

1 **Effectiveness of shared medical appointments delivered in primary care for**
2 **improving health outcomes in patients with long-term conditions: a systematic**
3 **review of randomised controlled trials**
4
5

6 ¹Mei Yee Tang, meiyee.tang@newcastle.ac.uk**

7 ²Fiona Graham, fiona.graham@newcastle.ac.uk⁺

8 ²Amy O'Donnell, amy.odonnell@newcastle.ac.uk

9 ³Fiona Beyer, fiona.beyer@newcastle.ac.uk

10 ³Catherine Richmond, catherine.richmond@newcastle.ac.uk

11 ^{2,4}Falko Sniehotta, falko.sniehotta@medma.uni-heidelberg.de

12 ¹Eileen Kaner, eileen.kaner@newcastle.ac.uk

13

14 ¹ School of Psychology, Dame Margaret Barbour Building, Wallace Street, Newcastle
15 University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4DR, UK

16 ²NIHR Policy Research Unit in Behavioural Science, Population Health Sciences Institute,
17 Baddiley-Clark Building, Richardson Road, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne,
18 NE2 4AX, UK

19 ³Population Health Sciences Institute, Baddiley-Clark Building, Richardson Road, Newcastle
20 University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX, UK

21 ⁴Department of Public Health, Preventive and Social Medicine, Heidelberg University,
22 Heidelberg, DE

23

24

25 *Corresponding author

26 ⁺ Joint co-first authors

27

28

29 **KEYWORDS:** *shared medical appointments, long-term conditions, systematic review, meta-*
30 *analysis*

31

32 **WORD COUNT**

33 4417

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55 **ABSTRACT**

56 **Objectives**

57 Shared medical appointments (SMAs) have the potential to address interlinked challenges of
58 limited capacity in primary healthcare and rising prevalence of patients with multiple long-
59 term conditions (LTCs). This review aimed to examine the effectiveness of SMAs compared
60 to one-to-one appointments in primary care at improving health outcomes and reducing
61 demand on healthcare services.

62
63 **Methods**

64 We searched for randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of SMAs involving patients with LTCs
65 in primary care across six databases from 2013-2020 and added eligible papers identified
66 from previous relevant reviews. Data were extracted and outcomes narratively synthesised,
67 meta-analysis was undertaken where possible.

68
69 **Results**

70 Twenty-three unique trials were included. SMA models varied in terms of components, mode
71 of delivery and target population. Most trials recruited patients with a single LTC, most
72 commonly diabetes ($n=12$), although eight trials selected patients with multiple LTCs. There
73 was substantial heterogeneity in outcome measures which we categorised into health
74 outcomes (biomedical indicators, psychological and well-being measures), healthcare
75 utilisation, and cost and resource use. Meta-analysis showed that participants in SMA
76 groups had lower diastolic blood pressure than those in usual care ($d=-0.123$, $95\%CI = -$
77 $0.22, -0.03$, $n=8$). No statistically significant differences were found across other outcomes.
78 Compared with usual care, SMAs had no significant effect on healthcare service use.

79
80 **Conclusions**

81 SMAs were at least as effective as usual care in terms of health outcomes and did not lead
82 to increased healthcare service use in the short-term. To strengthen the evidence base,
83 future studies should target standardised behavioural and health outcomes and clearly
84 report SMA components so key behavioural ingredients can be identified. Similarly,
85 transparent approaches to measuring costs would improve comparability between studies.
86 To better understand SMA's potential to reduce demand on healthcare services, further
87 investigation is needed as to how SMAs can be best incorporated in the patient care
88 pathway.

89
90 **PROSPERO protocol registration: CRD42020173084**

91

92 299/300

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS**

- 105 • Focus on randomised controlled trials, highest quality evidence of the effectiveness
- 106 of SMAs in primary care for long term conditions
- 107 • Robust search strategy, based on previous high-quality review; refined by
- 108 information specialists to focus on primary care
- 109 • Rapidly evolving area of practice and publications and the most recent evidence may
- 110 be missing.
- 111 • Small number of studies reported resource use and costs limiting conclusions
- 112 regarding efficacy of SMAs in primary care.

113

114 **FUNDING**

115 This paper is independent research commissioned and funded by the NIHR PRU in
116 Behavioural Science (Award: PR-PRU-1217-20501). The views expressed in this publication
117 are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the National Institute for
118 Health Research, the Department of Health and Social Care or its arm's length bodies, and
119 other Government Departments. The funders had no role in the design of the study,
120 collection, analysis or interpretation of data or in the writing of the manuscript.

121

122 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

123 None to declare.

124

125 **CHECKLIST**

126 See supplementary material for PRISMA checklist.

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140 INTRODUCTION

141 Shared Medical Appointments (SMAs), also known as group consultations, are a model of
142 care with the potential to address the interlinked challenges of limited capacity in primary
143 care and rising prevalence of patients with multiple long-term conditions (LTCs)[1,2]. SMAs
144 are longer appointments (typically 60-120 minutes) whereby patients with the same LTCs
145 meet with their physician together[3]. SMAs are typically co-led and/or facilitated by
146 healthcare professionals, such as nurses, pharmacists, psychologists, and physiotherapists.
147 The group typically consists of between 6-15 patients and may include family members and
148 caregivers[4,5]. There are various models of SMA but generally they retain some features of
149 a standard one-to-one appointment such as physical examinations and personalised review
150 of medical charts[2]. In addition, SMAs provide participants an opportunity to ask questions
151 of clinicians and other patient and receive formal education and counselling during the group
152 session. SMAs have been used to deliver care for a range of health conditions including
153 diabetes, hypertension, and chronic pain; though there is potential for wider application,
154 including multimorbidity[6].

155

156 A recent synthesis of qualitative literature found that most patients and primary care
157 practitioners regarded SMAs positively[6]. Key benefits included improved patient self-
158 confidence and motivation for self-management; whilst practitioners felt that SMAs had the
159 potential to provide a more efficient and effective way of delivering care[7]. Previous reviews
160 of effectiveness were inconclusive but evidence, largely from the United States (US) and
161 Australia, reported a promising effect of SMAs for some biomedical measures. For example,
162 improvements in glycated haemoglobin A1C (HbA1C) and systolic blood pressure (SBP)
163 were greater in patients attending SMAs compared to usual care for diabetes[8,9]. However,
164 previous reviews include studies that evaluate the use of SMAs in secondary care settings
165 as follow-up appointments to specialist treatment [4]. A mixed-methods review of SMAs in
166 primary care settings for non-specialist treatment concluded that SMAs can yield
167 improvements in patient satisfaction and some biophysical markers of disease [5]. However,
168 this review conducted in 2015 included studies of SMAs for non-LTCs. It remains unclear
169 whether SMAs are effective in supporting improved ongoing management of LTCs in
170 primary care.

171

172 This review examined the effects of SMAs delivered in primary care on health outcomes and
173 healthcare service use in patients with LTCs. We sought to answer two overarching
174 research questions:

175

- 176 1. **Are SMAs effective in improving health outcomes for patients with one or more**
 177 **long-term conditions?**
 178 2. **Do SMAs reduce healthcare service use by patients with one or more long-**
 179 **term conditions?**

180 **METHOD**

181 This systematic review follows Cochrane Handbook Guidance[10] and the Preferred
 182 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines[11].

