# **Comparing Three Evidence-Based Strategies to Reduce Cardiovascular Disease Burden:**

# *An Individual-Based Cardiometabolic Policy Simulation*

# **Author List:**

- Sylvia Lutze,  $MS<sup>1</sup>$   $\bullet$  Steve Bachmeier, MS<sup>1</sup>  $\bullet$  Alison Bowman, MPH<sup>1</sup>  $\bullet$  Nicole DeCleene, BS<sup>1</sup>
- $\bullet$  Hussain Jafari, BS<sup>1</sup>
- Matthew Kappel,  $MS<sup>1</sup>$
- Caroline Kinuthia, MPH $<sup>1</sup>$ </sup>
- Paulina Lindstedt, MPH $<sup>1</sup>$ </sup>
- $\bullet$  Megan Lindstrom, PhD<sup>1</sup>
- Rajan Mudambi,  $BA<sup>1</sup>$
- 15 **•** Christian Razo,  $PhD^{1,2}$
- $\bullet$  Kjell Swedin<sup>1</sup>
- Abraham Flaxman,  $PhD^{1,2,3^*}$
- Gregory Roth, MD, MPH $^{1,2,4*}$
- \*Co-senior authors

# **Author Affiliations:**

- 21 <sup>1</sup>Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, University of Washington, Seattle
- 22 <sup>2</sup>Department of Health Metrics Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle
- 23 <sup>3</sup>Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle
- 24 <sup>4</sup>Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle
- 
- **Short Title:**
- Individual-Based Cardiometabolic Policy Simulation
- 
- **Corresponding Author Contact:**
- Sylvia Lutze
- lutzes@uw.edu
- (408) 823-3224
- Institute of Health Metrics and Evaluation
- Population Health Building/Hans Rosling Center
- 3980 15th Ave. NE, Seattle, WA 98195 USA
- UW Campus Box #351615
- 
- **Word Count of Manuscript:**
- 6522
- 
- 

 **Comparing Three Evidence-Based Strategies to Reduce Cardiovascular Disease Burden:**  *An Individual-Based Cardiometabolic Policy Simulation* Sylvia Lutze, Steve Bachmeier, Alison Bowman, Nikki DeCleene, Hussain Jafari, Matthew Kappel, Caroline Kinuthia, Paulina Lindstedt, Megan Lindstrom, Rajan Mudambi, Christian Razo, Kjell Swedin, Abraham Flaxman, Gregory Roth Abstract **Background:** Understanding the real-world impact of clinical trials is important for informing health care policy. This is particularly true when trials are designed to show changes in surrogate endpoints such as changes in risk factors rather than events or mortality. We developed an agent-based microsimulation that estimates the population-level benefits in each US state for cardiometabolic health interventions shown to improve risk factors. **Methods:** We designed a large-scale, location-specific agent-based simulation model with a population of 51 million *in silico* individuals and estimated results for the years 2023 to 2040 in 30-day steps for each of the 50 states and District of Columbia. Input data reflected current cardiometabolic health in each state and the effects of interventions and risk factors on outcomes. We constructed three health policy intervention scenarios based on successful randomized controlled trials designed to improve cardiometabolic population health: improved access to fixed-dose combination (FDC) antihypertensive medication, a pharmacist-led intervention to increase adherence to statin and antihypertensives medications at the time they are initiated (Pharmacy), and a community-based lifestyle and behavior intervention designed to prevent diabetes (Community). Outcomes included myocardial infarction, ischemic and non- ischemic heart failure, and ischemic stroke events, deaths, and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs).

 **Results:** Our simulation included a representative population of the United States, accurate at the age, sex, and state level, with individual people simulated over 17 years. By the



# Clinical Perspective:

# **What is new?**



- 87 Broad adoption of fixed-dose combination medication for hypertension had the largest health benefit in all states.
- 89 Interventions to improve adherence to medications or promote behavior change led to smaller reductions in disease burden.

 Direct comparison of the estimated real-world impact of clinical and community-based interventions can guide ongoing efforts to reduce the population burden of cardiovascular disease and resulting disparities.

