

Application of decision-analytic models to inform integrated care interventions for cardiometabolic multimorbidity: A systematic review

Elvis O. A. Wambiya¹, Duncan Gillespie¹, Robert Akparibo¹, James O. Oguta¹, Catherine Akoth¹, Peter Otieno², Peter J. Dodd¹

Author affiliations:

1. Sheffield Centre for Health and Related Research (SCHARR), School of Medicine and Population Health, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom
2. Chronic disease management (CDM) unit, African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC), Nairobi, Kenya.

Corresponding author: Elvis O. A. Wambiya

Sheffield Centre for Health and Related Research (SCHARR), School of Medicine and Population Health, University of Sheffield, Regent Court, 30 Regent Street, Sheffield, S1 4DA, United Kingdom

Email: ewambiya@gmail.com

Abstract

Introduction: Integrated care is increasingly being adopted to address the complex needs of patients with cardiometabolic multimorbidity. However, it is unclear how to cost-effectively configure health service pathways for these patients. This study aimed to review and appraise decision analytic models (DAMs) used in economic evaluations of integrated care interventions for patients with cardiometabolic multimorbidity.

Methods: We conducted a systematic search for peer-reviewed articles in eight electronic databases, published in English language until December 2023. Any study worldwide that used a decision-analytic model to conduct an economic evaluation of an integrated care model for patients with cardiometabolic multimorbidity was included. We summarised characteristics of the DAMs, integrated care models evaluated, diseases constituting multimorbidity, and critically appraised the quality of reporting of the economic evaluations using Philips (2006) checklist.

Results: Out of 16 model-based assessments of the differences between alternative integrated care pathways, most studies (n=13, 81%) were cost utility analyses, focused on care for patients with hypertension and/or diabetes concordant multimorbidity (n=11, 69%). Most studies were conducted in high-income countries (n = 11, 69%). More than half (n = 10, 63%) of the studies used simulated Markov models, while only three studies used individual sampling (microsimulation) models. Few studies were explicit about their data validation approaches against local data, quality of data incorporated in the models, and internal and external consistency.

Conclusion: Decision-analytic models investigating integrated care pathways for cardiometabolic multimorbidity should employ microsimulation to describe and incorporate repeated patient interactions with health care and multimorbidity outcomes in the economic evaluations. Consideration of uncertainty in data sources and model structure is also needed

to provide robust conclusions. The study also highlighted the need for more economic evaluations using DAMs in low- and middle-income countries to evaluate integrated care models in the context of cardiometabolic multimorbidity.

Keywords: Decision-analytic models, Integrated care, multimorbidity, cardiometabolic diseases

What is already known?

- Integrated care is an effective and recommended intervention in improving health outcomes for people with multimorbidity.
- Decision-making on the most cost-effective configuration of integrated care for cardiometabolic multimorbidity is complex because there are so many ways to integrate care to fit specific health services provision and population contexts.
- Model-based explorations of the alternative service specifications of integrated care are useful in tailoring them to the target populations in the most cost-effective way and therefore informing health care decision making.

What are the new findings?

- This systematic review synthesised evidence on the application of decision-analytic models (DAMs) used in economic evaluations of integrated care interventions in the context of cardiometabolic multimorbidity.
- Most of the DAMs evaluating integrated care are Markov models, performed from a health system perspective, and considering hypertension or diabetes as the main disease conditions.
- There is limited evidence in the application of DAMs evaluating integrated care models for cardiometabolic multimorbidity from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

What do the new findings imply?

- The complexity of integrated care in the context of multiple diseases indicates the need for more studies using individual patient simulation models that can better describe repeated interactions with health care for patients with multimorbidity.
- Future DAMs should be more transparent in their considerations and reporting of data incorporation, assessment of uncertainty, model validation, internal and external consistency.

- More studies using DAMs to evaluate integrated care for cardiometabolic multimorbidity are needed to inform decision making in LMICs.

Background

Chronic diseases are generally defined as conditions lasting at least a year and requiring continued medical attention or limit activities of daily living or both ¹. They are a leading cause of morbidity, mortality, and disability globally, making them an important focus for health systems ²⁻⁵. Recent evidence highlights an increasing global burden of chronic diseases which is attributable to socio-demographic and lifestyle changes, and increased life expectancy due to improved therapies ⁶⁻⁸. This increase has contributed to the growing number of people living with multiple chronic conditions making multimorbidity, the simultaneous existence of two or more chronic diseases in an individual, a pertinent public health topic ⁹⁻¹¹. Multimorbidity is associated with increased disability, morbidity and mortality, reduced quality of life, and polypharmacy leading to adverse drug reactions ¹²⁻¹⁶. In addition, it results in higher health care costs to the patients affected and the health system ¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Given the complex array of different types of multimorbidity, the contexts of the individuals' lives and the services that are involved in treating it, understanding how to cost-effectively improve services that treat multimorbid patients is a major challenge for health systems.

Multimorbidity carries a significant burden globally and the distribution and patterns vary across populations, geographical areas, and health care settings ²⁰⁻²². A recent meta-analysis of 68 community-based studies among people aged 45 years and above estimated that at least a third of these populations have two or more chronic diseases with the prevalence being higher in high income- (HICs) than low-and middle-income countries (LMICs) ²³. Cardiometabolic multimorbidity is considered one of the most common types of multimorbidity ²⁴⁻²⁶. In LMICs however, there is a rising burden of multimorbidity linked to the changing disease landscape characterised by a rise in chronic non-communicable disease burden in the context of persistent chronic communicable diseases ^{24,27,28}. This inevitably puts

pressure on the health systems of these countries which have been primarily designed to address acute episodic care leading to fragmentation of health services, yet patients with multimorbidity have higher utilisation and complex needs for the comorbidities and their complications^{18,29–33}. Due to the complex nature of multimorbidity, a more comprehensive approach to service delivery that transcends beyond a single-disease focus and is person-centred is needed. However, this would likely require large scale system change to services that would in turn require careful consideration of the relative cost-effectiveness of the alternative options.

Integrated care has been widely adopted to reduce fragmentation and promote comprehensive delivery and promote efficiency of health services³⁴. Traditionally more prominent in HICs, integrated care is increasingly gaining prominence in LMICs to address unique health challenges faced by people with multiple chronic diseases^{35–37}. Different integrated care models have been developed for health care delivery in diverse service contexts to meet the needs of patients with multimorbidity^{38–40}. Existing evidence, mainly from trial settings, demonstrates the effectiveness of integrated care in improving access to and utilisation of care, quality of care, service delivery, clinical outcomes, and cost-saving for people with multimorbidity^{41–45}. The diversity of integrated care models and limited evidence from real-world studies presents a challenge for economic evaluations aimed at decision-making on integrated care and indicates the need for model-based appraisals of alternative options for integrated care tailored to specific service and population contexts.

Decision analytic models (DAMs) provide a systematic approach to evaluate the impact of health interventions on costs and outcomes under alternate scenarios⁴⁶. They use mathematical relationships to define a series of possible consequences that would occur from a set of alternatives being evaluated, and can be implemented through different model-based approaches^{47–49}. DAMs are particularly suited to addressing the decision-making challenges

in integrated care as they enable the flexible specification of the population, disease mechanisms and diverse intervention components, allowing the computation of cost-effectiveness metrics that allow comparisons of different specifications of integrated care in the context of multimorbidity. Although some studies have been published using DAMs to model the impact of integrated care for people with multiple diseases in diverse settings⁵⁰⁻⁵², there has been no attempt at synthesising the modelling approaches taken in a systematic review to understand and appreciate the breadth and quality of evidence. Therefore, the present systematic review aimed to answer the question, how have DAMs been applied to evaluate the health economic impact of integrated care models for patients with cardiometabolic multimorbidity? The aim was to assess the suitability of the DAMs found for assessing the cost-effectiveness of integrated care in the context of cardiometabolic multimorbidity. Based on the review results, we provide recommendations for best practice in decision-analytic modelling for decision making regarding integrated care models for people with cardiometabolic multimorbidity.

Methods

The systematic review followed methods specified in a registered protocol on PROSPERO (CRD42023407278)⁵³. The findings of this systematic review are reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines^{54,55}.