183

184 **Protocol and registration**

185 This study was registered on PROSPERO ([CRD42020173084](https://doi.org/10.1111/1747-7528.123084)). Regarding protocol
 186 changes, we proposed coding of Behaviour Change Techniques Taxonomy V1
 187 (BCTTv1)[12] used in SMAs and associated with changes in outcomes. However, most
 188 included studies did not report the required detail and so instead we narratively described
 189 this information.

190

191 **Inclusion/exclusion criteria**

192 Studies were included if they met the criteria outlined in Table 1. The focus of this review
 193 was on models of SMAs that include one-to-one time for every patient in attendance as per
 194 the description of group consultations reported previously [1,2].

195

196 Table 1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

PICOS Criterion	Description
Population	Adult patients (≥ 18 years of age) with one or more long-term conditions who have attended at least one shared medical appointment (SMA) in a primary care setting were eligible for inclusion.
	Patients in primary care settings who were seen by a secondary care specialist during the SMA were excluded.
Intervention (Model of care)	All countries were eligible for inclusion. SMAs/group consultations/group visits conducted in primary care setting, delivered by a primary care healthcare professional (e.g. nurse, doctor, pharmacist), were eligible for inclusion.
	The present review considered SMAs to be clinical encounters in which groups of patients with the same/similar long-term condition meet with a healthcare professional for routine care.
Comparison/control	The SMA must have included one-to-one time for every patient in attendance. Therefore, peer support groups were excluded. No restrictions – usual care, active control (e.g., another SMA model).
Outcomes	Behavioural outcomes – e.g., healthcare utilisation, physical activity, medication adherence. Disease-specific measures – e.g., Haemoglobin A1C (HbA1C). Biophysical health indicators – e.g., cholesterol, weight, BMI.

Study design	Cost/resource use. Other outcomes- e.g. psychological and wellbeing Only randomised controlled trials that were published in peer-reviewed journals were eligible for inclusion.
---------------------	--

197

198

199

Search strategy

200 A comprehensive search strategy was developed, based on the approach described in
201 Booth et al.[13], to search for trials published after their search, namely the period 2013-
202 2020. Key changes included the removal of the terms “group outpatient”, “GMV” or “GMA”,
203 “group processes” and “Group care” to improve the sensitivity and specificity of the search
204 (see S1). The search strategy was first used to search MEDLINE (via OVID) and then
205 translated for the following databases: EMBASE (via OVID), Science citation index (via Web
206 of Knowledge) Social Science Citation Index (via Web of Knowledge), Cumulative Index to
207 Nursing and Allied Health Literature (via EBSCOhost), Cochrane Central Register of
208 Controlled Trials (Wiley), DARE, NHS EED, and HTA (Centre for Reviews and
209 Dissemination). Any relevant pre-2013 trials identified by forward and backward citation
210 searches of the included trials, including those in relevant systematic reviews[4,6,14,15],
211 were also included in the review.

212

213

Screening

214 Screening and data extraction was facilitated using the systematic review management tool,
215 Covidence[16]. Two reviewers independently screened all titles and abstracts against the
216 inclusion criteria, and a third reviewer adjudicated any disagreements. This process was
217 also applied to the screening of full-text papers.

218

219

Data extraction

220 Information relating to the study design, population, and intervention were extracted based
221 on a framework on form of delivery[17] (e.g. experience/training of the providers and
222 facilitators), outcomes, and results were extracted from all relevant papers using a data
223 extraction form (see S2). All information was double-extracted by two researchers, with
224 disagreements resolved through discussion or third-party moderation.

225

226

227

228

229

230

Where data were reported for several time-points, the data-point closest to the end of the
SMA intervention was used to calculate the effect size as this would be when the largest
effects attributable to the SMA is expected. If available, intention-to-treat data were used to
calculate effect sizes.

231

232

233 **Quality assessment**

234 Two researchers independently assessed the quality of all included studies using the
235 Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool[18]. Percentages of judgements (high, low, or unclear) for each
236 domain was calculated across the studies.

237

238 **Data analysis/synthesis**

239 We mapped all reported outcomes into the following categories agreed by the wider
240 research team to best reflect SMA effectiveness and efficiency: health outcomes (biomedical
241 indicators, psychological and well-being measures), healthcare utilisation and cost and
242 resource use.

243

244 Meta-analyses were performed in StataC 15. Given the heterogeneity between studies, a
245 random-effects model was used[19]. Meta-analyses were conducted where there were at
246 least two studies reporting a specific outcome[20]. Outcome effect sizes were calculated as
247 Cohen's *d* (standardised mean difference). Heterogeneity was assessed using Higgins I-
248 Square (I^2), whereby 50-90% was considered as representing substantial heterogeneity[21].
249 Authors were contacted for additional information if data needed to calculate effect sizes
250 were not sufficiently reported in the published paper(s). Where this information could not be
251 obtained from authors, *p*-values and confidence intervals were used to calculate effect
252 sizes[10]. Only studies in which the comparator was usual care were pooled into the meta-
253 analysis.

254

255 Using meta-regression, sensitivity analyses were conducted to explore whether results
256 differed according to sources of bias identified from the risk of bias assessment.

257

258 Studies that were too heterogeneous to perform meta-analysis, and where the comparator
259 was not usual care, were synthesised narratively. Extracted data was tabulated by outcome
260 measure to enable comparisons and relationships across studies to be more easily
261 examined [22]. For each outcome measure, evidence of an effect was determined by the *p*-
262 values reported in the papers. To assess the certainty of the evidence, number of study
263 participants, confidence intervals and the consistency of effects across studies, the risk of
264 bias of the studies, how directly the included studies address the planned question
265 (directness) were taken into consideration.

266

267 **Patient and Public Involvement**

268 The PRU BehSci Public Patient Involvement group provided their patient perspective about
269 outcome measures of interests.

270

271 **RESULTS**

272 <Figure 1 – PRISMA diagram of study selection process here>

273

274 **Characteristics of the included studies**

275 Twenty-three unique trials (reported in thirty-four papers) were identified, for PRISMA details
276 see Figure 1 and Table 2. See S3 for list of included papers.

Table 2: Characteristics of included studies grouped by health condition(s)

Study	Condition(s)	Country	Setting	Sample size (N)	Model	Comparator
Scott (2004) [23] Coleman (2001)[24]	^Chronic conditions	USA	Large health maintenance organisation	295	CHCC model-'group visits'	Usual care
Gardiner (2017) [25] Gardiner (2019)[26]	Chronic pain and depression	USA	Community Health Centres serving low-income, racially and ethnically diverse populations	159	Integrated medical group visit	Usual care
Berry (2016)[27]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	Community-based health center serving low-income population who are working	80	Group visits	Usual care
Clancy 2003a [28] Clancy 2003b[29]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	University Primary Care Center serving uninsured or inadequately insured patients	120	CHCC model-'group visits'	Usual care
Clancy (2007a) [30] Clancy (2007b)[31] Clancy 2008[32]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	University Primary Care Center serving mainly minority, inadequately insured patients	186	CHCC model-'group visits'	Usual care
Cole (2013)[33]	Diabetes (Prediabetes)	USA	Military health system	65	SMA	Individual counselling
Drake (2018)[34]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	Family medicine centre	33	SMA + personalised health planning	SMA
Ee (2020)[35]	Diabetes (Type 2)	Australia	University primary care center	18	SMA	Usual care
Liu (2012)[36]	Diabetes (Type 2)	China	General practices	208	CHCC model-'group visits'	Usual care
Naik (2011)[37]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	Veterans Affairs Medical Centres	87	Group clinic	**Enhanced usual care
Schillinger (2008) [38] Schillinger (2009)[39] Wallace (2013)[40]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	University affiliated-Safety net settings- community health network	339	Group medical visit	Automated telephone self-management
Vaughan (2017)[41]	Diabetes (Prediabetes/ Type 2)	USA	Community health clinic serving low-income Hispanic adults	62	Group visit	Usual care After 6 months, the control group received the intervention
Vaughan (2020)[42]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	Community health clinic serving low-income Hispanic adults	89	Group visits	Usual care