# Introduction

 Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death in the United States and is responsible for  $-$  695,000 deaths annually,<sup>1,2</sup> with up to a third of those estimated to be preventable.<sup>3</sup> Large-scale health policy interventions such as the federally sponsored Million Hearts program have been rolled out to  $-$  reduce cardiovascular disease burden, but impact has been limited.<sup>4</sup> The strongest evidence supporting interventions to improve CVD comes from randomized clinical trials, which have shown benefits through medications, improved medication adherence, and behavioral changes. However, the real-world impact of these trials can be challenging to predict because they are most commonly powered for changes in surrogate endpoints such as risk factor levels, and their effect when implemented at scale in a state or health system can be unclear. Tools that estimate population-level impact from CVD interventions can provide policymakers with a realistic assessment of their choices and improve their ability to make necessary trade-off decisions between interventions.

 To guide public health decision-making, we developed a person-level agent-based simulation for the entire United States. The simulation estimates the real-world impact of well-tested risk factor-modifying interventions on death, disability, and disease burden for state and national populations. Person-level agent-based simulation is a method borrowed from engineering and related fields that offers substantial advantages over traditional health models such as compartmental or decision tree simulations. For example, it can accurately represent complex, multi-step interventions common for cardiovascular diseases or even apply multiple interventions to be delivered over time, while also incorporating both the observed variation in individual response to therapies and uncertainty around that response.

In this analysis, we modeled 51 million individuals ("simulants") to understand how interventions

might change observed levels of risk factors in each US state, and how this change would affect

116 cardiovascular events and deaths over the next two decades.

# Methods

Overview

 We constructed and ran an individual-based microsimulation for all 50 states and Washington, DC. Individual-based microsimulation is a computer modeling approach in which a cohort of 51 million *in silico* individuals was created with demographic and health characteristics, and those characteristics were changed sequentially in steps that represented the passage of time. Our simulation represented all adults over age 25 in each US state and ran in the simulated timeframe of 2023 through 2040. We utilized data from the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) 2019 study and other sources to match patterns of age, sex, metabolic risk factor exposure and burden, disease rate, mortality rate, and health care 126 delivery in each US state.<sup>5-8</sup> We designed the simulation to examine major metabolic risk factors: levels of systolic blood pressure (SBP), fasting plasma glucose (FPG), serum LDL cholesterol (LDL-C), and body mass index (BMI), and common cardiovascular diseases: ischemic heart disease (IHD), ischemic stroke, and both ischemic and non-ischemic heart failure. A high-level flow diagram can be seen in Figure 1, with detailed methods, an illustrative flow diagram (eFigure 1), and a schematic showing the relationship between risk factors and outcomes (eFigure 2) in the supplement. The study did not involve enrollment of human participants and used only existing population-level data. 133 Input Data for the Simulation Data for risk factor levels, disease incidence, and cause-specific mortality were obtained from the

136 surveys.<sup>5–8</sup> The relationship between a simulant's risk factor level and health outcomes, both initially and

GBD study, along with existing published studies, including national and state-level population health

after treatment, were based on estimates of effect size from the GBD study's meta-analyses of risk

138 factor-outcome relationships.<sup>9</sup> Further details on the GBD study's estimation of relative risks can be found in the supplement and previous publication.<sup>6</sup> 139

140 At initialization of the simulation, each simulant received an age, sex, disease status, and location-141 specific level of systolic blood pressure (in mmHg), low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (in mmol/L), body 142 mass index (in kg/m<sup>2</sup>), and fasting plasma glucose (in mmol/L) from GBD data. We calibrated health care 143 visit rates to the GBD health care utilization study.<sup>10</sup> To determine use of blood-pressure-lowering and 144 cholesterol-lowering medications, we initialized simulants based on self-reported use in the National 145 Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) and Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System 146 (BRFSS) data to reflect observed state variation in medication rates.<sup>11,12</sup> Our model represented 147 prescription and up-titration rates seen in real-world clinical practice, including AHA/ACC guideline-148 based practice as well as practices that diverge from that guidance.<sup>13-15</sup> Our model also incorporated the 149 effect of therapeutic inertia, the resistance to starting or increasing medication frequently observed in 150 practice, using real-world rates reported in previously published studies.<sup>16,17</sup> The biologic effect of 151 pharmacotherapies on risk factors was based on large meta-analyses pooling the observed effect size 152 across multiple studies.<sup>18,19</sup> Real-world differences in patient adherence were included based on 153 Medicare Part D data and a systematic review of the published literature.<sup>20,21</sup> A full list of input values 154 and data sources are included in supplement eTable 1.