Search strategy and literature search

A systematic literature search was conducted in eight electronic peer-reviewed databases including Medline, Web of Science, EMBASE, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), APA Psychinfo, Econlit, Scopus, and the Cochrane register of controlled trials between 20/11/2023 and 15/12/2023, in English language, without limits in

the time frame. The search strategy captured four key concepts: 1) model-based health economic evaluations 2) integrated care 3) chronic diseases and 4) cardiometabolic diseases. The search strategy was initially piloted in Medline, Embase and Web of Science, and was refined with the help of an information specialist and adapted for each specific database. Full search terms are available in online supplemental appendix section S1.

Inclusion criteria

Eligible studies included economic evaluations reporting cost-effectiveness or cost-utility (where the outcomes are measured in quality-adjusted life years) outcomes^{56,57}. Descriptive studies, opinion pieces, conference or dissertation abstracts and protocols were excluded. We defined cardiometabolic multimorbidity as the existence of two or more chronic diseases in the same individual, at least one of which was a cardiometabolic disease. Concordant multimorbidity is defined as the co-existence of two or more chronic diseases all of which are cardiometabolic diseases, while discordant cardiometabolic multimorbidity is existence of two or more chronic diseases at least one of which is a cardiometabolic^{58,59}. Integrated care was defined as health service delivery containing two or more components of the chronic care model (CCM), and at least one element of Singer et al.'s, (2011)⁶⁰ framework for measuring integrated patient care for patients with multiple or complex chronic conditions. Studies not published in the English language, and review papers were excluded. We checked through the reference list of review papers to identify potentially relevant studies that met our inclusion criteria. Definition of terms used for this review are outlined in online supplemental appendix table S1. The inclusion and exclusion criteria summarised using the population, intervention, comparator, outcome (PICO) framework are presented in online supplemental appendix table S2.

Study selection

The studies identified by the searches were independently screened by three reviewers. Using a predefined selection checklist, the reviewers first screened the titles and abstracts and those that met the eligibility criteria proceeded to full text screening. Reviewers were blinded to each other's decisions throughout the screening process and any conflicts identified from the screening were resolved through discussion with a fourth reviewer (either RA, DG, or PD). Endnote software was used for the removal of duplicates while Covidence software aided the screening. A detailed explanation of the process is provided in online supplemental appendix section S2.

Data extraction

Data was extracted electronically by two reviewers using a pre-specified Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The data extraction tool was piloted to ensure that it captured all the required information based on the review objectives. The data that was extracted from the selected studies pertained to study characteristics (study title, authors, year of publication, study setting, study aim, target population), details regarding the decision-analytic model (model type/ approach, integrated care model/intervention evaluated, comparators, model assumptions, model inputs and their sources, multimorbidity conditions modelled, disease parameters included, model limitations), results and conclusions of the study. The findings are reported on a summary table and further described narratively.

Quality assessment

We used the Philips et al., (2006) checklist to evaluate the quality of the included studies in three domains: structure, data inputs, and consistency⁶¹. The assessment was completed by one reviewer (EW) and validated by at least one of the co-authors (JO, DG, RA, or PD). For each item on the checklist, a value of “yes,” “No”, “unclear” or “not applicable” was attributed, which corresponded to numeric values of 1, 0, and 0.5 respectively. We then calculated a mean quality score for each study and for each item across the studies.

Data synthesis

We undertook a narrative synthesis of the data to summarise and appraise the identified model-based economic evaluations of integrated care for cardiometabolic multimorbidity. We first summarised the population and integrated interventions modelled by the geographical distribution, integrated care model types, and disease conditions modelled. Secondly, we described the decision-analytic approaches used including the type of DAMs, model perspectives, model horizon, and model adaptations which are important aspects in the modelling of integrated care. Finally, appraised the quality of the DAMs used for the economic evaluation of integrated care using the Philips (2006) checklist ⁶¹. This process enabled the critical synthesis of the considerations in the use of DAMs in economic evaluations of integrated care for cardiometabolic multimorbidity. We have presented results of the economic evaluations which may be useful for readers in online supplemental appendix section S3 and online supplemental appendix table S4.

Results

The results of the study selection are presented in the PRISMA flow chart (Figure 1). We ultimately included 16 articles.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

Figure 1: PRISMA flow chart of identification, screening, and final inclusion of articles

Populations and interventions

Settings and target populations

Eleven studies were conducted in high income countries, three in lower middle-income countries (Bhutan ⁶², Jordan ⁶³, and Kenya ⁶⁴), and one in a low-income country (Uganda ⁵⁰): see Figure 2. Modelled populations ranged between 15 and 75 years of age. In nine of the included articles, the starting population were either previously diagnosed or having

hypertension^{65–67}, type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2D)^{51,52,63,68}, HIV⁵⁰, multiple disease risk factors⁶², or a combination of these⁵². Seven studies had a baseline population without disease^{64,69–74}.

[Insert Figure 2 here]

Figure 2: Geographical distribution and disease distribution in selected studies, Figure 2(A): Geographical distribution of included studies; USA, United States of America, UK, United Kingdom, *Countries contained in one multicountry study; Figure 2(B): Top 10 most frequent diseases in selected studies, Figure 2(C): Combination of disease conditions in selected studies. Dots represent number of studies with disease combinations included.

Disease conditions modelled

The review focused on both concordant and discordant cardiometabolic multimorbidity. Eight of the 16 included studies had diabetes as the primary disease^{51,52,62,63,68,70,71,73}. Hypertension was the primary disease in four of the studies^{62,65,67}. Two studies in SSA had HIV as the primary disease^{50,64}. Other primary conditions included atrial fibrillation⁶⁹ and cancer⁷⁴ (Table 1). The most common pair of conditions considered was hypertension or diabetes and their related complications including stroke, myocardial infarction (MI), coronary heart disease (CHD), chronic kidney disease (CKD) (Figure 2).

Table 1: Characteristics of the included studies

Author (year)	Country	Evaluation type	Health system context	Integrated care intervention	Comparator	Main disease modelled	Other co/ multimorbidities modelled
Afzali et al. (2012) 75	Australia	CUA	Primary health care	High level Practice nurse involvement in clinic-based activities	Low level Practice nurse involvement in clinic-based activities	Diabetes	-MI -CHD (ISD) -Heart failure -Stroke -Renal failure -Blindness -Amputation
Dukpa et al. (2014) 62	Bhutan	CEA	Primary health care	WHO PEN which uses an integrated approach to assess and manage cardiovascular risk using hypertension and diabetes as entry points	No screening	Hypertension and/or diabetes	-Stroke -CHD -Retinopathy -Neuropathy -Nephropathy
Hirsch et	USA	CEA	Primary	A collaborative endocrinologist-	Usual primary care physician	Diabetes	-Hypertension

al. (2017) 52			health care	pharmacist Diabetes Intense Medical Management (DIMM) “Tune-Up” clinic for complex diabetes patients	(PCP) care		-Hyperlipidemia -MI -CHF -CHD (Coronary artery disease) -CKD -COPD
Hobbs et al. (2005) 69	United Kingdom	CEA	Primary health care	Different screening strategies (targeted, whole-population screening and opportunistic screening with prompts)	No screening	Atrial fibrillation	-Ischaemic -stroke -Haemorrhagic stroke -GI -complications
Howard et al. (2010) ⁷²	Australia	CUA	Primary health care	Primary care based screening for CKD risk factors and improved management	Routine glucose and blood pressure control	CKD	-Hypertension -Diabetes -Proteinuria
Kasaie et al. (2020) 64	Kenya	CEA	Primary health care	A joint community outreach campaign for screening and treatment of HIV, hypertension,	Standard care	HIV	-Diabetes -Hypertension -Cardiac arrest

				and diabetes			-MI -Angina -Stroke
Kim et al. (2021) ⁶⁶	Republic of Korea	CUA	Primary health care	A chronic disease management program (CDMP) in patients with hypertension	Usual care	Hypertension	-MI -Stroke -CKD -Heart failure
Mason et al. (2005) ⁷⁰	United Kingdom	CUA	Primary health care and hospital	Specialist nurse-led clinics provided to improve lipid and blood pressure control in diabetic patients	Usual care	Diabetes	-Hypertension (Part of intervention) -Hyperlipidemia (Part of intervention) -Stroke -MI
Mousa et al. (2021) ⁶³	Jordan	CEA	Primary health care and hospital	Pharmacist-led care	Usual care	Diabetes	Cardiovascular disease events including: -Stroke -CHD