Wagner (2001)[43]	Diabetes (Type 1 & 2)	USA	Primary care practices in health maintenance organisation	708	Chronic care clinic	Usual care
Cohen (2011)[44]	Diabetes (Type 2) and cardiovascular risk	USA	Veterans Association Medical Center	99	SMA programme (2 phases)	Usual care
Taveira (2014)[45]	Diabetes and cardiovascular risk	USA	Veterans Association Medical Center	200	Group medical visit	CRRC Individual clinic Usual care
Wu (2018)[46]	Diabetes (Type 2) and cardiovascular risk	USA	Veterans Health Administration Hospital primary care services	250	Group medical visit	Usual care
Taveira (2011)[47]	Diabetes (Type 2) and depression	USA	Veterans Affairs Medical Centres	88	SMA/ Group medical appointment	Usual care
Yancy (2020)[48] Crowley (2017)[49]	Diabetes (Type 2) and overweight	USA	Veterans Association Medical Center	263	Group medical visit with IWM	Group medical visit
Edelman (2010)[50] Crowley (2013)[51] Crowley (2014)[52] Eisenberg (2019)[53]	Diabetes (Type 2) and hypertension	USA	Veterans Association Medical Center	239	Group clinic	Usual care
Gao (2015)[54]	Hypertension	China	Community Health Care Centre	1346	CHCC model+ 'group visits'	Usual care
Simon (2015)[55]	Hypertension	Germany	Physician practices	48	CHCC model 'group medical visit'	Usual care
Baqir (2020)[56]	Osteoporosis	UK	General practices	158	Group consultation	Usual care

278
279
280

Multiple papers for the same trial were found therefore we bolded the one used as the index paper throughout the rest of the paper. ^Chronic conditions (including asthma, COPD, heart failure, diabetes, arthritis, deafness, blindness). **Enhanced usual care- patients required to attend 2 diabetes group education sessions. CRRC- Cardiovascular Risk Reduction Clinic, IWM- intensive weight management, SM- Self-management, SMA- Shared medical appointment, UC- usual care.

281 Fifteen trials (70%) were for a single LTC, of these: 12 were for diabetes[27,29,30,33–
282 38,41–43], two for hypertension[54,55]; and one was for osteoporosis[56]. Eight trials
283 considered multiple LTCs: three were diabetes and hypertension/cardiovascular risk[44–
284 46,50]; one was diabetes and depression[47], one was for overweight patients with diabetes
285 [48]; one was chronic pain and depression[26]; and one included multiple LTCs including:
286 arthritis, hypertension, cancer, deafness and diabetes[23]. Overall, 20/23 (87%) of trials
287 focused on patients with diabetes.

288

289 Eighteen trials (83%) were conducted in the US[23,26,27,29,30,33,34,37,38,41–48,50], two
290 in China[36,54] and one each in Australia[35], Germany[55] and the UK[56]. Eleven trials
291 were measured the effectiveness, impact or efficacy of SMAs compared to usual
292 care[23,26,27,30,33,36,37,42,43,46,50], Eight trials examined feasibility
293 parameters[28,34,35,38,41,42,47,54], and two trials were non-inferiority/superiority
294 trials[48,49,56].

295

296 In eight trials (35%) participants were veterans or military personnel[33,37,44–48,50].
297 Participants were from low-income communities in four trials[26,27,41,42], and uninsured
298 communities in three US trials[29,30,38]. Two trials were tailored for non-English speaking
299 participants, where written materials were available in Spanish[38,42]. The majority of
300 participants were over 50 years old, the mean age of participants ranged between
301 50.5[25,26] to 74 years old[56]. Two trials were specifically for older patients over 55 or 60
302 years respectively[23,55], and two trials excluded patients over 75[48] and 80 years[36].
303 Twelve trials (52%) had a majority of female participants[23,27,28,36,41,42,54,56]. Ten trials
304 had majority of male participants[33–35,37,44–48,50]. One trial did not report the gender
305 balance of participants[55]. Five studies had a majority White population[26,33,43,46,47], six
306 trials had a majority Black population[27,29,30,34,48,50], two trials had a majority Hispanic
307 population[41,42], two trials had a majority Asian population[35,36], and one trial had a
308 majority White-Latino population [38]. Five studies did not report the ethnicity of
309 participants[23,44,54–56].

310

311 Most trials ($n=17$, 78%) had a two-arm design that compared SMAs with usual care, typically
312 a one-to-one (1:1) appointment with primary care physician[23,26,27,29,30,35,36,41–
313 47,50,54,56]. In three other two-arm trials, the comparator was a 1:1 appointment plus two
314 diabetes group education sessions[37], an SMA without an integrated weight management
315 programme[48] or an SMA with a personal health planning component (PHP)[34]. Two trials
316 had a delayed six-month waitlist control design[41,42]. Two trials had a three-arm design:
317 one examined the effectiveness of a cardiovascular risk reduction clinic compared with

318 group medical visits and usual care[45]; and a second compared an automated telephone
319 self-management service with SMAs and usual care[38]. Where descriptions of usual care
320 were available, usual care was delivered by a primary care provider, typically a physician/GP
321 or nurse practitioner [57–62]and, in some cases, a pharmacist [62,63]or dietician [64]. A
322 review of medication and chronic disease monitoring (e.g., measures of blood pressure and
323 HbA1c) commonly took place in these sessions [58,59,63,65,66]. In some of the SMAs for
324 diabetes, the usual care sessions included some form of individualised diabetes self-
325 management education[58,62,64] or referrals were made available to see a diabetes
326 educator dietician [59,67].

327

328 **SMA components and mode of delivery**

329 There was much variation in the SMAs models reported by studies (see S9 for detailed
330 description). Key features of SMA models were: facilitated group discussion or group
331 question and answer session (15 trials)[19,22,25,26,29,30,32–34,37–39,40,43,46,50], ‘group
332 education’ (14 trials)[19,23,25,31–33,37,38,42,43,44,46,50], and the opportunity to socialise
333 (11 trials)[19,22,25,26,29,32,34,37,38,46,50].

334

335 SMAs were delivered face-to-face in all trials, although three SMA models included digital
336 technologies, namely website and telephone support[26] and phone calls or text message
337 support and/or reminders[41,42]. In three trials[37,45,56] SMAs were delivered by a single
338 healthcare professional though mostly they were delivered by multidisciplinary teams.
339 Professionals most commonly involved were family physicians[23,27,28,34–
340 38,43,48,50,54,55], nurse practitioners[27,30–33,36,48,49] or nurses[23,24,43,44,46,50–
341 54]. It was not always possible to tell what role each member of staff had in the delivery of
342 the SMA. Provider characteristics other than profession or role were rarely reported, though
343 two trials involving a majority Hispanic/Latino participants reported that the community health
344 worker and or physician were bilingual[38,42]. Four trials reported that the same
345 interventionists attended all visits for a particular group[44,48,50,55]. One trial of diabetes
346 SMAs reported that group assignments were maintained for all SMAs to facilitate peer
347 interactions and relationships within groups[37]. The consistency in group composition in
348 terms of patient and interventionists attending each session was not reported by most
349 studies.