## 155 Individual-Based Simulation

156 We used the inputs above to create a simulation of risk factor exposures and disease rates through 157 the year 2040. We modeled changes in the health of each simulant according to the following inputs: a) 158 age- and sex-specific risk factor levels, <sup>6</sup> disease and mortality rates, <sup>5</sup> b) rates of primary care visits for 159 risk factor screening,<sup>10</sup> c) rates for the use of antihypertensive and lipid-lowering medications,<sup>11</sup> d) rates 160 of therapeutic inertia,  $16,17$  and e) medication titration over time based on observed rates of follow-up 161 and medication adjustment. $13-15,18-20$ 





#### 194 Outcomes and Scenarios Analysis

 For each scenario, we calculated rates of incident disease (myocardial infarction, stroke, heart failure), cause-specific death, all-cause death, years lived with disability (YLDs, years lived in less-than- ideal health), years of life lost (YLLs, years of life lost due to premature mortality), and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs, the sum of YLLs and YLDs) in each state, stratified by age and sex. We define CVD outcomes in this paper as the sum of ischemic stroke, ischemic heart disease, and heart failure. We compared intervention scenarios by calculating the number and percentage of cause-specific cardiac events, deaths, YLDs, YLLs, and DALYs averted compared to the baseline scenario. The simulation used 202 identical simulants for each scenario who have the same probability of disease and death.<sup>33</sup> State-level results were summed to national results based on state population. Results were averaged for annual values between 2025 and 2040 to capture the long-term impact of interventions once fully adopted.

#### Validation and Data Processing

 We ensured that model inputs remained stable within the complex dynamics of the simulation's medications, CVD events, and mortality by comparing incidence, prevalence, and mortality rates for all 208 diseases, risk factor distributions, and risk factor–attributable burden against GBD values.<sup>5,6</sup> Additionally, we ensured health care visit rates, adherence rates, medication effects, and therapeutic inertia rates

- 210 Femained stable over time.<sup>10,16–20</sup> Lastly, we ensured that verified that changes in adherence and risk
- factors seen in the simulation were the same as those seen in the RCT results.
- In later years of the simulation, population sizes differ due to the interventions' cumulative effects
- on lives saved. Capturing these increases in population are an important output of this type of
- simulation work. For the sake of clarity, counts data throughout this paper are scaled to the baseline
- population size. Further details are in the supplement.

#### Statistical Analyses

- We included parameter uncertainty in the microsimulation by running 10 replications with
- independent parameter values drawn from the posterior distribution of our input data, resulting in our
- modeling the life course of 51 million simulants. We used this to quantify uncertainty in our results by
- calculating the mean, range, and 95% uncertainty interval (95% UI) based on the different draw values.

# Results

# **Estimated Reduction in Cardiovascular Disease DALYs**  At the national level, the FDC intervention resulted in a 1.2% (95% UI 0.90–1.4%) reduction in CVD DALYs annually compared to the baseline scenario, while the Pharmacy intervention and the Community intervention resulted in 0.26% (95% UI 0.20–0.31%) and 0.23% (95% UI 0.20–0.26%) reductions, respectively. There was an average annual reduction between 2025 and 2040 of 776,000 (95% UI 578,000–956,000) DALYs in the FDC scenario, 170,000 (95% UI 129,000–208,000) in the Pharmacy intervention, and 152,000 (95% UI 128,000–173,000) in Community intervention nationwide (Table 1). All states saw the highest impact from FDC interventions, with lower impacts from the Pharmacy intervention and Community intervention (Figure 2). The mean annual reduction in CVD DALYs from FDC

- varied between 1.5% and 0.97% across locations (Figure 2). For the Pharmacy intervention, the mean
- reduction in CVD DALYs varied between 0.32% and 0.19%, and for the Community intervention, it varied
- between 0.32% and 0.18%. Total DALYs averted by state can be found in eTable 7 in the supplement.



nationwide. The Pharmacy intervention and Community interventions, respectively, resulted in a 0.58%

(95% UI 0.36–0.85%) and 0.09% (95% UI -0.04–0.21%) reduction in stroke DALYs. This led to 5,530 (95%

- UI 3,700–7,520) and 1,220 (95% UI 176–1,990) fewer strokes and 664 (95% UI 253–1,110) and 63 (95%
- UI -76–229) fewer stroke deaths annually. Total stroke count annually can be seen in Figure 4. State-
- 261 level results are in eTables 5-7 in the supplement.