Penaloza-Ramos et al. (2016) ⁶⁵	United Kingdom	CUA	Primary health care	Self-monitoring and self-management of blood pressure in hypertensive patients	Usual care	Hypertension	-CHD -Diabetes mellitus -Stroke -CKD
Sando et al. (2020) ⁵⁰	Uganda	CEA	Primary health care	Integration of screening and treatment for hypertension, diabetes, and hypercholesterolemia into HIV care	Standard HIV care without NCD screening	HIV	-Hypertension -Diabetes -Hypercholesterolemia
Schaufler et al. (2010) ⁷¹	Germany	CUA	Primary health care	Screening strategy for type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2D) including early detection and secondary prevention	Routine clinical practice	Diabetes	-MI -Stroke -Renal disease -Neuropathy
Schouten et al. (2010) ⁶⁸	Netherlands	CUA	Primary health care	A quality improvement collaborative (QIC) focusing on patients with diabetes	Usual care	Diabetes	-MI -Stroke -Renal disease -Neuropathy

Schuetz et al. (2013) ⁷³	Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Poland, and the United Kingdom	CUA	Primary health care	A vascular disease Health Checks program which integrates the prevention, early detection, and treatment of type 2 diabetes, hypertension, dyslipidemia, and smoking.	Usual care	Diabetes	-Coronary artery disease -CHF -Stroke -Hypertension -Obesity -Metabolic syndrome -Cancers (breast, lung, colon)
Schultz et al. (2021) ⁶⁷	USA	CUA	Primary health care	A pharmacist-led medication therapy management (MTM) clinic	Usual care	Hypertension	- MI -Stroke -Other CVD events (peripheral artery disease, angina, and transient ischemic attack) -Chronic CVD Tunnel states: -stroke recovery -MI recovery

							-Other recovery
Wang et al. (2006) 74	Taiwan	CEA	Primary care and hospital	A community-based Integrated Screening (KCIS) programme for chronic diseases	No screening	Cancers: colorectal, breast, cervical and oral cancer	-Type 2 diabetes -Hypertension

CEA, cost effectiveness analysis; CUA, cost utility analysis; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; MI, myocardial infarction; GI, gastrointestinal; CHD, coronary heart disease; CHF, congestive heart failure; IHD, Ischaemic heart disease; PEN, Package of essential NCD interventions

Interventions modelled

The integrated care models or interventions evaluated varied from health care provider-led interventions (e.g., pharmacist-led), integrated screening and treatment, comprehensive disease management programs, and a quality improvement intervention. The details and characterisation of the integrated care interventions are presented in Table 1 and online supplemental appendix table S3, respectively. There was a high level of diversity in the interventions modelled under the definition of integrated care in the selected studies. Two studies conducted in Jordan⁶³ and USA⁶⁷ evaluated pharmacist-led care and medication therapy management (MTM) for diabetes and hypertension respectively. Hirsch et al.,⁵² evaluated collaborative endocrinologist-pharmacist intense medication management for diabetes in the USA. One study in Australia⁵¹ evaluated high level patient nurse involvement, while another study in the UK⁷⁰ focused on specialist nurse-led clinics for diabetes. Integrated screening and treatment constituted most of the included studies. The study conducted in Bhutan⁶² and a multicountry study in six European countries⁷³ evaluated integrated screening and treatment and management for diabetes, hypertension among other related risk factors. A study in Uganda⁵⁰ evaluated integrated screening and treatment of NCDs into HIV care. Early detection and secondary prevention of diabetes was evaluated in one study in Germany⁷¹ while a study in Australia⁷² evaluated primary care-based screening for chronic kidney disease risk factors and improved management. Community-based integrated screening was evaluated in two studies in Kenya⁶⁴ and Taiwan⁷⁴. One UK study examined whole population screening and opportunistic screening compared to usual care⁶⁹. Self-monitoring and management of blood pressure in hypertensive patients was evaluated in one UK study⁶⁵ while another study conducted in the Netherlands⁶⁸ evaluated a quality improvement collaborative for patients with T2D.

Analytic approaches used

Economic approach

Cost utility analysis (CUA) was used by 13 studies^{50,52,62,64–68,70–73,75}, while three studies^{63,69,74} were cost-effectiveness analysis studies whose outcomes were not based on utilities (Table 1).

Discount rates

Discount rates used in the selected studies varied among countries due to the conventions used in different countries. The discount rates for costs ranged between 3% and 5% while the discount rates for outcomes ranged between 1.5% and 5% (Table 2).

Table 2: Characteristics of the decision analytic models developed in the economic evaluations

Author (year)	Model type	Time horizon	Perspective	Discount rate	Costs and resource use parameters included	Disease parameters included	Analysis of sensitivity and uncertainty	Existing model adapted
Afzali et al. (2012)	SMM	40 years	Health care system	5%	Patient-level data on hospital and primary care services from 70,340 patients with a mean duration of 4.5 years of follow-up.	History of diabetes History of comorbidities (e.g., peripheral vascular disease [PVD]) History of diabetes-related complications. Time-varying risk factors (HbA1c, BP, TC, HDL, smoking status)	PSA (non-parametric bootstrapping) First-order uncertainty (i.e., variability) minimised by performing 1,000 repeated Simulations per patient in the model.	No
Dukpa et al. (2014)	Decision tree and a SMM	Lifetime	Societal	3%	Screening BP monitoring Treatment and follow up of diabetes Treatment and follow up of hypertension	Prevalence, proportions of hypertension in diabetes patients Transitional probabilities - developing complications or death Sensitivity, and specificity of	PSA for parametric uncertainty First-order uncertainty (i.e., variability) was minimised by performing 1,000 repeated Simulations per patient in the model.	No

						screening tools		
Hirsch et al. (2017)	Individual sampling model	2 years, 5 years, and 10 years	Health care system and payer	3%	Intervention costs: Clinical pharmacists (including follow-up phone contact, nonpatient administrative cost, and patient no-show time, and recognizing non-scheduled weeks for the DIMM clinic) Inpatient, outpatient, ambulatory, treatment, and other costs.	Incidence, risk reduction of diabetes and related complications BMI, weight, blood pressure, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, total cholesterol, triglycerides, fasting plasma glucose, A1c, and glomerular filtration rate.	1-way and 2-way, and PSA were conducted using upper and lower limits of 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for clinical outcome parameters Probabilistic analyses simulated 1,000 replications	Archimedes model
Hobbs et al. (2005)	DES	Lifetime	Health system and patient perspective	3.5%	Screening costs Costs of stroke Costs of GI bleed Cost of Warfarin treatment	Prevalence & incidence of AF, first ischaemic stroke, GI bleed Rate, risks and probabilities of AF, stroke Relative risk, and risk reduction with medication.	PSA was undertaken using distributions for variables where variation around the point estimates used in the model was available. For each patient group and screening type, plus no screening	No

							A total of 10,000 replications was performed, with summary data for each replication representing 10,000 patients.	
Howard et al. (2010)	SMM	Lifetime	Health care funder perspective	5%	Drug costs Out-patient health care utilisation including consultation costs for different providers e.g., GP, dietician, podiatrist, nephrologist, diagnostic tests	Relative risks of CVD death CVD events Progression to microalbuminuria Progression to end-stage kidney disease (ESKD) for hypertension and diabetes patients	PSA was conducted	No
Kasaie et al. (2020)	Individual sampling model	15 years	National and regional	3%	Costs of standard care Costs of screening for hypertension and diabetes Costs of acute care for cardiac arrest, MI, angina, stroke, post-CHD, post-stroke Costs of HIV, hypertension,	CVD natural history CVD Risk - 10-year risk categories Probability of first CHD event (cardiac arrest, MI, Angina) Acute and annual Mortality following CVD event	One-way sensitivity analysis was performed by varying the value of selected parameters to +/-15% of the original values	No

					and diabetes treatment	NCD treatment effectiveness HIV, Hypertension, and diabetes prevalence ART coverage HIV incidence		
Kim et al. (2021)	SMM	Up to 60 years	Health care payer	5%	Direct medical costs for hypertension, MI, stroke, CKD, heart failure Additional costs including pay-for-performance incentives to patients Costs for health support services	Incidence rates Mortality rates Effects of CDMP - Hazard ratios	Sensitivity analysis conducted based on probability, utility, and cost (Probabilities varied based on their 95% confidence intervals (CIs), utilities in between a $\pm 20\%$ range, and costs up to 92.0 USD (100 000 KRW)). A sensitivity analysis at a range of around 20% excluding the cost of the policy was conducted.	No
Mason et al. (2005)	SMM	Lifetime	Health care system	5%	Costs of drugs, acute and chronic treatment after stroke and MI	Risk of suffering a stroke or MI based on age, sex, and cardiovascular risk factors	Uncertainty surrounding estimates explored using CEACs, generated from Monte Carlo analyses making	No