350

351 Trial outcome measures varied across trials though most included biomedical indicators,
352 psychological and well-being measures, healthcare service use and cost and resource use.
353 Full details of all outcome measures reported by the studies are presented in S4.

354

355

356 **Risk of bias**

357 Risk of bias item across the studies was generally low across the items, except for 'Blinding
358 of participants and personnel' (83% of trials high, 17% unclear) (See S5).

359

360 Sensitivity analyses

361 There were no differences for any of the outcomes according to the risk of bias assessment
362 criteria relating to random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding,
363 incomplete outcome data, and selected reporting (see S5).

364

365 **Effectiveness of SMAs**

366

367 Biomedical indicators

368

369 *Glycated haemoglobin A1C (HbA1c) (%)*

370 Of the 14 trials measuring HbA1c (%) which compared SMA to usual care, nine
371 trials[27,30,35,38,42,45–47] were included in a meta-analysis. No statistically significant
372 difference between SMAs and usual care was found for HbA1c (%) at follow-up ($d=-0.098$,
373 $95\%CI = -0.34, 0.14, n=9$) ($p=0.420$) (see Figure 2a). Substantial heterogeneity was
374 observed ($I^2 = 70.9\%$). Of four other SMA trials reporting HbA1c (%) but not in the meta-
375 analysis[29,43,44,50], only one reported significant between group differences, whereby the
376 SMA group had significantly higher odds of attaining HbA1c goals (< 7%) compared to usual
377 care[27]. However, this was a high risk of bias study, scoring 'unclear' across the six
378 domains.

379

380 *Diastolic blood pressure*

381 Of 11 studies which reported diastolic blood pressure (DBP)[27,30,33–
382 36,38,41,42,45,50,54], eight were included in meta-analysis[27,33,35,38,41,42,45,54]. A
383 very small statistically significant pooled effect was found at follow-up ($d=-0.123, 95\%CI = -$
384 $0.22, -0.03, n=8$) ($p=0.008$), whereby participants in the SMA group had lower DBP than
385 those in usual care (see Figure 2b).

386

387 Of the three studies not included in the meta-analysis[30,36,50], one trial of SMAs for
388 diabetes and hypertension reported that mean DBP was lower in the SMA group (78.3
389 mmHg) than in the usual care group (82.1 mmHg) at 12 months[50].

390

391 *Systolic blood pressure*

392 Of 13 trials reporting SBP[27,30,33,35,36,38,41,42,44–46,50,54], nine could be meta-
393 analysed[27,33,35,38,41,42,45,46,54]. No statistically significant difference between SMAs
394 and usual care was found for SBP at follow-up ($d=-0.018$, $95\%CI = -0.11, 0.08$, $n=9$)
395 ($p=0.709$), with lows level of heterogeneity observed ($I^2 = 3.8\%$) (see Figure 2c). Of the four
396 trials not in the meta-analysis[30,36,44,50], two moderately robust studies reported
397 statistically significant between group differences in SBP at follow-up[36,50], whereby the
398 SMA group showed greater decreases in SBP compared to usual care.

399
400 No statistically significant effect of SMAs compared to usual care was found for other
401 biomedical health outcomes including: total cholesterol, high density lipoprotein cholesterol,
402 low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, triglycerides, weight, and BMI (see S6).

403

404 *Trials with non-usual care comparators*

405 Three trials had enhanced SMAs as their comparator[34,37,48], all of which found greater
406 reductions in the enhanced SMA group compared to the standard SMA group [64,68,69].
407 Drake et al. (2018) reported that there significantly greater improvements in HbA1c (%) were
408 observed in the PHP SMA group compared to the standard SMA group at follow-up[68].
409 Naik et al. (2011) found that HbA1c (%) was significantly lower in the SMA group than the
410 traditional diabetes group education group immediately following the active interventions at
411 three months, and the between group differences remained clinically and statistically
412 significant at one year follow-up[64]. Yancy et al. (2020) found that the mean reduction in
413 HbA1c (%) was significantly greater in the enhanced SMA group compared to the standard
414 GMV group at 16 and 32 weeks. However, at 48 weeks, no between group differences in
415 HbA1c (%) were observed[69].

416

417 Further, Drake et al., (2018) reported that participants in the PHP SMA group had lower DBP
418 ($M=86$ mmHg) at 8 months follow-up compared to participants in the standard SMA group
419 ($M=79.8$ mmHg)[34]. Yancy et al. (2020) reported patient weight loss in the SMAs with
420 intensive weight management was comparable to weight loss amongst patients attending
421 SMAs but statistical significance was unclear[48]. It is possible that other studies could not
422 detect statistically significant differences between arms due to small sample sizes.

423

424 <Insert Figure 2 a,b,c, here>

425

426 Psychological and well-being measures

427

428 *Quality of life*

429 Six trials reported quality of life (QoL) outcomes[23,26,35,38,44,46] of which two trials
430 reported significant between group differences[23,38]. One trial of SMAs for chronically ill
431 patients with multiple LTCs found that participants in the SMA group ($M=7.2$, $SD=1.8$)
432 reported significantly better QoL than the usual care group ($M=6.3$, $SD=2.0$) ($p=.002$) at 24
433 months[23]. Schillinger et al., (2008) measured QoL using the short form (SF)-12 instrument
434 which comprised of mental health and physical health subscales. Improvements in SF-12
435 mental health was observed for SMA group compared to SMA (effect size=0.31, $p=0.03$)
436 and usual care (effect size=0.18, $p=0.2$)[38]. However, this was considered as a high risk of
437 bias study, with high/unclear judgements across four out of six domains.

438

439 *Patient satisfaction*

440 Four trials measured patient satisfaction[23,34,43,56]. Scott et al. (2004) reported significant
441 differences at follow-up, with SMA patients reporting higher satisfaction with practitioner
442 discussions compared to controls[23]. The other three studies found no between group
443 differences.

444

445 *Patient self-efficacy*

446 Self-efficacy was measured in nine trials[23,27,36,38,44,47,50,54], of which five studies
447 were included in meta-analysis[23,26,27,38,54]. No statistically significant effect was found
448 ($d=0.167$, $95\%CI = -0.08, 0.41$, $n=5$) ($p=0.182$) (See S7). High levels of heterogeneity were
449 observed ($I^2=78.9\%$). Of the four other studies not included in meta-analysis[36,44,47,50],
450 two reported that SMA patients had significant improvements in self-efficacy to manage
451 diabetes compared to usual care[36,50].

452

453 No statistically significant effect of SMAs compared to usual care was found for other
454 depression, the only other psychological and well-being measure identified (see S7).

455

456 *Trials with non-usual care comparator*

457 Drake et al. (2018) reported significant improvements in self-efficacy, as measured using the
458 Diabetes Empowerment Scale, for the PHP SMA group compared to the standard SMA
459 group[30]. Naik et al. (2011) did not find any differences in diabetes self-efficacy scores
460 between the SMA group and the traditional diabetes group education group[37].