#### Heart Failure

- There was a smaller reduction in heart failure cases compared to other CVD events (Figure 4). The
- FDC intervention resulted in a 1.0% (95% UI 0.64–1.6%) annual reduction in heart failure DALYs. This led
- to 21,600 (95% UI 10,100–40,300) fewer heart failure cases and 19,900 (95% UI 11,500–36,300) fewer
- heart failure deaths nationwide. The Pharmacy intervention and Community intervention resulted in a
- 0.13% (95% UI 0.08–0.21%) and 0.34% (95% UI 0.30–0.40%) reduction, respectively, in heart failure
- DALYs. This led to 1,680 (95% UI 216–4,240) and 6,470 (95% UI 5,330–8,250) fewer heart failure cases
- and 1,950 (95% UI 522–4030) and 6,170 (95% UI 5,280–7,740) fewer heart failure deaths annually. Total
- heart failure count annually can be seen in Figure 4. State-level results are in eTables 5-6 in the
- supplement.

#### Age and Sex

Our input data were specific to 5-year age and sex groups, allowing us to assess how results might

differ by population. Younger age groups saw much less benefit from interventions compared to ages 65

and above for all scenarios (Figure 5). The figure shows DALY counts averted, with the greatest

reductions in 65–75- and 75–85-year-olds. Despite sex-specific risk factor and disease rate inputs, we did

277 not see sex differences in relative impact or ordering of the interventions our results.

#### Validation

 Disease model inputs remained stable for the duration of the simulation, matching the empirically estimated disease rates from the Global Burden of Disease study used to initialize the first year of the simulation. Additionally, health care visit rates, adherence rates, medication effects, and therapeutic inertia rates remained stable over time and matched desired inputs. The stability of disease rates and

health care activities is reassuring and shows that simulants continued to be exposed to a realistic

process across many years of the simulation.

 Our results were largely aligned with the results from the RCTs used to design the interventions. For example, the FDC intervention trials report medication adherence and change in SBP level, which were included directly in our simulation. Our results found an average decrease in SBP of 8.6 mmHg in all states analyzed 1 year into the simulation. The reference source FDC trials found similar results in blood  $p$  pressure reduction.<sup>31,32</sup>

The intervention to increase medication adherence trial only reported change in adherence,

291 which we directly implemented and modeled in our simulation. Similarly, for the Community

intervention, we directly modeled changes in risk factors to match the initial and sustained drops seen in

the 10-year follow-up of the NDPP. Further comparisons of simulated and RCT results can be found in

eTable 4 in the supplement.

# Discussion

 We estimate 4.0 million CVD events and 3.1 million CVD deaths, for a total of 67.8 million CVD DALYs in 2040 nationally. Our simulation suggests that substantial improvements in population health could be achieved with effective and broad delivery of proven interventions. Broad adoption of a fixed-dose combination antihypertensive regimen for the management of hypertension is estimated to prevent 101,300 cardiovascular events and 44,600 CVD deaths in the United States annually, and over 1.5 million events and 600,000 deaths by the year 2040. A pharmacy-based intervention to increase medication adherence is estimated to prevent 24,610 CVD events and 9,540 CVD deaths annually. A community- based intervention for lifestyle modification is estimated to prevent 12,950 CVD events and 8,260 CVD deaths annually. These latter two interventions achieved only about 25% of the reductions seen with the FDC intervention, suggesting that improvements in efficacy of pharmacotherapies would have a larger impact than broader adoption of the current federal program for lifestyle modification or interventions



care providers are common in the US, meaning there were significantly more eligible people accessing

the FDC intervention than the Community intervention, even accounting for the limiting effects of

331 therapeutic inertia and nonadherence.