						<p>Risk of death for patients who have had a stroke or MI, adjusted by age and sex</p> <p>Mortality adjusted for diabetes</p> <p>Mortality from non-cardiovascular causes</p> <p>Risk ratios for blood pressure and lipid lowering</p>	<p>10,000 evaluations of each model.</p> <p>Parameters were sampled randomly from distributions for costs of acute and chronic stroke and MI, and risk ratios for BP and lipid lowering.</p>	
Mousa et al. (2021)	SMM	10- years	Public health provider	4.75%	<p>Medical procedure costs for CVD events</p> <p>Outpatient and inpatient costs</p> <p>Medication for outpatient visit</p> <p>Utilisation of medication</p>	<p>Changes in BP, HA1c, total cholesterol, HDL-cholesterol</p> <p>Risk of T2D patients experiencing CVD events over 10 years</p>	<p>PSA was conducted for the base-case analysis to allow all variables to vary simultaneously by assigning a probability distribution for CVD risk, LYG, and cost, where gamma distribution was assigned for cost data, beta distribution for 1- to 10-year CVD risk, and Lognormal distribution for the relative risk of stroke recurrence following primary</p>	No

							CHD and stroke. Monto-Carlo simulation with 10,000 iterations was performed to construct a CEAC.	
Penaloz a-Ramos et al. (2016)	SMM	Horizon varied from 30 years (lifetime) to between 1 - 20	UK NHS and Personal social services	3.5%	Costs for ongoing BP monitoring in primary care, self-management, and prescription of antihypertensive agents Intervention: Self-management, equipment, and training costs. Replacement costs for the equipment and training were included at five yearly intervals Costs for acute and chronic cardiovascular events	Blood pressure control Stroke risk Cardiovascular risk Mortality.	Data were entered into the model as distributions in order that a PSA could be undertaken to incorporate parameter uncertainty Gamma distributions were fitted to all costs obtained from the TASMIN-SR trial and beta distributions were applied to the utility values. The PSA was run with 10,000 second-order Monte Carlo simulations and cost-effectiveness planes and cost-effectiveness acceptability curves constructed to estimate the probability of self-	No

							management being cost-effective at different willingness-to-pay thresholds.	
Sando et al. (2020)	Epidemiologic-cost model	10 years	Health care system	3%	Costs of medical consultation, lab, and medicines for hypertension, T2DM, and high cholesterol patients) Cost of hospitalisation for fatal or non-fatal CVD event and treatment costs	NCD risk factors Prevalence of HIV among 15–49-year-olds Proportion of HIV-infected enrolled in ART programs Prevalence of hypertension, DM, hypercholesterolemia Proportion on medication for hypertension, DM, and high cholesterol Treatment efficacy for NCD risk factors (RR of stroke and coronary events for hypertensive, diabetic, and high cholesterol patients)	Univariate sensitivity analyses, where varied one input parameter at a time independently while maintaining values for the other input parameters unchanged.	No

Schaufli et al. (2010)	SPL MM	Lifetime	German statutory health insurance	Costs discounted at 5% QALYs not discounted	Costs for interventions: Screening test verification of diagnosis costs Prevention using drugs and lifestyle interventions Costs for complications	Age-dependent prevalence of pre-diabetes and T2D Incidence of pre-diabetes and T2D Incidence rates for complications Mortality rates Risk reductions due to prevention	Varying the following parameters within reasonable limits: Costs of early detection and prevention. Discounting rates for costs and utilities, Participation rates in the target population (5%, 15%, 45%, 30%), effectiveness of early detection and prevention.	No
Schouten et al. (2010)	SMM	Lifetime	Health care system	Costs: 4.50% Effect sizes: 1.50%	Intervention costs (program-management costs of the Dutch Institute of Health care Improvement Costs of the participating health care providers (time and related costs) spent on the project, local overhead for each site, per patient	Life expectancy (Patient ageing) HRQoL % of nonsmokers % of patients with HbA1c <7 and <8.5% Hazard ratios for excess cardiovascular morbidity and mortality associated with diabetes	One-way sensitivity analyses were conducted to test the robustness of the model results. PSA was performed to estimate the uncertainty surrounding the ICER.	No

					annually). Health care costs	Age-related risk of diabetes-specific complications		
Schuetz et al. (2013)	Individual sampling model	30 years (Lifetime)	Health care system	3%	Costs associated with the health check, subsequent testing and treatment, and cardiovascular events.	Incidence and prevalence of diagnoses of T2D, major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE, first occurrence of myocardial infarction, stroke, or cardiovascular death), and a composite of serious microvascular complications (first occurrence of diabetes related blindness, CKD, end stage renal disease, renal death, foot ulcer or foot amputation) Medication use (e.g., anti-hypertensive, statin, and anti-diabetic treatments) Disease burden in the country	Not clearly reported	Archimedes model

						(including type 2 diabetes, nephropathy, retinopathy, neuropathy, myocardial infarction, stroke, cardiovascular death, and mortality).		
Schultz et al. (2021)	CTM C Model	10 years	Payer perspective	3%	Costs of patient visits to MTM clinic Costs for primary prevention Costs of CVD events (states in the model including Stroke-tunnel, MI-tunnel, and other-tunnel states)	Mean changes in A1c, blood pressure, emergency department and hospital admissions 10-year CVD risk Transition probabilities (Same CVD event, primary prevention to CVD event, recovery state of one CVD event to another CVD event) Mortality risk	One-way and PSA were performed. Risk ratios were varied by 10% above and below the base-case values, utilities by 20%, and costs by 50% to 200%. A 10 000-iteration Monte Carlo simulation was used to perform the PSA. CEACs were generated to display the Monte Carlo simulation results.	No
Wang et al. (2006)	SMM	20 years or 99	Health care system	5%	Screening costs Manpower cost Confirmation costs	Disease progression Transition probabilities Natural history for each disease	Not reported	No

		years (Lifetime)			Average costs for terminal care	risk factor prevalence Survival Complication rates e.g., perforation in colonoscopy Association between non-malignant chronic diseases and cancers Screening performance parameters: Sensitivity and specificity		
--	--	---------------------	--	--	---------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

CTMC, Continuous time Markov chain; DES Discrete event simulation; PSA Probabilistic sensitivity analysis; SMM, Simulated Markov Model; SPLMM, Simulated patient-level Markov model

Model type

Of the 16 selected economic evaluations, nine used simulated Markov models to evaluate the impact of the integrated care interventions^{51,63,65,66,68,70,71,74}. Of these studies, eight studies^{51,62,63,66,67,70–72} had an annual cycle length while one study in the UK⁶⁵ used a 6-month cycle length. Three studies used individual sampling models (microsimulation models) which incorporated the patients' unique medical histories and characteristics and complexities of the health system and multimorbidity in the modelling^{52,64,73}. The study conducted in Uganda used an epidemiologic-cost model to estimate costs and effects of integrated screening and treatment⁵⁰. One study conducted in the USA used a discrete event simulation (DES) for their evaluation from the health system and payer perspective⁶⁹. One study conducted in the USA used a semi-Markov model in the evaluation to incorporate time-varying mortality⁶⁷.

Model perspective

Seven of the included studies performed the economic evaluations from a health care system perspective^{50,51,63,64,68,70,73,74} while only three studies included a societal or patient perspective in their evaluations^{62,65,69}. Three studies performed their evaluations from both health system and payer perspectives^{52,65,69}. One study used a health care funder perspective⁷² and another study in Germany was performed from the perspective of the German statutory health insurance⁷¹.

