

1 **Title: Endline Assessment of a Community-Based Program on Hypertension and Diabetes**
2 **Management in Brazil**

3 Luisa Sorio Flor PhD^{1*}, Shelley Wilson BA¹, Welma Wildes Amorim MD MSc², Mark TU Barone PhD^{3,4},
4 Vanessa Moraes Bezerra PhD⁵, Paurvi Bhatt MPH⁶, Maria A Loguercio Bouskela MD MBA⁷, Joseph N
5 Camarda BA¹, Christiane CR Cimini MD MPH⁸, Matheus L Cortes MPH⁵, Jessica Daly MPH⁶, Patrick W
6 Endlich PhD⁸, Nancy Fullman MPH¹, Katie Panhorst Harris MPA¹, Clavdia N Kochergin PhD⁵, Marcia
7 Maria Oliveira Lima PhD⁸, José A Louzado MPH⁵, Junia X Maia MD⁹, Milena S Marcolino MD PhD⁹,
8 Claire R McNellan MPH¹⁰, Danielle Souto de Medeiros PhD¹¹, Sostenes Mistro BPharm PhD⁵, Marie
9 Ng PhD¹², Joao AQ Oliveira MSc PharmD⁹, Marcio Galvão Oliveira BPharm PhD⁵, Bryan K Phillips
10 MPH¹³, Vânia S de O e Almeida Pinto MD Med⁸, Antonio Luiz P Ribeiro MD PhD⁹, Davi Rumel MD
11 PhD¹⁴, Kelle Oliveira Silva BPharm PhD⁵, Daniela Arruda Soares PhD⁵, Blake Thomson DPhil¹⁵,
12 Emmanuela Gakidou PhD¹

13
14 Author Affiliations:

- 15 1. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, Department of Health Metrics Sciences, University of
- 16 Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
- 17 2. Department of Natural Science, Vitória da Conquista Campus, Universidade Estadual do Sudoeste
- 18 da Bahia, Vitória da Conquista, Brazil
- 19 3. Department of Research and Education, Associação de Diabetes Juvenil Brasil, Sao Paulo, SP, Brazil
- 20 4. International Diabetes Federation, Brussels, Belgium
- 21 5. Multidisciplinary Institute in Health, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Vitória da Conquista, Bahia,
- 22 Brazil
- 23 6. Medtronic Foundation, Minneapolis, MN, USA
- 24 7. YOM Consulting, Washington DC, USA
- 25 8. Universidade Federal dos Vales do Jequitinhonha e Mucuri, Teófilo Otoni, Minas Gerais, Brazil
- 26 9. Department of Medicine, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil
- 27 10. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Social Work, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
- 28 11. Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Vitória da
- 29 Conquista, Bahia, Brazil
- 30 12. IBM Watson Health, San Jose, CA, USA
- 31 13. University of California Los Angeles, Fielding School of Public Health, Los Angeles, CA, USA
- 32 14. School of Medicine, Universidade Municipal de São Caetano do Sul, São Caetano do Sul, São
- 33 Paulo, Brazil
- 34 15. The George Institute for Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

35
36 *Corresponding author:

37 Luisa Sorio Flor, PhD
38 Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation
39 Department of Health Metrics Sciences
40 University of Washington
41 Email: lsflor@uw.edu

42 **Abstract**

43 **Background:** Brazil HealthRise community-based program focused on improving technologies for
44 care coordination, developing the local workforce, and identifying and educating individuals with
45 hypertension and diabetes.

46 **Objectives:** To assess the impact of HealthRise on hypertension and diabetes management among
47 patients in the region of Teófilo Otoni (TO) and in the city of Vitória da Conquista (VC).

48 **Methods:** Grantees routinely collected patient-level clinical in intervention areas from March 2017
49 to December 2018; endline qualitative interviews were conducted with patients, providers,
50 administrators, and policymakers in both intervention and comparison sites. Paired t-tests were
51 employed to measure the potential impact of the program on reducing systolic blood pressure (SBP)
52 and hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) between baseline and endline, and on increasing the percentage of
53 enrollees meeting clinical targets (SBP < 140 mmHg for hypertension; < 8% HbA1c for diabetes). We
54 analyzed qualitative data using thematic coding.