 The Pharmacy intervention was the second most effective. This intervention was designed to improve adherence rates to medications, resulting in a significant benefit for those simulants who began receiving medications. However, because the intervention only impacted individuals who would have been non-adherent, only 7% of antihypertensive medication users and 12% of cholesterol medication users experienced a benefit. The Community intervention program was limited, by design, to those who both have high BMI and are pre-diabetic, resulting in a smaller enrolled population size than the other interventions, approximately 2.8% of simulants compared to 9.6% in FDC intervention. Future community-based programs targeting behavior change should consider enrolling broader populations at risk. Overall, heart failure cases saw less reduction than stroke or myocardial infarction (Figure 4). There are two reasons for this outcome. First, reductions in FPG and LDL-C have not been shown to reduce incident HF in longitudinal studies once changes in IHD are accounted for, and therefore this was not 344 included in the simulation.<sup>43–47</sup> The lack of observed effect may reflect limited sample size in large cohort studies, which suggests that any possible missed effect is small. Second, the attributable fraction of heart failure due to elevated SBP and BMI is much lower than in IHD and stroke. We estimated approximately 50% of IHD or stroke cases are caused by elevated BMI or SBP, but only about 20% of

heart failure cases are caused by one of these risk factors.<sup>6</sup> 

 Our simulation utilizes data that are representative of the entire population in each state, which includes variation between states due to demographic differences. Analysis at the state level allows us to see how those demographic differences impact the relative impact from each intervention. The intervention effect was similar across all states, but the magnitude of disease burden averted varied widely. For example, Utah had the lowest rate of DALYs averted due to the FDC intervention, with

0.97%. Utah has one of the lowest average SBP levels of any state and one of the lowest rates of

- hypertensive medication use. Fewer simulants received the FDC intervention, and SBP is responsible for
- fewer CVD events in Utah, leading to a reduced impact.
- Calibration of a simulation model to match real-world situations is essential to trusting the results of
- a computer-based simulation of population health. For example, our model reliably reproduced the
- expected results observed in RCTs. In the FDC intervention, our model found SBP reductions within the
- 360 confidence interval of 2 of the 3 trials for combination therapies reviewed.<sup>31,32</sup> This is especially
- important as the change in SBP was based on medication prescription and dynamics within the model,
- not based on a direct effect of the intervention. This means that the complex health care system
- designed to emulate real-world medication dynamics was successful in capturing sufficient detail.

#### Limitations

 Given the scale of data inputs required for a simulation of this kind, some necessary input data were limited in level of available detail or geographic representation. This was most apparent for inputs used to model aspects of the health care system, such as therapeutic inertia or medication adherence. Although we have age/sex/state-specific values for incidence, mortality rates, risk factors, and medication rates, we assumed that the rates of adherence and therapeutic inertia did not vary by age, sex, or state. For these limited components where we did not reflect possible variation in input data, we might not fully capture expected variation in outcomes by sex, age, or state. We would not expect this to bias our results at the aggregate, but our estimates could diverge from real-world when input is limited in this way. We do note that there are very few population-level data available on medication adherence or therapeutic inertia, and we do not know if age, sex, or location has a substantial impact on these aspects of health care delivery. Also, our choice to estimate intervention impact using RCTs may lead to overestimation of their impact due to differences between efficacy of an intervention among a highly selected population enrolled in a trial and effectiveness in the general population. We accepted

- this as a potential source of bias in order to inform the simulation with the most reliable and robust
- estimates of each intervention's effect, based on estimates that due to randomization were unaffected
- 380 by either observed or unobserved confounding. $48$

# Conclusion

- This simulation quantifies the potential public health benefit if effective interventions were to be
- scaled up successfully at the state and national level. Broad adoption of a fixed-dose combination
- antihypertensive regimen for the management of hypertension was estimated to prevent 101,300 CVD
- events and 44,600 CVD deaths in the United States annually, and over 1.5 million events and 600,000
- deaths by the year 2040. This simulation suggests that substantial improvements in population health
- are achievable with effective and broad delivery of proven interventions.