461

462 *Healthcare service utilisation*

463

464 *Hospital admissions*

465 Seven trials reported hospital admissions within six to 24 months[23,27,29,43,45,47,50] and
466 three were included in a meta-analysis[23,27,45]. There was no difference between SMAs
467 and usual care in terms of hospital admissions at follow-up ($d=-0.016$, $95\%CI = -0.38, 0.35$,
468 $n=3$; ($p=0.931$) (see Figure 3a). Substantial heterogeneity was observed ($I^2 = 71.1\%$).

469

470 None of the other four trials[29,43,47,50] reported significant between group differences for
471 hospital admissions at follow-up.

472

473 *Emergency department use*

474 Of eight relevant trials[23,26,27,29,43,45,47,50], four were included in a meta-
475 analysis[23,27,43,45]. No difference between SMAs and usual care was found for
476 admissions to emergency departments at follow-up ($d=-0.083$, $95\%CI = -0.30, 0.13$, $n=4$,
477 $p=0.453$ (Figure 3b). Considerable heterogeneity was observed ($I^2 = 61.7\%$).

478

479 Of four trials not in the meta-analysis [26,29,47,50], only Edelman et al. (2010) reported
480 significant between group differences in emergency department use favouring SMAs with
481 0.4 ($95\%CI = 0.20, 0.70$) fewer emergency care visits than the usual care group over the 12-
482 month study period [50].

483

484 *Primary care visits*

485 Four trials reported the number of primary care visits participants made during the study
486 period[23,43,47,50]. Three were pooled in a meta-analysis[23,43,47] showing no statistically
487 significant difference ($d=0.034$, $95\%CI = -0.09, 0.16$, $n=3$, $p=0.575$) (see Figure 3c).

488

489 Edelman et al. (2010), which could not be included into the meta-analysis, reported that
490 SMA participants had significantly fewer primary care visits than controls (5.3 vs. 6.2 per
491 patient-year) at 12 months[50].

492

493 No statistically significant effect of SMAs compared to usual care were found for other
494 behavioural outcomes including medication adherence and physical activity (see S8)

495

496 <Insert Figure 3a,b,c here>

497

498 *Cost and resource use*

499 Few studies reported the costs involved in the delivery of the SMA and those that did were
500 unclear about cost parameters (i.e whether scheduling and preparation time was included or
501 not) or how the costs were attributed. One trial of diabetes SMAs reported that overall costs

502 per patient were higher in SMAs than those in usual care group for the study period of six
503 months[29]. However, another trial found no significant difference between SMA and usual
504 care in terms of total costs incurred during the 24 months study period, but showed a
505 positive effect of the SMA at 13 months post-study where cost decreased by 6% for the SMA
506 but increased by 13% for usual care $p < 0.01$ [43]. The SMA trial for osteoporosis reported that
507 the costs incurred during the study period were lower for the SMA group compared to control
508 groups[56]. A trial of chronic condition SMAs (reported that total costs incurred by the SMA
509 group were lower than the usual care group[23].

510

511

512 **DISCUSSION**

513 Our systematic review identified 23 unique RCTs comparing SMAs for one or more LTCs to
514 usual care or an enhanced SMA. We found that SMAs significantly improved diastolic blood
515 pressure for diabetes patients. In line with the findings of previous reviews[15], no harm was
516 observed for the use of SMAs across these outcomes and there was not enough evidence of
517 an effect on healthcare service use compared to usual care. This indicates that whilst SMAs
518 may not be superior to usual care in terms of most health outcomes or reducing demand on
519 services, they do not appear to increase demand at least in the short-term. Evidence
520 reporting costs is too heterogeneous to draw firm conclusions.

521

522 **Comparison with previous literature**

523 Like previous reviews of SMAs for LTCs[4,15,70], more than half of the included RCTs
524 included patients with diabetes, and as such the most commonly reported outcome measure
525 was HbA1C. However, unlike previous reviews[71,72], we did not observe any significant
526 improvements in HbA1c. This may be because previous reviews included trials in secondary
527 care. Our meta-analysis showed that SMA participants had lower DBP compared to patients
528 who received usual care. [54]

529

530 Previous systematic reviews have been inconclusive with regards to the impact of SMAs on
531 healthcare utilisation. Edelman et al.'s (2012) review[72] of SMAs for patients with chronic
532 medical conditions in older adults found a lower pattern of healthcare utilisation, whilst Booth
533 et al. (2015)[4] reported a mixed pattern of changes. Our meta-analyses show that SMAs do
534 not differ from usual care in terms of healthcare utilisation. There is no evidence in the
535 present data to suggest that patients compensate for a lack of privacy by returning to
536 primary care or that they risk hospitalisation because issues are not adequately addressed
537 during the SMA session(s). However, it should be noted that the key source of bias across
538 the included studies was the lack of blinding of participants and personnel. Therefore,

539 possible selection bias may result in recruitment of SMA participants with less concern about
540 sharing their personal/medical information.

541 In comparison to biomedical outcomes and psychological outcomes, healthcare service use
542 and costs and resource use and other behavioural outcomes were less frequently reported
543 by studies. This echoes the findings of Edelman et al. (2015)[46] which found there to be
544 limited data on key patient-centred outcomes such as patient satisfaction. Behavioural
545 outcomes such as medication adherence are important across many LTCs and are key to
546 understanding how patients are self-managing their conditions. In line with Kelly et al.'s
547 (2017)[12] recommendation, future studies should report outcome effectiveness measures
548 that are common or comparable across different LTCs such as physical activity, self-
549 efficacy, medication adherence, and quality of life. It would be advantageous to agree a
550 Core Outcome Set (COS), consisting of a standardised group of outcomes, to be reported
551 by all SMA trials. This can help with future evaluations of SMAs through reducing
552 heterogeneity and facilitating meta-analysis and ensuring that outcome measures are
553 relevant to key stakeholders[73].

554

555 **Strengths and limitations**

556 Although previous reviews have explored the effectiveness of SMAs in improving health
557 outcomes, this review provides a focus on primary care which is key to managing LTCs. We
558 found ten additional trials with 1160 participants since the comprehensive work by Booth et
559 al. (2015)[4] indicating a rapidly growing field. We used robust methods whereby our search
560 strategy was developed with input from Information Specialists through an iterative process
561 and key stages of the review (including screening, data extraction, and quality appraisal)
562 were undertaken independently by two reviewers. We included studies regardless of type of
563 LTC so that we were able to summarise all the available evidence on effectiveness of SMAs
564 for LTCs in primary care in one analysis. However, evidence of an effect was determined by
565 $p < .0.5$ in the papers. This assumes that studies were adequately powered, which may not
566 be the case, particularly for some of the secondary outcomes of the included studies.

567

568 **Limitations of evidence base and implications for future research**

569 Despite using a form of delivery framework to extract relevant study information[17], some
570 important contextual factors, such characteristics of the healthcare professionals delivering
571 the SMA, may not have been captured as this information was missing from the authors'
572 descriptions of the SMAs. Similar components may be described differently by different
573 authors or, conversely, similar descriptions are used to describe different components. Using
574 standardised taxonomies for describing form of delivery and intervention content when
575 designing the intervention/SMA content could help to identify important behavioural

576 components and key implementation processes that contribute to intervention effectiveness,
577 allowing for replication. However, for this to be possible, it is also important that
578 interventionists clearly specify which target behaviours (e.g. to increase physical activity) the
579 SMAs aim to change. None of the included studies included measures of fidelity which is
580 also important for determining whether the session(s) are delivered as intended to achieve
581 optimum effects[74]. Further, theoretical underpinnings were lacking in the included SMA
582 interventions, making it difficult to identify ‘mechanisms of action’ through which
583 interventions bring about change[75]. Future SMAs interventions should be theory-based
584 and be explicit in reporting its theoretical underpinnings.