55 **Results:** Across sites, 2,764 hypertension patients and 244 diabetes patients were followed through
56 endline. Participants experienced reductions in SBP in TO (-1.9 mmHg [-3.1;-0.7]) and VC (-4,2 mmHg
57 [-5.2;-3.1]); more hypertension patients met treatment targets in these locations (TO: +3.9
58 percentage-points [0.4;7.2]; VC: +10.5 percentage-points [7.81;13.2]) by endline. HbA1c decreased
59 in TO (-0.6 [-0.9;-0.4]) and VC (-0.9 [-1.4;-0.5]), and more individuals presented HbA1c < 8% by
60 endline (TO: +10.2 percentage-points [3.8, 16.6]; VC: +25 percentage-points [12.2, 37.8]). Qualitative
61 data pointed to overall enthusiasm for new technologies and care routine implemented by
62 HealthRise, but challenges regarding program implementation, integration with other levels of care,
63 and social determinants of health persisted.

64 **Conclusions:** Program showed positive effects on hypertension and diabetes outcomes. Community-
65 based health interventions can help bridge healthcare gaps, but their full impact will remain limited
66 until multisectoral policies and actions address underlying structural and social determinants of
67 health more effectively.

68 **Keywords**

69 Diabetes, Hypertension, Non-communicable diseases, Community-based intervention, Primary
70 Health care, Evaluation

71

72

73

74

75

76 **INTRODUCTION**

77 Non-communicable diseases (NCDs), including cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) and diabetes mellitus
78 (DM) impose a substantial health and economic burden on populations, especially in low- and
79 middle-income countries (LMICs) where NCD risk factors such as hypertension (HTN) and unhealthy
80 diet are on the rise, and are a threat to sustainable development.¹

81
82 In Brazil, a country with one of the fastest ageing populations globally,² important strategic efforts³
83 aiming to tackle NCDs and its risk factors were adopted in the past decades and have successfully led
84 to decreases in standardized NCD mortality.⁴ However, prevalence of HTN and DM are still rising.
85 Approximately 25% and 8% of the adult population living in Brazilian state capitals are diagnosed
86 with HTN and DM, respectively,⁵ with social aspects, such as education, income, gender, and
87 ethnicity being associated with higher prevalence of both conditions nationwide.^{6,7} As a result, CVDs
88 and DM account for a persistent large share of the country's burden of disease and resulted in more
89 than 19 million deaths in 2017.⁸

90
91 Most of the care for NCDs within the publicly funded Brazilian Unified Health System is provided
92 through decentralized primary health care (PHC) services. Since 1994, the Family Health Strategy
93 (FHS) focus has reorganized PHC to guarantee universal access to care and widened the scope of its
94 action from traditional curative medical care to prevention, health promotion, and integrated
95 practices.^{9,10} However, despite progressive expansion of the FHS – from covering 4% of the Brazilian
96 population in 1998 to 64% in 2016 –,^{9,11} obstacles to high-quality care endure. Brazil's PHC suffers
97 from constrained public financing and inefficient integration with other levels of care, and many
98 health facilities are not equipped to reliably diagnose and treat NCDs, especially those in
99 underserved areas.¹² As a result, sizable gaps observed along the cascade of care – diagnosing,
100 treating, and controlling disease – emphasize the need to better reach patients, retain them in care,
101 and promote effective interventions for disease management.^{13–16}

102
103 Community-based programs, which bridge communities and health systems, have emerged as a
104 promising approach to filling gaps in local healthcare provision.^{17,18} Past LMICs studies suggest that
105 locally relevant community-based strategies targeting HTN and DM can contribute to improved
106 disease management and health outcomes.^{19–22} The HealthRise program was developed to
107 implement and evaluate pilot programs aimed to improve screening, diagnosis, management, and
108 control of HTN and DM among underserved communities in Brazil, India, South Africa, and the
109 US.^{23,24} In Brazil, pilot programs were implemented between 2017 and 2018 in two sites – the region

110 of Teófilo Otoni (TO) and the city of Vitoria da Conquista (VC) – and included a range of integrated
111 strategies aimed at reorganizing the local health system and improving FHS teams’ practices to
112 identifying, educating, and empowering HTN and DM patients.