Model horizon

The time horizons in the included studies ranged between two years and a lifetime horizon. Ten of the selected studies used a lifetime horizon^{62,65,66,68–74}. Four studies conducted in the USA, Uganda, and Bhutan used a 10-year horizon^{50,52,63,67}, while one study in Kenya used a 15-year horizon⁶⁴. In addition to a lifetime horizon, three studies in Taiwan, UK, and USA simulated between one and 20 years horizon^{52,65,74}.

Model adaptations

Eight of the selected studies either adapted existing models or used them to generate inputs. One study conducted in Australia⁵¹ used the UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) outcomes model to estimate costs and effects of the alternative models of care⁷⁶. Studies conducted in Bhutan (Mousa) and the Netherlands⁶⁸ used the UKPDS risk engine to calculate CVD risk estimates for their models^{77,78}. A study conducted in the USA⁵² and another in six European countries and the UK⁷³, used the Archimedes model to estimate costs and QALYs. The Archimedes model is validated and has been widely used to model diabetes^{79,80}. The study in Uganda⁵⁰ used the Globorisk model to obtain estimates of CVD risk, while one study in the USA⁶⁷ used Framingham risk equations⁸¹. The study conducted in Kenya used an existing population-based model of HIV dynamics (SPECTRUM) combined with a microsimulation⁶⁴.

Quality assessment

The mean quality score in the included studies was 81% [57% - 93%] (Table 3). The selected studies showed good quality of reporting on the model structure domain (89%). The studies showed adequate reporting and justification of the decision problem and objective, perspective and scope of the model, rationale for the structure, assumptions, model type, horizon, cycle length and disease pathways. However, only four studies provided a clear statement on whether all feasible and practical options were evaluated^{50,62,71,74} while it was not clear in 11 studies. Despite almost 90% of studies stating the model perspective, the primary decision-maker for the analysis was not clear in almost half of the selected studies. Majority of studies adequately reported costs, utilities and their sources, data identification, and methods of incorporating data (76%). Notably, patient indirect costs and productivity losses were not reported for most studies, including those that used a societal perspective. Furthermore, only one study evaluating a quality improvement collaborative reported

program implementation costs such as project management and local overhead costs for participating facilities⁶⁸. However, deficiencies were noted in the assessment of uncertainty where only two studies reported having used all the four principal types of uncertainty with majority not justifying omission^{65,69}. Only five out of the 16 selected studies performed subgroup analysis by disaggregating the final cost-effectiveness results by gender or age group^{50,64,65,69,71}. More than 80% of the studies adequately reported and addressed structural and parameter uncertainty while less than half assessed methodological uncertainty or heterogeneity by running the models separately for different subgroups. For the consistency domain, higher scores were achieved for external consistency as compared to internal consistency. Only five studies justified the internal validity of their model^{51,52,68,69,73}.

Table 3: Quality assessment of included studies

Dimension of quality			Afzali (2012)	Dukpa (2014)	Hirsch (2017)	Hobbs (2005)	Howard (2010)	Kasate (2020)	Kim (2021)	Mason (2005)	Mousa (2021)	Ramos (2016)	Sando (2020)	Schaufler (2010)	Schouten (2010)	Schuetz (2013)	Schultz (2016)	Wang (2006)	
Structure		Item #																	
S1	Statement of decision problem/ objective	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
		3	U	Y	U	U	U	U	Y	X	U	Y	U	Y	U	X	U	U	X
S2	Statement of scope/ perspective	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	X
		2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	U
		3	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U
		4	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U
S3	Rationale for structure	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U
		2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
		3	U	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	U
S4	Structural assumptions	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
		2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
S5	Strategies/ comparators	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
		2	U	Y	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	Y	Y	U	U	X	X	Y
		3	U	n/a	Y	U	n/a	n/a	U	U	U	U	n/a	U	X	U	U	X	n/a
S6	Model type	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	X	Y	Y	Y	
S7	Time horizon	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
S8	Disease states/ pathways	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	U	

S9	Cycle length	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	X	n/a	Y	X	
Data																				
D1	Data identification	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
		3	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
		4	U	U	U	Y	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	Y	U	X
		5	n/a	U	U	Y	n/a	U	U	U	Y	U	Y	U	U	U	Y	U	U	U
D2	Data modelling	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	
D2a	Baseline data	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		2	Y	Y	Y	U	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	U	U	
		3	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	Y	U	U	U	U	n/a	X	U	U	
		4	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	n/a	U	U	U	U	n/a	X	U	U	
D2b	Treatment effects	1	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y	n/a	
		2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	X	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	
		3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	
		4	Y	n/a	Y	U	U	Y	U	X	X	Y	X	U	X	X	X	X	U	
		5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	
D2c	Costs	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	
		3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
D2d	Quality of life weights (utilities)	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		2	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	
		3	Y	Y	Y	U	X	U	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	
D3	Data incorporation	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		2	Y	Y	U	U	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	X	U	U	Y		
		3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U		
		4	U	Y	X	Y	Y	U	U	Y	Y	Y	X	X	U	X	U	U		
		5	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	U	X	Y	Y	Y	X	U	U	U	X	U		

D4	Assessment of uncertainty	1	X	X	X	Y	X	X	X	U	X	Y	X	X	X	X	X	X
		2	X	X	X	n/a	X	X	X	U	U	n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X
D4a	Methodological	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	Y	U	X	X	X	X	X
D4b	Structural	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X
D4c	Heterogeneity	1	X	X	X	Y	X	Y	X	X	X	Y	Y	Y	X	X	X	X
D4d	Parameter	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	U
		2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	X	Y	Y
Consistency																		
C1	Internal consistency	1	Y	U	Y	Y	U	U	X	U	U	U	U	U	Y	Y	U	X
C2	External consistency	1	Y	n/a	Y	Y	n/a	Y	n/a	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	n/a	Y
		2	n/a	n/a	n/a	U	U	Y	n/a	Y	U	U	U	U	U	Y	U	Y
		3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	X

Notes: Y - Yes, X - No, n/a - Not applicable, U - Unclear

Discussion

A total of 16 studies were included in this systematic review, majority of which were conducted in high-income countries than LMICs. There was significant heterogeneity in the types of integrated care models evaluated as well as the chronic disease focus in the included studies. However, most of the studies used simulated Markov models and focused on hypertension or diabetes as the primary disease condition. While the health outcome metrics reported were consistent, there was poor reporting of data validation approaches against local data, the quality of data incorporated in the models, and internal and external consistency. Furthermore, individual patient simulations were better able to capture complexities of integrated care interventions and multimorbidity.

The majority of the integrated care models in the included studies were integrated screening and treatment interventions at health facility and community level. This is consistent with existing literature on integrated care for multiple chronic diseases focused on integrating screening and treatment⁸²⁻⁸⁵. The primary disease conditions in the evaluations were diabetes or hypertension which supports literature from existing studies on integrated care⁸⁶⁻⁸⁹. The only two studies from this review focused on infectious disease and NCD integration were conducted in SSA countries. This corroborates studies on integrated care in SSA which have focused on HIV and NCD integration in the region⁸⁹⁻⁹². A plausible reason for this integration is the heightened risk of NCDs among PLHIV who have higher life expectancy due to improved therapies and management structures. However, the findings indicate the need to evaluate models of integration for concordant cardiometabolic multimorbidity occasioned by the rising burden of these conditions²⁴.

The majority of the studies performed the model-based economic evaluations from a health system perspective^{50,51,63,64,68,70,73,74}, while only three studies included a societal or patient perspective in their evaluation^{62,65,69}. Of note is that the studies that included a patient

perspective did not report including the indirect costs such as informal care and productivity losses in addition to the direct patient costs as recommended by existing health economic guidelines⁹³. Most of the selected studies did not provide implementation costs of the integrated care models. In fact, only one study that evaluated a quality improvement collaborative included the program implementation costs, such as program management costs and local overhead costs for each participating facility, as part of their inputs for the economic model⁶⁸. Guidelines for economic evaluations recommend a lifetime horizon for interventions that impact costs and outcomes over a patient's lifetime, with shorter horizons being appropriately justified⁹³. However, a third of the selected studies did not include a lifetime horizon and studies that used 10-year^{50,52,63,67} and 15-year⁶⁴ horizons did not provide clear justifications. Due to the long-term effects of multiple chronic conditions hence the need to seek continuous care, a lifetime horizon is appropriate in economic evaluations of integrated care.