# References

- 1. Multiple Cause of Death Data on CDC WONDER. Accessed November 22, 2023.
- https://wonder.cdc.gov/mcd.html
- 2. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics—2023 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association | Circulation. Accessed November 22, 2023.
- https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIR.0000000000001123
- 3. Potentially Preventable Deaths from the Five Leading Causes of Death United States, 2008–2010. Accessed November 22, 2023. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6317a1.htm
- 4. CDC. Million Hearts®. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published May 5, 2023. Accessed November 14, 2023. https://millionhearts.hhs.gov/index.html
- 5. Vos T, Lim SS, Abbafati C, et al. Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10258):1204-1222. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30925-9
- 6. Murray CJL, Aravkin AY, Zheng P, et al. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10258):1223-1249. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30752-2
- 7. Kenchaiah S, Sesso HD, Gaziano JM. Body Mass Index and Vigorous Physical Activity and the Risk of Heart Failure Among Men. *Circulation*. 2009;119(1):44-52. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.108.807289
- 8. Zhang Y, Vittinghoff E, Pletcher MJ, et al. Associations of Blood Pressure and Cholesterol Levels During Young Adulthood With Later Cardiovascular Events. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;74(3):330-341. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2019.03.529
- 9. Zheng P, Afshin A, Biryukov S, et al. The Burden of Proof studies: assessing the evidence of risk. *Nat Med*. 2022;28(10):2038-2044. doi:10.1038/s41591-022-01973-2
- 10. Moses MW, Pedroza P, Baral R, et al. Funding and services needed to achieve universal health coverage: applications of global, regional, and national estimates of utilisation of outpatient visits and inpatient admissions from 1990 to 2016, and unit costs from 1995 to 2016. *Lancet Public Health*. 2019;4(1):e49-e73. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(18)30213-5
- 11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey Data.
- https://wwwn.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes/continuousnhanes/default.aspx?BeginYear=2017
- 12. CDC BRFSS. Published January 9, 2024. Accessed January 25, 2024. https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/index.html
- 13. Arnett DK, Blumenthal RS, Albert MA, et al. 2019 ACC/AHA Guideline on the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of

- Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2019;140(11). doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000677
- 14. Byrd JB, Zeng C, Tavel HM, et al. Combination therapy as initial treatment for newly diagnosed hypertension. *Am Heart J*. 2011;162(2):340-346. doi:10.1016/j.ahj.2011.05.010
- 15. Nguyen V, deGoma EM, Hossain E, Jacoby DS. Updated cholesterol guidelines and intensity of statin therapy. *J Clin Lipidol*. 2015;9(3):357-359. doi:10.1016/j.jacl.2014.12.009
- 16. Turchin A, Goldberg SI, Shubina M, Einbinder JS, Conlin PR. Encounter Frequency and Blood Pressure in Hypertensive Patients with Diabetes. *Hypertension*. 2010;56(1):68-74. doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.109.148791
- 17. Goldberg KC, Melnyk SD, Simel DL. Overcoming inertia: improvement in achieving target low-density lipoprotein cholesterol. *Am J Manag Care*. 2007;13(9):530-534.

 18. Law MR, Morris JK, Wald NJ. Use of blood pressure lowering drugs in the prevention of cardiovascular disease: meta-analysis of 147 randomised trials in the context of expectations from prospective epidemiological studies. *BMJ*. 2009;338:b1665. doi:10.1136/bmj.b1665

- 19. Descamps O, Tomassini JE, Lin J, et al. Variability of the LDL-C lowering response to ezetimibe and ezetimibe + statin therapy in hypercholesterolemic patients. *Atherosclerosis*. 2015;240(2):482- 489. doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2015.03.004
- 20. Cheen MHH, Tan YZ, Oh LF, Wee HL, Thumboo J. Prevalence of and factors associated with primary medication non-adherence in chronic disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2019;73(6):e13350. doi:10.1111/ijcp.13350
- 21. Part C and D Performance Data | CMS. Accessed January 30, 2024. https://www.cms.gov/medicare/health-drug-plans/part-c-d-performance-data
- 22. Vivarium. https://vivarium.readthedocs.io/en/latest/

 23. Heidenreich PA, Albert NM, Allen LA, et al. Forecasting the impact of heart failure in the United States: a policy statement from the American Heart Association. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2013;6(3):606-619. doi:10.1161/HHF.0b013e318291329a

