM, Srinivas SK. Electronic Reminder to
492 Transition Care After Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy: A Randomized Controlled Trial.
493 *Obstet Gynecol.* 2023;142(1):91-98. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000005237
- 494 51. Yee LM, Martinez NG, Nguyen AT, Hajjar N, Chen MJ, Simon MA. Using a Patient Navigator
495 to Improve Postpartum Care in an Urban Women's Health Clinic. *Obstet Gynecol.*
496 2017;129(5):925-933. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000001977
- 497 52. Himes KP, Donovan H, Wang S, Weaver C, Grove JR, Facco FL. Healthy Beyond
498 Pregnancy, a Web-Based Intervention to Improve Adherence to Postpartum Care:
499 Randomized Controlled Feasibility Trial. *JMIR Human Factors.* 2017;4(4):e7964.
500 doi:10.2196/humanfactors.7964

- 501 53. Kabakian-Khasholian T, Campbell OMR. A simple way to increase service use: triggers of
502 women's uptake of postpartum services. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics &*
503 *Gynaecology*. 2005;112(9):1315-1321. doi:10.1111/j.1471-0528.2004.00507.x
- 504 54. Polk S, Edwardson J, Lawson S, et al. Bridging the Postpartum Gap: A Randomized
505 Controlled Trial to Improve Postpartum Visit Attendance Among Low-Income Women with
506 Limited English Proficiency. *Women's Health Reports*. 2021;2(1):381-388.
507 doi:10.1089/whr.2020.0123
- 508 55. Attanasio LB, Ranchoff BL, Cooper MI, Geissler KH. Postpartum Visit Attendance in the
509 United States: A Systematic Review. *Women's Health Issues*. 2022;32(4):369-375.
510 doi:10.1016/j.whi.2022.02.002
- 511 56. Wilcox A, Levi EE, Garrett JM. Predictors of Non-Attendance to the Postpartum Follow-up
512 Visit. *Matern Child Health J*. 2016;20(1):22-27. doi:10.1007/s10995-016-2184-9
- 513 57. Masho SW, Cha S, Karjane N, et al. Correlates of Postpartum Visits Among Medicaid
514 Recipients: An Analysis Using Claims Data from a Managed Care Organization. *Journal of*
515 *Women's Health*. 2018;27(6):836-843. doi:10.1089/jwh.2016.6137
- 516 58. Soffer MD, Rekawek P, Pan S, Overbey J, Stone J. Improving Postpartum Attendance
517 among Women with Gestational Diabetes Using the Medical Home Model of Care. *Am J*
518 *Perinatol*. 2023;40(3):313-318. doi:10.1055/s-0041-1727216
- 519 59. McKenney KM, Martinez NG, Yee LM. Patient navigation across the spectrum of women's
520 health care in the United States. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;218(3):280-286.
521 doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2017.08.009

522
523

524
525
526
527

TABLES

Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of the Analytical Sample

Characteristic	Control Group (n=173)	Intervention Group (n=180)
Patient Age at Estimated Due Date, Mean (SD), Years	34.0 (5.0)	34.2 (4.8)
Enrollment Relative to Delivery		
During Pregnancy	170 (98.3)	173 (96.1)
Postpartum	8 (1.7)	7 (3.9)
Gestational Age at Enrollment, Mean (SD), Days	254 (20)	255 (20)
Primary Site of Prenatal Care		
Hospital-based Clinic	121 (69.9)	129 (71.7)
Community-based Clinic	52 (30.1)	51 (28.3)
PCP Visit within 3 Years Prior to Enrollment	121 (69.9)	111 (61.7)
Health Condition		
Anxiety or Depression	128 (74.0)	138 (76.7)
Chronic or Gestational Hypertensive Disorder	26 (15.0)	31 (17.2)
Chronic or Gestational Diabetes Mellitus	38 (22.0)	31 (17.2)
Obesity (Pre-pregnancy BMI \geq 30 kg/m ²)	75 (43.4)	69 (38.3)
Race ¹		
Asian	13 (7.5)	11 (6.1)
Black	12 (6.9)	14 (7.8)
Multiple Races or "Other" ²	28 (16.2)	25 (13.9)
White	115 (66.5)	127 (70.6)
Declined / Not reported	5 (2.9)	3 (1.7)
Ethnicity ¹		
Hispanic	41 (23.7)	37 (20.6)
Non-Hispanic	127 (73.4)	139 (77.2)
Not reported	5 (2.9)	4 (2.2)
Preferred Language ¹		
English	161 (93.1)	167 (92.8)
Spanish	12 (6.9)	13 (7.2)
Marital Status ¹		
Married	125 (72.3)	137 (76.1)
Not married	48 (27.7)	43 (23.8)
Education ¹		
High School Graduate or Some High School	30 (17.3)	22 (12.2)
Some College	11 (6.4)	22 (12.2)
Bachelor's or Associate Degree	69 (39.9)	71 (39.4)
Graduate School Degree	63 (36.4)	65 (36.1)
Individual Annual Earnings ¹		
<\$30,000	32 (18.5)	36 (20.0)
\$30,000 - \$74,999	37 (21.4)	55 (30.6)
\geq \$75,000	82 (47.4)	76 (42.2)
Not reported	22 (12.7)	13 (7.2)
Primary Payer for Delivery Hospitalization		
Medicaid	40 (23.1)	35 (19.4)
Private / Other	130 (75.1)	138 (76.7)
Unknown	3 (1.7)	7 (3.9)
Physical Health Status at Time of Enrollment ¹		
"Good", "Very Good," or "Excellent"	151 (87.3)	161 (89.4)
"Fair" or "Poor"	22 (12.7)	19 (10.6)