585

586 Where multiple healthcare professionals are involved in the SMA, their key role and purpose
587 in the SMA were rarely clearly defined. There was also limited reporting on the composition
588 of the SMA groups across some of the included studies (i.e. how patients were selected for
589 recruitment and size). Therefore, it is unclear which groups of patients might benefit from
590 attending the same SMAs together and what implications SMAs may have for intervention-
591 generated health inequalities. One third of the included studies were conducted on US
592 veterans and one third of studies have involved participants from low-income/uninsured
593 population groups. Generalisability of these groups to other healthcare settings in other
594 countries is unclear. There needs to be further examination into how SMAs have been
595 implemented into typical NHS practice. It was envisaged that “they are not an addition to
596 one-to-one appointments – they replace them.” (p.65, Clay & Stern, 2015). However, there is
597 anecdotal evidence that SMAs are being used in addition to usual care models of chronic
598 disease management rather than as replacements. Further investigations into SMAs for
599 patients with one or more LTCs is required, including a wider variety of LTCs (such as
600 asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) and with more diverse population
601 groups. For example, including low-income and disadvantaged groups in other countries,
602 including the UK.

603

604 **Conclusions**

605 This review is the first to examine the effects of SMAs delivered in primary care on health
606 outcomes and healthcare service use in patients with one or more LTCs. Our review
607 suggests that SMAs are unlikely to result in less favourable outcomes to patients with LTCs
608 compared to usual care. To identify key intervention components that contribute to
609 effectiveness, future studies will benefit from using standardised taxonomies to report
610 intervention content. The use of an evaluation framework, with a core outcome set, is
611 recommended to improve evidence in this field.

612

613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

EK and FS designed the study. MYT, FG, CR, and FB developed the search strategy and undertook the searches. FG and MYT carried out the screening, data extraction, and analysis. All authors contributed to the interpretation. MYT and FG wrote the manuscript that all authors contributed to and approved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the PRU BehSci Public Patient Involvement group for providing their patient perspective about outcome measures of interests. Professor Kaner is supported via an NIHR Senior Investigator award.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Ethical approval was not required due to the present study being a systematic review.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA

As this study is a systematic review, all data reported has been previously published and is in the public domain.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

PROSPERO PROTOCOL

PRISMA checklist

Supplementary File 1- Search strategy for Ovid MEDLINE

Supplementary File 2- Data Extraction Form

Supplementary File 3- List of included peer-reviewed papers

Supplementary File 4- Outcomes reported by studies

Supplementary File 5- Quality assessment of included studies with sensitivity analyses

Supplementary File 6- Additional biomedical measures examined with forest plots

Supplementary File 7- Additional psychological and well-being measures examined with forest plots

Supplementary File 8- Additional behavioural outcomes examined with forest plots

Supplementary File 9- SMA delivery, dose and components

668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722

REFERENCES

- 1 Clay H, Stern R. Making time in general practice: freeing GP capacity by reducing bureaucracy and avoidable consultations, managing the interface with hospitals and exploring new ways of working. 2015.
- 2 Hayhoe B, Verma A, Kumar S. Shared medical appointments. *BMJ (Online)* 2017;**358**:10–1. doi:10.1136/bmj.j4034
- 3 Jones T, Darzi A, Egger G, *et al.* Process and Systems: A systems approach to embedding group consultations in the NHS. *Future Healthcare Journal* 2019;**6**:8–16. doi:10.7861/futurehosp.6-1-8
- 4 Booth A, Cantrell A, Preston L, *et al.* What is the evidence for the effectiveness, appropriateness and feasibility of group clinics for patients with chronic conditions? A systematic review. *Health Services and Delivery Research* 2015;**3**:1–194. doi:10.3310/hsdr03460
- 5 Clay H, Stern R. Making Time in General Practice. 2015. https://www.primarycarefoundation.co.uk/images/PrimaryCareFoundation/Downloading_Reports/PCF_Press_Releases/Making-Time-in-General-Practice_FULL_REPORT_28_10_15.pdf
- 6 Wadsworth KH, Archibald TG, Payne AE, *et al.* Shared medical appointments and patient-centered experience: A mixed-methods systematic review. *BMC Family Practice* 2019;**20**:1–13. doi:10.1186/s12875-019-0972-1
- 7 Graham F, Tang MY, Jackson K, *et al.* Barriers and facilitators to implementation of shared medical appointments in primary care for the management of long-term conditions: a systematic review and synthesis of qualitative studies. *BMJ Open* 2021;**11**:e046842. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046842
- 8 Edelman D, Gierisch JM, McDuffie JR, *et al.* Shared Medical Appointments for Patients with Diabetes Mellitus: A Systematic Review. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2015;**30**:99–106. doi:10.1007/s11606-014-2978-7
- 9 Booth A, Cantrell A, Preston L, *et al.* What is the evidence for the effectiveness, appropriateness and feasibility of group clinics for patients with chronic conditions? A systematic review. *Health Services and Delivery Research* 2015;**3**:1–194. doi:10.3310/hsdr03460
- 10 Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al.* Systematic Reviews of Interventions. In: Deeks J, Higgins J, Altman D, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2 (updated February 2021)*. 2021.
- 11 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al.* The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *The BMJ* 2021;**372**. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
- 12 Michie S, Richardson M, Johnston M, *et al.* The behavior change technique taxonomy (v1) of 93 hierarchically clustered techniques: Building an international consensus for the reporting of behavior change interventions. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 2013;**46**:81–95. doi:10.1007/s12160-013-9486-6
- 13 Booth A, Cantrell A, Preston L, *et al.* What is the evidence for the effectiveness, appropriateness and feasibility of group clinics for patients with chronic conditions? A systematic review. *Health Services and Delivery Research* 2015;**3**:1–194. doi:10.3310/hsdr03460
- 14 Kirsh SR, Aron DC, Johnson KD, *et al.* A realist review of shared medical appointments: How, for whom, and under what circumstances do they work? *BMC Health Services Research* 2017;**17**:1–13. doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2064-z
- 15 Kelly F, Liska C, Morash R, *et al.* Shared medical appointments for patients with a nondiabetic physical chronic illness: A systematic review. *Chronic Illness* 2019;**15**:3–26. doi:10.1177/1742395317731608
- 16 Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software. 2021.