- 24. Haddock B, Pletcher A, Blair-Stahn N, et al. Simulated data for census-scale entity resolution research without privacy restrictions: a large-scale dataset generated by individual-based modeling. *Gates Open Res*. 2024;8:36. doi:10.12688/gatesopenres.15418.1
- 25. Kannan A, Tsoi D, Xie Y, Horst C, Collins J, Flaxman A. Cost-effectiveness of Vitamin A supplementation among children in three sub-Saharan African countries: An individual-based simulation model using estimates from Global Burden of Disease 2019. Horton S, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2022;17(4):e0266495. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0266495
- 26. Young N, Bowman A, Swedin K, et al. Cost-effectiveness of antenatal multiple micronutrients and balanced energy protein supplementation compared to iron and folic acid supplementation in
- India, Pakistan, Mali, and Tanzania: A dynamic microsimulation study. *PLOS Med*.
- 2022;19(2):e1003902. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003902
- 27. Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study Research Group, Orchard TJ, Temprosa M, et al. Long-term effects of the Diabetes Prevention Program interventions on cardiovascular risk factors: a report from the DPP Outcomes Study. *Diabet Med J Br Diabet Assoc*. 2013;30(1):46-55. doi:10.1111/j.1464-5491.2012.03750.x
- 
- 28. National Diabetes Prevention Program | Diabetes | CDC. Published December 27, 2022. Accessed February 1, 2023. https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/prevention/index.html
- 29. Derose SF, Green K, Marrett E, et al. Automated Outreach to Increase Primary Adherence to Cholesterol-Lowering Medications. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2013;173(1):38-43. doi:10.1001/2013.jamainternmed.717
- 30. Thom S, Poulter N, Field J, et al. Effects of a Fixed-Dose Combination Strategy on Adherence and Risk Factors in Patients With or at High Risk of CVD: The UMPIRE Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2013;310(9):918-929. doi:10.1001/jama.2013.277064
- 31. Muñoz D, Uzoije P, Reynolds C, et al. Polypill for Cardiovascular Disease Prevention in an Underserved Population. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(12):1114-1123. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1815359
- 32. Webster R, Salam A, de Silva HA, et al. Fixed Low-Dose Triple Combination Antihypertensive Medication vs Usual Care for Blood Pressure Control in Patients With Mild to Moderate Hypertension in Sri Lanka: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2018;320(6):566-579. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.10359
- 33. Flaxman AD, Deason AW, Dolgert AJ, et al. Untangling uncertainty with common random numbers: a simulation study. In: *Proceedings of the Summer Simulation Multi-Conference*. SummerSim '17. Society for Computer Simulation International; 2017:1-12.
- 34. Weinstein MC, Coxson PG, Williams LW, Pass TM, Stason WB, Goldman L. Forecasting coronary heart disease incidence, mortality, and cost: the Coronary Heart Disease Policy Model. *Am J Public Health*. 1987;77(11):1417-1426. doi:10.2105/AJPH.77.11.1417
- 35. Pandya A, Sy S, Cho S, Alam S, Weinstein MC, Gaziano TA. Validation of a Cardiovascular Disease Policy Micro-simulation Model Using Both Survival and Receiver Operating Characteristic Curves. *Med Decis Mak Int J Soc Med Decis Mak*. 2017;37(7):802-814. doi:10.1177/0272989X17706081
- 36. Hirsch G, Homer J, Evans E, Zielinski A. A System Dynamics Model for Planning Cardiovascular Disease Interventions. *Am J Public Health*. 2010;100(4):616-622. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.159434
- 37. Kazi DS, Wei PC, Penko J, et al. Scaling Up Pharmacist-Led Blood Pressure Control Programs in Black Barbershops: Projected Population Health Impact and Value. *Circulation*. 2021;143(24):2406- 2408. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.051782
- 38. Bibbins-Domingo K, Chertow GM, Coxson PG, et al. Projected effect of dietary salt reductions on future cardiovascular disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(7):590-599. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0907355

 39. Bellows BK, Ruiz-Negrón N, Bibbins-Domingo K, et al. Clinic-based strategies to reach United States Million Hearts 2022 blood pressure control goals: a simulation study. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2019;12(6):e005624. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.118.005624

- 40. Bossick AS, Brown J, Hanna A, Parrish C, Williams EC, Katon JG. Impact of State-Level Reproductive Health Legislation on Access to and Use of Reproductive Health Services and Reproductive Health Outcomes: A Systematic Scoping Review in the Affordable Care Act Era. *Womens*
- *Health Issues*. 2021;31(2):114-121. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2020.11.005
- 41. Woolf SH. The Growing Influence of State Governments on Population Health in the United States. *JAMA*. 2022;327(14):1331-1332. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.3785
- 42. CDC. Hypertension Prevalence in the U.S. | Million Hearts®. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published May 12, 2023. Accessed November 14, 2023. https://millionhearts.hhs.gov/data-reports/hypertension-prevalence.html