Mental Health Status at Time of Enrollment ¹		
"Good", "Very Good," or "Excellent"	136 (78.6)	148 (82.2)
"Fair" or "Poor"	37 (21.4)	32 (17.8)

528

529 ¹ Self-reported.

530 ² Patients could select "Other" as a race option if they did not self-identify with the other options: American
531 Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White.

532 Abbreviation: PCP, Primary Care Clinician

533

534 **Table 2. Effects on Care Utilization**
 535

Outcomes	Control Group n (%)	Intervention Group n (%)	p-value	Adjusted Between-group difference, percentage point (95% CI)¹
Primary Outcome				
Completion of a primary care visit for routine or chronic condition care within 4 months of EDD	38 (22.0%)	72/180 (40.0)	<0.001	18.7 (9.0 to 28.2)
Secondary Outcomes of Unscheduled Care Use				
Obstetric triage visit	28 (16.2%)	28 (15.6%)	0.87	-0.1 (-8.2 to 7.2)
Emergency department or urgent care visit	23 (13.3%)	20 (11.1%)	0.53	-1.8 (-8.6 to 5.0)
Postpartum readmission	10 (5.8)	3 (1.7%)	0.04	-3.9 (-7.8 to -0.1)

536
 537 Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval; EDD, estimated date of delivery; PCP, Primary Care Clinician.
 538 More descriptive definitions for all outcomes are included in the Appendix (eTable 2).
 539

540 ¹ To account for randomization strata, regressions include indicator variables for whether or not the
 541 participant had any PCP visit in the 3 years before randomization and whether the participant received
 542 prenatal care from a hospital or health center.
 543
 544

545 **Table 3. Sensitivity Analyses for the Primary Outcome**

546

Sensitivity Analysis	Control Group n (%)	Intervention Group n (%)	p-value	Adjusted Between-group difference, percentage point (95 CI)[†]
Self-reported PCP visit completion within 4 months of delivery	46/113 (40.7)	65/105 (61.9)	0.002	20.1 (7.0 to 33.3)
Primary outcome restricted to visits with the patient's designated PCP	23/173 (13.3)	50/180 (27.8)	0.001	15.1 (6.7 to 23.5)
Primary outcome restricted to patients whose PCP in the same health system	30/123 (24.4)	58/118 (49.2)	<0.001	24.6 (12.5 to 36.6)
Any primary care visit within 4 months of EDD	54/173 (31.1)	82/180 (25.6)	0.006	15.1 (5.0 to 25.3)
Any primary care visit or scheduled within 1 year of EDD	75/173 (43.4)	117/180 (65.0)	<0.001	24.0 (14.2 to 33.8)

547


548

549 **FIGURES**

550

551 **Figure 1. Consort Diagram**

552




553

554

555
556

Figure 2. Effects on Content of Care Received at any Primary Care Clinician Visit



557
558
559
560

Abbreviation: PCP, Primary Care Clinician.

Levels of significance (p-value): * <0.05, ** <0.001, *** <0.001.