- 723 17 Dombrowski SU, O'Carroll RE, Williams B. Form of delivery as a key 'active
724 ingredient' in behaviour change interventions. *British Journal of Health Psychology*
725 2016;**21**:733–40. doi:10.1111/bjhp.12203
- 726 18 Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, *et al.* The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for
727 assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ (Online)* 2011;**343**:1–9.
728 doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928
- 729 19 Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in
730 health care. York: 2009.
- 731 20 Valentine JC, Pigott TD, Rothstein HR. How many studies do you need? A primer on
732 statistical power for meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*
733 2010;**35**:215–47. doi:10.3102/1076998609346961
- 734 21 Deeks J, Higgins J, Altman D. Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In:
735 Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al.*, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic*
736 *Reviews of Interventions*. Cochrane 2021.
- 737 22 Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, *et al.* Guidance on the Conduct of Narrative
738 Synthesis in Systematic Reviews A Product from the ESRC Methods Programme
739 Peninsula Medical School, Universities of Exeter and Plymouth. 2006.
- 740 23 Scott JC, Conner DA, Venohr I, *et al.* Effectiveness of a group outpatient visit model
741 for chronically ill older health maintenance organization members: A 2-year
742 randomized trial of the Cooperative Health Care Clinic. *J Am Geriatr Soc*
743 2004;**52**:1463–70. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2004.52408.x
- 744 24 Coleman EA, Eilertsen TB, Kramer AM, *et al.* Reducing emergency visits in older
745 adults with chronic illness. A randomized, controlled trial of group visits. *Eff Clin Pract*
746 2001;**4**:49–57.
- 747 25 Gardiner P, Lestoquoy AS, Gergen-Barnett K, *et al.* Design of the integrative medical
748 group visits randomized control trial for underserved patients with chronic pain and
749 depression. *Contemporary Clinical Trials* 2017;**54**:25–35.
750 doi:10.1016/j.cct.2016.12.013
- 751 26 Gardiner P, Luo M, D'Amico S, *et al.* Effectiveness of integrative medicine group visits
752 in chronic pain and depressive symptoms: A randomized controlled trial. *PLoS ONE*
753 2019;**14**:1–20. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0225540
- 754 27 Berry DC, Williams W, Hall EG, *et al.* Imbedding Interdisciplinary Diabetes Group
755 Visits Into a Community-Based Medical Setting. *The Diabetes Educator* 2016;**42**:96–
756 107. doi:10.1177/0145721715620022
- 757 28 Clancy DE, Cope DW, Magruder K, *et al.* Evaluating group visits in an uninsured or
758 inadequately insured patient population with uncontrolled type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes*
759 *Educ* 2003;**29**:292–203. doi:10.1177/0145721707299266
- 760 29 Clancy DE, Cope DW, Magruder KM, *et al.* Evaluating concordance to American
761 Diabetes Association standards of care for type 2 diabetes through group visits in an
762 uninsured or inadequately insured patient population. *Diabetes Care* 2003;**26**:2032–6.
763 doi:10.2337/diacare.26.7.2032
- 764 30 Clancy DE, Huang P, Okonofua E, *et al.* Group visits: Promoting adherence to
765 diabetes guidelines. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2007;**22**:620–4.
766 doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0150-3
- 767 31 Clancy DE, Yeager DE, Huang P, *et al.* Further evaluating the acceptability of group
768 visits in an uninsured or inadequately insured patient population with uncontrolled
769 type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Educ* 2007;**33**:309–14. doi:10.1177/0145721707299266
- 770 32 Clancy DE, Dismuke CE, Magruder KM, *et al.* Do Diabetes Group Visits Lead to
771 Lower Medical Care Charges? *American Journal of Managed Care* 2008;**14**:39–44.
- 772 33 Cole RE, Boyer KM, Spanbauer SM, *et al.* Effectiveness of Prediabetes Nutrition
773 Shared Medical Appointments: Prevention of Diabetes. *The Diabetes Educator*
774 2013;**39**:344–53. doi:10.1177/0145721713484812
- 775 34 Drake C, Meade C, Hull SK, *et al.* Integration of Personalized Health Planning and
776 Shared Medical Appointments for Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Southern*
777 *Medical Journal* 2018;**111**:674–82. doi:10.14423/SMJ.0000000000000892

- 778 35 Ee C, de Courten B, Avarad N, *et al.* Shared Medical Appointments and Mindfulness
779 for Type 2 Diabetes—A Mixed-Methods Feasibility Study. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*
780 2020;**11**:1–16. doi:10.3389/fendo.2020.570777
- 781 36 Liu S, Bi A, Fu D, *et al.* Effectiveness of using group visit model to support diabetes
782 patient self-management in rural communities of Shanghai: A randomized controlled
783 trial. *BMC Public Health* 2012;**12**:1. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-1043
- 784 37 Naik AD, Palmer N, Petersen NJ, *et al.* Comparative effectiveness of goal setting in
785 diabetes mellitus group clinics: Randomized clinical trial. *Archives of Internal Medicine*
786 2011;**171**:453–9. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2011.70
- 787 38 Schillinger D, Hammer H, Wang F, *et al.* Seeing in 3-D: Examining the reach of
788 diabetes self-management support strategies in a public health care system. *Health*
789 *Education and Behavior* 2008;**35**:664–82. doi:10.1177/1090198106296772
- 790 39 Schillinger D, Handley M, Wang F, *et al.* Effects of self-management support on
791 structure, process, and outcomes among vulnerable patients with diabetes: a 3-arm
792 randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2009;**32**. doi:10.2337/dc08-0787.Clinical
- 793 40 Wallace A, Perkhounkova Y, Tseng H, *et al.* Influence of patient characteristics on
794 assessment of diabetes self-management support. *Nursing Research* 2013;**62**:106–
795 14. doi:10.1097/NNR.0b013e3182843b77
- 796 41 Vaughan EM, Johnston CA, Cardenas VJ, *et al.* Integrating CHWs as Part of the
797 Team Leading Diabetes Group Visits: A Randomized Controlled Feasibility Study.
798 *Diabetes Educator* 2017;**43**:589–99. doi:10.1177/0145721717737742
- 799 42 Vaughan EM, Hyman DJ, Naik AD, *et al.* A Telehealth-supported, Integrated care with
800 CHWs, and MEdication-access (TIME) Program for Diabetes Improves HbA1c: a
801 Randomized Clinical Trial. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* Published Online
802 First: 2020. doi:10.1007/s11606-020-06017-4
- 803 43 Wagner EH, Grothaus LC, Sandhu N, *et al.* Chronic care clinics for diabetes in
804 primary care: A system-wide randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2001;**24**:695–700.
805 doi:10.2337/diacare.24.4.695
- 806 44 Cohen LB, Taveira TH, Khatana SAM, *et al.* Pharmacist-Led Shared Medical
807 Appointments for Multiple Cardiovascular Risk Reduction in Patients With Type 2
808 Diabetes. *The Diabetes Educator* 2011;**37**:801–12. doi:10.1177/0145721711423980
- 809 45 Taveira TH, Wu WC. Interventions to maintain cardiac risk control after discharge
810 from a cardiovascular risk reduction clinic: A randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes*
811 *Research and Clinical Practice* 2014;**105**:327–35. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2014.05.013
- 812 46 Wu WC, Taveira TH, Jeffery S, *et al.* Costs and effectiveness of pharmacist-led group
813 medical visits for type-2 diabetes: A multi-center randomized controlled trial. *PLoS*
814 *ONE* 2018;**13**:1–14. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0195898
- 815 47 Taveira TH, Dooley AG, Cohen LB, *et al.* Pharmacist-Led Group Medical
816 Appointments for the Management of Type 2 Diabetes with Comorbid Depression in
817 Older Adults. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy* 2011;**45**:1346–55. doi:10.1345/aph.1Q212
- 818 48 Yancy WS, Crowley MJ, Dar MS, *et al.* Comparison of Group Medical Visits
819 Combined with Intensive Weight Management vs Group Medical Visits Alone for
820 Glycemia in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes: A Noninferiority Randomized Clinical Trial.
821 *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2020;**180**:70–9. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.4802
- 822 49 Crowley MJ, Edelman D, Voils CI, *et al.* Jump starting shared medical appointments
823 for diabetes with weight management: Rationale and design of a randomized
824 controlled trial. *Contemporary Clinical Trials* 2017;**58**:1–12.
825 doi:10.1016/j.cct.2017.04.004
- 826 50 Edelman D, Fredrickson SK, Melnyk SD, *et al.* Medical Clinics Versus Usual Care for
827 Patients With Both Diabetes. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2010;**152**:689–96.
- 828 51 Crowley MJ, Melnyk SD, Coffman CJ, *et al.* Impact of baseline insulin regimen on
829 glycemic response to a group medical clinic intervention. *Diabetes Care*
830 2013;**36**:1954–60. doi:10.2337/dc12-1905