113

114 In this independent prospective evaluation, we used both quantitative and qualitative data to assess
115 the potential impact of the Brazil HealthRise programs on improving clinical and health outcomes for
116 HTN and DM patients in TO and VC. We hypothesized that participation in the Brazil HealthRise
117 program could lead to reduced biomarker readings and increase the proportion of individuals
118 meeting treatment targets for both conditions.

119

120 **METHODOLOGY**

121 **Study design**

122 HealthRise was funded by the Medtronic Foundation and the Institute for Health Metrics and
123 Evaluation (IHME) served as the independent program evaluator. Programs were designed and
124 implemented by local grantees. Further information on the global HealthRise initiative team
125 structure is published elsewhere.^{23,24} we used a mixed-methods quasi-experimental design to assess
126 the magnitude and potential effects of HealthRise programs in Brazil. We used process indicators to
127 assess program implementation; quantitative data to measure changes in patient outcomes over
128 time; and qualitative data to contextualize patients, providers, and stakeholders’ experiences with
129 HealthRise and usual NCD care.

130

131 **HealthRise program**

132 Supported by the Brazilian Ministry of Health, pilot programs were implemented in two sites: (1) TO
133 region, a cluster of 10 municipalities located in the Mucuri Valley, in Minas Gerais (May 2017-
134 December 2018); and (2) VC, a city located in northeastern Brazil, in Bahia state (March 2017-
135 December 2018). Sites were selected a priori by the Medtronic Foundation and grantees due to high
136 NCD burden, existing health service gaps, and interest of government and nongovernmental
137 partners.

138

139 Interventions were drawn from site-specific baseline needs assessment conducted prior to program
140 implementation and evaluation onset, which highlighted shared health demands and challenges
141 across sites.²⁵ In both locations, health infrastructure was characterized by insufficient human
142 resources for health, no electronic medical records (EMR), medication stock-outs, and lack of
143 equipment. Diagnosis of HTN and DM were typically delayed until after the emergence of symptoms.

144 Once diagnosed, a majority of patients were found to initiate treatment; however, many failed to
145 reach treatment targets. Lifestyle modifications and the time required to schedule follow-up
146 appointments, as a result of overburdened facilities, were identified by patients as some of the
147 major challenges to controlling their diseases.²⁵

148

149 The programs' interventions and activities covered six common components (i.e. technologies for
150 care coordination; healthcare service organization; workforce development; screening and
151 recruitment; disease management and health promotion; and patient empowerment and health
152 education) and are described in more detail in Table 1.

153

154 **HealthRise participants**

155 In the TO region, HealthRise activities targeted individuals aged 30-69 years old living in urban and
156 rural areas of the selected municipalities; in the TO municipality, only those living in the same area
157 as five selected PHCU were considered for inclusion. In VC, the target population was composed of
158 individuals aged 30 years and above living in the urban area. Patients were enrolled in the program
159 on an ongoing basis if (1) they had an established HTN or DM diagnosis and attended a follow-up
160 consultation at the health facility; or (2) had no previous diagnosis, screened above threshold at any
161 HealthRise-supported screening activity and attended a follow-up consultation at the PCHU for
162 diagnosis confirmation. For HTN, "screened above threshold", meant that a participant's blood
163 pressure (BP) exceeded diagnostic thresholds (i.e., systolic blood pressure (SBP) ≥ 140 mmHg or
164 diastolic blood pressure (DBP) ≥ 90 mmHg). For DM, it meant a random blood glucose (RBG)
165 measure of ≥ 140 mg/dL in VC; and a RBG reading of ≥ 200 mg/dL with at least one classical DM
166 symptom (polyuria, polydipsia, or polyphagia) or a fasting glucose ≥ 126 mg/dL following a
167 cardiovascular risk assessment (only individuals with a body mass index (BMI) ≥ 25 ; or age ≥ 45 , or at
168 least moderate cardiovascular disease risk were referred to get a fasting glucose test at the health
169 facility) in TO. Newly diagnosed patients were those who screened above the threshold at a
170 screening event and received a HTN or DM diagnosis after two follow-up consultations at the health
171 facility. For those with a screening RBG reading of ≥ 200 mg/dL with at least one classical diabetes
172 symptom or blood pressure ≥ 180 mmHg/ ≥ 110 mmHg one assessment was enough for diagnosis. BP
173 and hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) measures were used to monitor enrolled patients. Figure 1 shows
174 information on the target population and a flowchart of participants in each of the Brazilian sites.