Majority of the DAMs in the selected studies were Markov models. The evaluation of a chronic disease programme in Korea used a Markov model that assumed identical progression probabilities after development of complications in the two groups, which may underestimate or overestimate the outcomes⁶⁶. Similarly, a Markov model to evaluate the WHO PEN model for hypertension and diabetes in Bhutan assumed similar treatment outcomes for comorbidity and diabetes alone⁶², yet there may be considerable variation in the disease outcomes for a single disease compared to a patient with comorbidity. Markov models are considered limited in assessing complex health care interventions due to their limitations in capturing individual dynamics^{48,94,95}. In the case of integrated care for multiple chronic diseases, the multiple disease states that would exist with multimorbidity and complex interactions within an integrated health system, such as repeated interactions with health care, may not be adequately represented. Furthermore, assumptions of constant

transition probabilities, as was observed with majority of the selected studies using Markov models, overlook potential temporal changes and relationships that may exist, and important interplays between health system elements and patient behaviours may be a potential limitation. For such interventions, more advanced methodologies such as individual sampling models, dynamic simulation, or system dynamics models are recommended to better encompass the complexities^{48,96}. For instance, one of the included studies conducted in Kenya⁶⁴ used a microsimulation model and was able to model CVD dynamics at individual level by modelling impact on patients based on their levels of CVD risk, which was not captured by the cohort level models.

Despite most of the included DAMs scoring well in their quality of reporting, there was poor reporting with regards to accounting for uncertainty and validation in the studies. Philips et al., (2006) recommend distinguishing between the four principal types of uncertainty when reporting economic evaluations i.e. methodological, structural, heterogeneity, and parameter uncertainty⁶¹. Similar to our findings, other reviews on economic evaluations show that economic evaluations have scored highly on reporting structural and parameter uncertainty through one-way, two-way, and probabilistic sensitivity analyses, and scoring poorly on reporting heterogeneity and methodological uncertainty^{97,98}. With regards to heterogeneity, only about a third of the selected articles reported performing subgroup analysis. For a health care intervention such as integrated care which impacts the general population, it is important to assess its differential impact on different groups to account for the equity considerations in case the interventions are to be scaled up, an important consideration for policy makers.

The findings of our systematic review have important implications for health care decision making for chronic disease prevention and control in LMICs where the burden of multimorbidity is increasing^{24,27}. Given the demonstrated potential benefits of integrated care for patients with chronic disease multimorbidity in other settings, the scarcity of

economic evaluations using DAMs in LMICs signals a substantial data gap that limits evidence-based decision making for chronic disease prevention and control. Therefore, there is an urgent need for more economic evaluations using DAMs to inform integrated care models of healthcare delivery that are tailored to different contexts in LMICs for cardiometabolic multimorbidity and other common multimorbidity patterns. Considering the social and health inequalities and disparities in healthcare provision that have been evidenced in LMICs^{99,100}, health economists and analysts should consider the use of individual sampling models that will capture the complexity of different integrated care configurations and patients interactions with the health care models in the context of multiple diseases using a lifetime horizon. This ensures that recommended integrated care models are deemed cost-effective, context-specific, and sustainable.

This systematic review is the first to synthesise evidence on model-based economic evaluations conducted to evaluate integrated care for cardiometabolic multimorbidity. The key strength of our study is the broad review of the literature that was designed to capture studies with a wide heterogeneity, and synthesized the findings to provide more understanding of how integrated care can be modelled using DAMs. Our study has some limitations. Firstly, we only included original articles published in the English language, hence there is a chance that relevant studies published in other languages may have inadvertently been excluded from the review. Furthermore, non-inclusion of grey literature such as thesis, reports or guidance documents may have left out some relevant studies that meet the inclusion criteria. Despite these limitations, our systematic review contributes to the existing literature by synthesizing and appraising the current evidence base on the use of DAMs to model the economic impact of integrated care interventions for cardiometabolic multimorbidity.

Conclusion

Model-based economic evaluations (including simulated Markov models, individual sampling models, discrete event simulation, and epidemiologic cost models) have been used to evaluate integrated care interventions for cardiometabolic multimorbidity, most often considering hypertension and/ or diabetes in high-income countries. Future studies could improve in their consideration of uncertainty and validation and should consider methods such as microsimulation that can more easily describe repeated interactions with health care. More studies should consider inclusion of patient costs, which are a domain of potential benefit from integrated care. More studies using DAMs to evaluate integrated care for cardiometabolic multimorbidity are needed to inform decision making in LMICs, especially individual sampling models that capture the complexity of integrated care delivery within specific contexts for different populations with multimorbidity.

Data availability statement

Data sharing not applicable as no datasets generated and/or analysed for this study. Not applicable.

Ethics statements

Patient consent for publication

Not applicable.

Ethics approval

This study does not involve human participants.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Ms. Louise Falzon of Sheffield Centre for Health and Related Research (SCHARR), School of Medicine and Population Health, University of Sheffield for help in the development of the search strategy, and the Wellcome Trust for funding the study.

References

1. Goodman RA, Posner SF, Huang ES, Parekh AK, Koh HK. Defining and measuring chronic conditions: imperatives for research, policy, program, and practice. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2013;10:E66.
2. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable diseases fact sheet. Published 2021. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases>
3. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable diseases progress monitor 2022. Published online 2022.
4. 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. *Lancet*. 2020;396(10258):1204-1222.
5. World Health Organization. *World Health Statistics 2023: Monitoring Health for the SDGs.*; 2023.
6. Beaglehole R, Yach D. Globalisation and the prevention and control of non-communicable disease: The neglected chronic diseases of adults. *Lancet*. 2003;362(9387):903-908.
7. Popkin BM. The nutrition transition: an overview of world patterns of change. *Nutr Rev*. 2004;62(suppl_2):S140-S143.
8. Popkin BM, Adair LS, Ng SW. Global nutrition transition and the pandemic of obesity in developing countries. *Nutr Rev*. 2012;70(1):3-21.
9. Aiden H. Multimorbidity understanding the challenge. *A report for the Richmond group of charities*. Published online 2018.
10. Mercer S, Furler J, Moffat K, Fischbacher-Smith D, Sanci L. *Multimorbidity: Technical Series on Safer Primary Care*. World Health Organization; 2016.
11. Academy of Science of South Africa. Improving the prevention and management of multimorbidity in sub-Saharan Africa. Published online 2020.
12. Cheng X, Ouyang F, Ma T, et al. Association of Healthy Lifestyle and Life Expectancy in Patients With Cardiometabolic Multimorbidity: A Prospective Cohort Study of UK Biobank. *Frontiers in Cardiovascular Medicine*. 2022;9 (no pagination). doi:10.3389/fcvm.2022.830319
13. Doessing A, Bureau V. Care coordination of multimorbidity: a scoping study. *Journal of Comorbidity*. 2015;5(1):15-28.
14. Wolff JL, Starfield B, Anderson G. Prevalence, Expenditures, and Complications of Multiple Chronic Conditions in the Elderly. *Arch Intern Med*. 2002;162(20):2269.
15. Fortin M, Bravo G, Hudon C, et al. Relationship between multimorbidity and health-related quality of life of patients in primary care. *Qual Life Res*. 2006;15:83-91.