- 831 52 Crowley MJ, Melnyk SD, Ostroff JL, *et al.* Can group medical clinics improve lipid
832 management in diabetes? *American Journal of Medicine* 2014;**127**:145–51.
833 doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2013.09.027
- 834 53 Eisenberg A, Crowley MJ, Coffman C, *et al.* Effect of a group medical clinic for
835 veterans with diabetes on body mass index. *Chronic Illness* 2019;**15**:187–96.
836 doi:10.1177/1742395317753885
- 837 54 Gao J, Yang L, Junming D, *et al.* Evaluation of group visits for Chinese hypertensives
838 based on primary health care center. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Public Health*
839 2015;**27**:NP350–60. doi:10.1177/1010539512442566
- 840 55 Simon B, Sawicki PT. Quality improvement in chronic care delivery for patients with
841 arterial hypertension through Group Medical Visits: Patient acceptance and
842 attendance in the German pilot project. *Quality in Primary Care* 2015;**23**:106-112 7p.
- 843 56 Baqir W, Gray WK, Blair A, *et al.* Osteoporosis group consultations are as effective as
844 usual care: Results from a non-inferiority randomized trial. *Lifestyle Medicine*
845 2020;**1**:1–9. doi:10.1002/lim2.3
- 846 57 Gardiner P, Luo M, D'Amico S, *et al.* Effectiveness of integrative medicine group visits
847 in chronic pain and depressive symptoms: A randomized controlled trial. *PLoS ONE*
848 2019;**14**:1–20. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0225540
- 849 58 Berry DC, Williams W, Hall EG, *et al.* Imbedding Interdisciplinary Diabetes Group
850 Visits Into a Community-Based Medical Setting. *The Diabetes Educator* 2016;**42**:96–
851 107. doi:10.1177/0145721715620022
- 852 59 Clancy DE, Cope DW, Magruder K, *et al.* Evaluating group visits in an uninsured or
853 inadequately insured patient population with uncontrolled type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes*
854 *Educ* 2003;**29**:292–203. doi:10.1177/0145721707299266
- 855 60 Clancy DE, Huang P, Okonofua E, *et al.* Group visits: Promoting adherence to
856 diabetes guidelines. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2007;**22**:620–4.
857 doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0150-3
- 858 61 Ee C, de Courten B, Avarid N, *et al.* Shared Medical Appointments and Mindfulness
859 for Type 2 Diabetes—A Mixed-Methods Feasibility Study. *Frontiers in Endocrinology*
860 2020;**11**:1–16. doi:10.3389/fendo.2020.570777
- 861 62 Vaughan EM, Hyman DJ, Naik AD, *et al.* A Telehealth-supported, Integrated care with
862 CHWs, and MEdication-access (TIME) Program for Diabetes Improves HbA1c: a
863 Randomized Clinical Trial. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* Published Online
864 First: 2020. doi:10.1007/s11606-020-06017-4
- 865 63 Baqir W, Gray WK, Blair A, *et al.* Osteoporosis group consultations are as effective as
866 usual care: Results from a non-inferiority randomized trial. *Lifestyle Medicine*
867 2020;**1**:1–9. doi:10.1002/lim2.3
- 868 64 Naik AD, Palmer N, Petersen NJ, *et al.* Comparative effectiveness of goal setting in
869 diabetes mellitus group clinics: Randomized clinical trial. *Archives of Internal Medicine*
870 2011;**171**:453–9. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2011.70
- 871 65 Liu S, Bi A, Fu D, *et al.* Effectiveness of using group visit model to support diabetes
872 patient self-management in rural communities of Shanghai: A randomized controlled
873 trial. *BMC Public Health* 2012;**12**:1. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-1043
- 874 66 Crowley MJ, Melnyk SD, Coffman CJ, *et al.* Impact of baseline insulin regimen on
875 glycemic response to a group medical clinic intervention. *Diabetes Care*
876 2013;**36**:1954–60. doi:10.2337/dc12-1905
- 877 67 Taveira TH, Wu WC. Interventions to maintain cardiac risk control after discharge
878 from a cardiovascular risk reduction clinic: A randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes*
879 *Research and Clinical Practice* 2014;**105**:327–35. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2014.05.013
- 880 68 Drake C, Meade C, Hull SK, *et al.* Integration of Personalized Health Planning and
881 Shared Medical Appointments for Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Southern*
882 *Medical Journal* 2018;**111**:674–82. doi:10.14423/SMJ.0000000000000892
- 883 69 Yancy WS, Crowley MJ, Dar MS, *et al.* Comparison of Group Medical Visits
884 Combined with Intensive Weight Management vs Group Medical Visits Alone for

- 885 Glycemia in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes: A Noninferiority Randomized Clinical Trial.
886 *JAMA Internal Medicine* 2020;**180**:70–9. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.4802
887 70 Edelman D, McDuffie JR, Oddone E, *et al.* Shared Medical Appointments for Chronic
888 Medical Conditions: A Systematic Review. *VA Evidence-based Synthesis Program*
889 *Reports* 2012.
890 71 Housden L, Wong ST, Dawes M. Effectiveness of group medical visits for improving
891 diabetes care: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Canadian Medical Association*
892 *Journal* 2013;**185**:E635–44. doi:10.1503/cmaj.130053
893 72 Edelman D, Gierisch JM, McDuffie JR, *et al.* Shared Medical Appointments for
894 Patients with Diabetes Mellitus: A Systematic Review. *Journal of General Internal*
895 *Medicine* 2015;**30**:99–106. doi:10.1007/s11606-014-2978-7
896 73 Webbe J, Sinha I, Gale C. Core Outcome Sets. *Archives of Disease in Childhood:*
897 *Education and Practice Edition* 2018;**103**:163–6. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2016-
898 312117
899 74 Bellg AJ, Resnick B, Minicucci DS, *et al.* Enhancing treatment fidelity in health
900 behavior change studies: Best practices and recommendations from the NIH Behavior
901 Change Consortium. *Health Psychology* 2004;**23**:443–51. doi:10.1037/0278-
902 6133.23.5.443
903 75 Carey RN, Connell LE, Johnston M, *et al.* Behavior Change Techniques and Their
904 Mechanisms of Action: A Synthesis of Links Described in Published Intervention
905 Literature. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* 2018;**53**:693–707. doi:10.1093/abm/kay078
906
907

908 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

- 909
910 Figure 1: PRISMA diagram of study selection process
911
912 Figure 2: Forest plot for a) HbA1C(%), b) diastolic blood pressure, c) systolic blood pressure
913
914 Figure 3: Forest plot for a) hospital admissions, b) emergency department use, c) primary
915 care visits