 43. Lee MMY, Sattar N, McMurray JJV, Packard CJ. Statins in the Prevention and Treatment of Heart Failure: a Review of the Evidence. *Curr Atheroscler Rep*. 2019;21(10):41. doi:10.1007/s11883-019- 0800-z

- 44. Agarwala A, Pokharel Y, Saeed A, et al. The association of lipoprotein(a) with incident heart failure hospitalization: Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities study. *Atherosclerosis*. 2017;262:131-137. doi:10.1016/j.atherosclerosis.2017.05.014
- 45. Bell DSH, Goncalves E. Heart failure in the patient with diabetes: Epidemiology, aetiology, prognosis, therapy and the effect of glucose-lowering medications. *Diabetes Obes Metab*. 2019;21(6):1277-1290. doi:10.1111/dom.13652
- 46. Nichols GA, Koro CE, Kolatkar NS. The incidence of heart failure among nondiabetic patients with and without impaired fasting glucose. *J Diabetes Complications*. 2009;23(3):224-228. doi:10.1016/j.jdiacomp.2007.10.001
- 47. Deedwania P, Patel K, Fonarow GC, et al. Prediabetes is not an independent risk factor for incident heart failure, other cardiovascular events or mortality in older adults: Findings from a population-based cohort study. *Int J Cardiol*. 2013;168(4):3616-3622.
- doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2013.05.038
- 48. Nordon C, Karcher H, Groenwold RHH, et al. The "Efficacy-Effectiveness Gap": Historical Background and Current Conceptualization. *Value Health*. 2016;19(1):75-81. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2015.09.2938
- 
- 

# <sup>526</sup> Table and Figure Information

# 527 **Table 1: Average Cardiovascular Disease Disability-Adjusted Life Years, Deaths, and Events Averted**

- 528 **Annually in the United States between 2025 and 2040**
- 529



530 *Caption: Total cardiovascular disease (CVD) disability-adjusted life years (DALYs), CVD deaths, and CVD events* 

531 *averted annually between 2025 and 2040 under each alternative intervention scenario. Includes a 95% uncertainty*  532 *interval based on variation between simulation runs.* 

533

# 534 *All figures uploaded separately as PDFs.*

# 535 **Figure 1: Flow of Simulants through the Model**

536 *Caption: High-level overview of the flow of simulants, including the health care system, interventions,* 

537 *risks affected, and outcomes. More detailed information including data input values can be found in* 

538 *eFigure 1.* 

# 539 **Figure 2: Map Showing CVD DALYs Averted from Each Intervention by State**

540 *Caption: Percentage of cardiovascular disease (CVD) disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) averted under* 

541 *all intervention scenarios in each state.*

# 542 **Figure 3: Risk Factor Distribution Comparison between Scenarios in Three States**

543 *Caption: Change in risk factors between those who received each intervention and the same population* 

544 *in the baseline scenario. Shown for California, Illinois, and Florida. Only interventions that affect the risk*

545 *factor are included in each graph. A version of Figure 2 for intention to treat can be found in eFigure 3 in* 

546 *the supplement.* 

# 547 **Figure 4: Line Graph for Count of Incident CVD Events between Scenarios Over Time**

- *Caption: Comparison of counts of total myocardial infarctions, heart failure diagnoses, and ischemic*
- *strokes per year for each intervention scenario.*

### **Figure 5: Stacked Bar Chart for CVD DALYs Averted between Scenarios by Age Group**

- *Caption: Comparison of CVD DALYs averted in each age group and for each intervention scenario: fixed-*
- *dose combination (FDC) antihypertensive, pharmacy intervention to increase medication adherence, and*
- *community-based National Diabetes Prevention Program (NDPP).*





Percent of CVD DALYs Averted with Pharmacy Scenario



Percent of CVD DALYs Averted with Community Scenario



# Comparing Risk Exposures Across Scenarios for 3 Illustrative States





(which was autoralient propect round is the authoral dest, who has granted medical has defined the preprint in Mandeday. medRxiv preprint doi: [https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.01.24311387;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.01.24311387) this version posted August 3, 2024. The copyright holder for this pre