16. Barnett K, Mercer SW, Norbury M, Watt G, Wyke S, Guthrie B. Epidemiology of multimorbidity and implications for health care, research, and medical education: a cross-sectional study. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9836):37-43.
17. Brilleman SL, Purdy S, Salisbury C, Windmeijer F, Gravelle H, Hollinghurst S. Implications of comorbidity for primary care costs in the UK: a retrospective observational study. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2013;63(609):e274-e282.
18. Lee JT, Hamid F, Pati S, Atun R, Millett C. Impact of noncommunicable disease multimorbidity on healthcare utilisation and out-of-pocket expenditures in middle-income countries: cross sectional analysis. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(7):e0127199.
19. Figueroa JF, Papanicolas I, Riley K, et al. International comparison of health spending and utilization among people with complex multimorbidity. *Health Serv Res*. 2021;56(S3):1317-1334.
20. Buddeke J, Bots ML, Van Dis I, et al. Comorbidity in patients with cardiovascular disease in primary care: a cohort study with routine healthcare data. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2019;69(683):e398-e406.
21. Prazeres F, Santiago L. Prevalence of multimorbidity in the adult population attending primary care in Portugal: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(9):e009287.
22. Chowdhury SR, Das DC, Sunna TC, Beyene J, Hossain A. Global and regional prevalence of multimorbidity in the adult population in community settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eclinicalmedicine*. 2023;57.
23. Nguyen H, Manolova G, Daskalopoulou C, Vitoratou S, Prince M, Prina AM. Prevalence of multimorbidity in community settings: A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Journal of comorbidity*. 2019;9:2235042X19870934.
24. Asogwa OA, Boateng D, Marzà-Florensa A, et al. Multimorbidity of non-communicable diseases in low-income and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(1):e049133.
25. Kaluvu L, Asogwa OA, Marzà-Florensa A, et al. Multimorbidity of communicable and non-communicable diseases in low-and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *Journal of Multimorbidity and Comorbidity*. 2022;12:26335565221112590.
26. Koné Pefoyo AJ, Bronskill SE, Gruneir A, et al. The increasing burden and complexity of multimorbidity. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15(1):1-11.
27. National Research Council. *The Continuing Epidemiological Transition in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Workshop Summary*.; 2012.
28. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable diseases country profiles 2018. Published online 2018.
29. Bähler C, Huber CA, Brüngger B, Reich O. Multimorbidity, health care utilization and costs in an elderly community-dwelling population: a claims data based observational study. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2015;15:1-12.

30. Glynn LG, Valderas JM, Healy P, et al. The prevalence of multimorbidity in primary care and its effect on health care utilization and cost. *Fam Pract*. 2011;28(5):516-523.
31. Palladino R, Tayu Lee J, Ashworth M, Triassi M, Millett C. Associations between multimorbidity, healthcare utilisation and health status: evidence from 16 European countries. *Age Ageing*. 2016;45(3):431-435.
32. Pati S, Agrawal S, Swain S, et al. Non communicable disease multimorbidity and associated health care utilization and expenditures in India: cross-sectional study. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2014;14:1-9.
33. Unger J, De Paepe P, Green A. A code of best practice for disease control programmes to avoid damaging health care services in developing countries. *Int J Health Plann Manage*. 2003;18(S1):S27-S39.
34. Baxter S, Johnson M, Chambers D, Sutton A, Goyder E, Booth A. The effects of integrated care: a systematic review of UK and international evidence. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2018;18(1):1-13.
35. Mounier-Jack S, Mayhew SH, Mays N. Integrated care: learning between high-income, and low-and middle-income country health systems. *Health Policy Plan*. 2017;32(suppl_4):iv6-iv12.
36. Hort K, Gilbert K, Basnayaka P, Annear PL. Strategies to strengthen referral from primary care to secondary care in low-and middle-income countries. Published online 2019.
37. Briggs CJ, Garner P. Strategies for integrating primary health services in middle and low income countries at the point of delivery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2006;(2).
38. Hopman P, de Bruin SR, Forjaz MJ, et al. Effectiveness of comprehensive care programs for patients with multiple chronic conditions or frailty: A systematic literature review. *Health Policy*. 2016;120(7):818-832.
39. McCarthy D, Ryan J, Klein S. Models of Care for High-Need, High-Cost Patients: An Evidence Synthesis. *Issue Brief*. 2015;31:1-19.
40. Palmer K, Marengoni A, Forjaz MJ, et al. Multimorbidity care model: Recommendations from the consensus meeting of the Joint Action on Chronic Diseases and Promoting Healthy Ageing across the Life Cycle (JA-CHRODIS). *Health Policy*. 2018;122(1):4-11.
41. Mitchell GK, Burridge L, Zhang J, et al. Systematic review of integrated models of health care delivered at the primary–secondary interface: how effective is it and what determines effectiveness? *Aust J Prim Health*. 2015;21(4):391-408.
42. Valentijn PP, Pereira FA, Ruospo M, et al. Person-Centered Integrated Care for Chronic Kidney Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2018;13(3):375-386.

43. Yiu KC, Rohwer A, Young T. Integration of care for hypertension and diabetes: a scoping review assessing the evidence from systematic reviews and evaluating reporting. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2018;18:1-17.
44. Otieno P, Agyemang C, Wao H, et al. Effectiveness of integrated chronic care models for cardiometabolic multimorbidity in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13(6):e073652.
45. Taylor AH, Taylor RS, Ingram WM, et al. Adding web-based behavioural support to exercise referral schemes for inactive adults with chronic health conditions: the e-coachER RCT. *Health Technol Assess*. 2020;24(63):1.
46. Soto J. HEALTH ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS USING DECISION ANALYTIC MODELING: Principles and Practices—Utilization of a Checklist to Their Development and Appraisal. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2002;18(1):94-111.
47. Briggs A, Sculpher M, Claxton K. *Decision Modelling for Health Economic Evaluation*. OUP Oxford; 2006.
48. Brennan A, Chick SE, Davies R. A taxonomy of model structures for economic evaluation of health technologies. *Health Econ*. 2006;15(12):1295-1310.
49. Cooper K, Brailsford SC, Davies R. Choice of modelling technique for evaluating health care interventions. *J Oper Res Soc*. 2007;58(2):168-176.
50. Sando D, Kintu A, Okello S, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of integrating screening and treatment of selected non-communicable diseases into HIV/AIDS treatment in Uganda. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2020;23:e25507.
51. Haji Ali Afzali H, Gray J, Beilby J, Holton C, Karnon J. A model-based economic evaluation of improved primary care management of patients with type 2 diabetes in Australia. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*. 2013;11(6):661-670.
52. Hirsch JD, Bounthavong M, Arjmand A, et al. Estimated cost-effectiveness, cost benefit, and risk reduction associated with an endocrinologist-pharmacist diabetes intense medical management “tune-up” clinic. *Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy*. 2017;23(3):318-326.
53. Wambiya EOA, Oguta J, Akparibo R, Gillespie D, Dodd PJ. A systematic review of model-based economic evaluations of the health and economic impacts of integrated care on prevention and management of cardiometabolic multimorbidity. PROSPERO CRD42023407278. Published May 2023. Accessed May 2023. https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42023407278
54. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group, Prisma. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Int J Surg*. 2010;8(5):336-341.
55. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Int J Surg*. 2021;88:105906.

56. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care Programmes*. Oxford University Press; 2015.
57. Turner HC, Archer RA, Downey LE, et al. An Introduction to the Main Types of Economic Evaluations Used for Informing Priority Setting and Resource Allocation in Healthcare: Key Features, Uses, and Limitations. *Front Public Health*. 2021;9:722927.
58. Aga F, Dunbar SB, Kebede T, Gary RA. The role of concordant and discordant comorbidities on performance of self-care behaviors in adults with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes*. Published online 2019:333-356.
59. Piette JD, Kerr EA. The impact of comorbid chronic conditions on diabetes care. *Diabetes Care*. 2006;29(3):725-731.
60. Singer SJ, Burgers J, Friedberg M, Rosenthal MB, Leape L, Schneider E. Defining and measuring integrated patient care: promoting the next frontier in health care delivery. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2011;68(1):112-127.
61. Philips Z, Bojke L, Sculpher M, Claxton K, Golder S. Good practice guidelines for decision-analytic modelling in health technology assessment: a review and consolidation of quality assessment. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2006;24:355-371.
62. Dukpa W, Teerawattananon Y, Rattanavipapong W, et al. Is diabetes and hypertension screening worthwhile in resource-limited settings? An economic evaluation based on a pilot of a Package of Essential Non-communicable disease interventions in Bhutan. *Health Policy & Planning*. 2015;30(8):1032-1043.
63. Mousa R, Hammad E. Cost-effectiveness of pharmacist-led care versus usual care in type 2 diabetic Jordanians: a Markov modeling of cardiovascular diseases prevention. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res*. 2021;21(5):1069-1079.
64. Kasaie P, Weir B, Schnure M, et al. Integrated screening and treatment services for HIV, hypertension and diabetes in Kenya: assessing the epidemiological impact and cost-effectiveness from a national and regional perspective. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2020;23 Suppl 1:e25499.
65. Penaloza-Ramos MC, Jowett S, Mant J, et al. Cost-effectiveness of self-management of blood pressure in hypertensive patients over 70 years with suboptimal control and established cardiovascular disease or additional cardiovascular risk diseases (TASMIN-SR). *Eur J Prev Cardiol*. 2016;23(9):902-912.
66. Kim W, Lee SA, Chun SY. A cost-effectiveness analysis of the Chronic Disease Management Program in patients with hypertension in Korea. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2021;33(2):30.
67. Schultz BG, Tilton J, Jun J, Scott-Horton T, Quach D, Touchette DR. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of a Pharmacist-Led Medication Therapy Management Program: Hypertension Management. *Value Health*. 2020;24(4):522-529.
68. Schouten LM, Niessen LW, van de Pas JW, Grol RP, Hulscher ME. Cost-effectiveness of a quality improvement collaborative focusing on patients with diabetes. *Med Care*. 2010;48(10):884-891.

69. Hobbs FDR, Fitzmaurice DA, Mant J, et al. A randomised controlled trial and cost-effectiveness study of systematic screening (targeted and total population screening) versus routine practice for the detection of atrial fibrillation in people aged 65 and over. The SAFE study. *Health Technol Assess*. 2005;9(40):iii-iv, ix-x, 1-74.
70. Mason JM, Freemantle N, Gibson JM, New, John P. Specialist nurse-led clinics to improve control of hypertension and hyperlipidemia in diabetes: economic analysis of the SPLINT trial. *Diabetes Care*. 2005;28(1):40-46.
71. Schaufler TM, Wolff M. Cost effectiveness of preventive screening programmes for type 2 diabetes mellitus in germany. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*. 2010;8(3):191-202.
72. Howard K, White S, Salkeld G, et al. Cost-effectiveness of screening and optimal management for diabetes, hypertension, and chronic kidney disease: A modeled analysis. *Value Health*. 2010;13(2):196-208.
73. Schuetz CA, Alperin P, Guda S, et al. A Standardized Vascular Disease Health Check in Europe: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(7) (no pagination). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066454
74. Wang PE, Wang TT, Chiu YH, Yen AMF, Chen THH. Evolution of multiple disease screening in Keelung: a model for community involvement in health interventions? *J Med Screen*. 2006;13 Suppl 1:S54-8.
75. Afzali HHA, Karnon J, Gray J, Beilby J. A model-based evaluation of collaborative care in management of patients with type 2 diabetes in Australia: an initial report. *Aust Health Rev*. 2012;36(3):258-263.
76. Clarke PM, Gray AM, Briggs A, et al. A model to estimate the lifetime health outcomes of patients with type 2 diabetes: the United Kingdom Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Outcomes Model (UKPDS no. 68). *Diabetologia*. 2004;47:1747-1759.
77. Stevens RJ, Kothari V, Adler AI, Stratton IM, Holman RR, Group, United Kingdom Prospective Diabetes Study. The UKPDS risk engine: a model for the risk of coronary heart disease in Type II diabetes (UKPDS 56). *Clin Sci*. 2001;101(6):671-679.
78. Adler AI. UKPDS—modelling of cardiovascular risk assessment and lifetime simulation of outcomes. *Diabet Med*. 2008;25:41-46.
79. Eddy DM, Schlessinger L. Archimedes: a trial-validated model of diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2003;26(11):3093-3101.
80. Stover J, Brown T, Puckett R, Peerapatanapokin W. Updates to the Spectrum/Estimations and Projections Package model for estimating trends and current values for key HIV indicators. *AIDS*. 2017;31(1):S5-S11.
81. Kariuki JK, Stuart-Shor EM, Leveille SG, Gona P, Cromwell J, Hayman LL. Validation of the nonlaboratory-based Framingham cardiovascular disease risk assessment algorithm in the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities dataset. *J Cardiovasc Med*. 2017;18(12):936-945.

82. Wroe EB, Mailosi B, Price N, et al. Economic evaluation of integrated services for non-communicable diseases and HIV: costs and client outcomes in rural Malawi. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(11):e063701.
83. Szafraniec-Burylo SI, Sliwczynski A, Tyszko P, et al. The implementation of integrated care for cardiovascular diseases in Poland. *Int J Integr Care*. 2016;16(6):1-2.
84. Hu TH, Su WW, Yang CC, et al. Elimination of Hepatitis C Virus in a Dialysis Population: A Collaborative Care Model in Taiwan. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2021;78(4):511-519.e1.
85. Littlewood R, Walker J, Rogany A. Childhood obesity: overarching, statewide governance as a successful enabler to an integrated approach for prevention and management. *Int J Integr Care*. 2018;18:1-2.
86. Cronin J, Murphy A, Savage E. Can chronic disease be managed through integrated care cost-effectively? Evidence from a systematic review. *Ir J Med Sci*. 2017;186(4):827-834.
87. Rohwer A, Nicol JU, Toews I, Young T, Bavuma CM, Meerpohl J. Effects of integrated models of care for diabetes and hypertension in low-income and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(7):e043705.
88. Desmedt M, Vertriest S, Hellings J, et al. Economic impact of integrated care models for patients with chronic diseases: a systematic review. *Value Health*. 2016;19(6):892-902.
89. McCombe G, Lim J, Van Hout MC, et al. Integrating Care for Diabetes and Hypertension with HIV Care in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Scoping Review. *Int J Integr Care*. 2022;22(1). doi:10.5334/ijic.5839
90. Njuguna B, Vorkoper S, Patel P, et al. Models of integration of HIV and noncommunicable disease care in sub-Saharan Africa: lessons learned and evidence gaps. *AIDS*. 2018;32(Suppl 1):S33.
91. Ameh S. Evaluation of an integrated HIV and hypertension management model in rural South Africa: a mixed methods approach. *Glob Health Action*. 2020;13(1):1750216.
92. Watkins DA, Tulloch NL, Anderson ME, Barnhart S, Steyn K, Levitt NS. Delivery of health care for cardiovascular and metabolic diseases among people living with HIV/AIDS in African countries: a systematic review protocol. *Syst Rev*. 2016;5:1-8.
93. NICE. Guide to the Methods of Technology Appraisal 2013 [Internet]. Published online 2013.
94. Briggs ADM, Wolstenholme J, Blakely T, Scarborough P. Choosing an epidemiological model structure for the economic evaluation of non-communicable disease public health interventions. *Popul Health Metr*. 2016;14(1):1-12.
95. Breeze PR, Squires H, Ennis K, et al. Guidance on the use of complex systems models for economic evaluations of public health interventions. *Health Econ*. Published online 2023.

96. Marshall DA, Grazziotin LR, Regier DA, et al. Addressing challenges of economic evaluation in precision medicine using dynamic simulation modeling. *Value Health*. 2020;23(5):566-573.
97. Twumwaa TE, Justice N, Robert van DM, Itamar M. Application of decision analytical models to diabetes in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022;22(1):1397.
98. Erku D, Mersha AG, Ali EE, et al. A systematic review of scope and quality of health economic evaluations conducted in Ethiopia. *Health Policy Plan*. 2022;37(4):514-522.
99. Miranda JJ, Kinra S, Casas JP, Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. Non-communicable diseases in low- and middle-income countries: context, determinants and health policy. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2008;13(10):1225-1234.
100. Hosseinpoor AR, Bergen N, Kunst A, et al. Socioeconomic inequalities in risk factors for non communicable diseases in low-income and middle-income countries: results from the World Health Survey. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12:912.

Contributors: EW is the study guarantor; EW, PD, DG, and RA conceptualized the study; EW, PD, DG, and RA designed the study; EW, JO, CA, and PO performed the literature search; EW performed the analysis; EW and PD developed the visualizations; EW drafted the first version of the paper; all authors provided critical review of the draft and suggestions for revision.

Funding: EW acknowledges funding support from the Wellcome Trust as part of a doctoral training grant [218462/Z/19/Z] at the University of Sheffield.

Competing interests: None declared.

Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Supplemental material: This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations,

clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.