175

176 **Endline evaluation data collection**

177 Quantitative process and patient-level data were collected from existing sources and collated by the
178 implementation teams, who provided de-identified patient-level data for enrolled individuals over
179 time. TO grantees used their newly implemented Clinical Decision Support System as the main
180 source of patient-level data; while the team in VC extracted data from paper-based and electronic
181 medical records. Data collected varied by program site because of the differing data source
182 infrastructure.

183

184 Qualitative data were collected from both intervention and comparison areas and consisted of key
185 informant interviews with PHC managers, clinic- and home-based providers, and policymakers, as
186 well as focus group discussions with patients, which were facilitated by independent local data
187 collection professionals contracted by IHME. Comparison locations – Padre Paraíso (for TO) and
188 Poções (for VC) – were selected based on cultural, geographic, and sociodemographic proximity and
189 the absence of any HealthRise programs. Frontline health workers (FLHWs) and CHWs were
190 randomly selected from a list provided by each facility manager. PHC managers and policymakers
191 were identified through the implementation teams. Patients were recruited to participate in focus
192 group discussions by health facility staff. Figure 1 displays the number of focus group discussions and
193 interviews conducted by site, and data collection methods are described in more detail
194 elsewhere.^{23,24} Interviews and focus group discussions were conducted in Portuguese, audio
195 recorded, transcribed, and translated to English. Survey instruments were designed by IHME with
196 input from local evaluation partners and are available at [http://www.healthdata.org/healthrise-
197 evaluation/data-collection-tools](http://www.healthdata.org/healthrise-evaluation/data-collection-tools).

198

199

200 **Endline evaluation analysis**

201 Two outcome indicators were used to quantify the potential effects of HealthRise participation: (1)
202 the proportion of patients meeting treatment targets (i.e., SBP < 140 mmHg and DBP < 90 mmHg for
203 HTN; < 8% HbA1c for DM); and (2) patient biometric measures (i.e., SBP for HTN, HbA1c for DM). The
204 endline study size was determined by the number of enrolled patients that had at least two BP or
205 two HbA1c readings recorded (Figure 1) – one that aligned with enrollment (i.e., baseline) and any
206 additional measure by endline. We ran paired-sample t-tests – for males, females and both sexes
207 combined – to assess whether statistically significant changes in HTN and DM measures – percent
208 meeting treatment targets and average biometric readings – occurred for HealthRise participants
209 from baseline to endline. All analyses were conducted in Stata version 15 and R version 3.6.2.^{26,27}

210

211 For the qualitative analysis, each transcription was read two or more times by a single researcher
212 who assessed open-ended questionnaire responses using thematic analysis.²⁸ Themes were
213 identified at the semantic level. Data were entered into excel templates for analysis with a focus on
214 data patterns associated with overarching research questions. Data codes were collated to generate
215 themes by site and draw comparisons between intervention and comparison regions.

216

217 **RESULTS**

218 Across both sites, 5,444 individuals without a previous HTN diagnosis and 9,005 individuals not
219 previously diagnosed with DM were screened through HealthRise programs, of which, 1,497
220 exceeded diagnostic thresholds for elevated BP and 624 met DM referral criteria for further testing
221 at the health facility. By the end of the programs, 493 new HTN and 84 new DM patients were
222 diagnosed. Site-specific figures are presented in Figure 2. Females accounted for the majority of the
223 newly diagnosed patients in TO – 52% of those diagnosed with HTN and 70% of those with DM. In
224 VC, more males were diagnosed with HTN (53%) and more female participants received a diagnosis
225 of DM (61%).

226

227 A total of 3,992 individuals with HTN and 1,028 individuals with DM attended the health facility at
228 least once and were enrolled in the program in TO; and 2,443 and 1,052 patients with HTN and DM,
229 respectively, were enrolled in VC. Baseline BP readings were available for the majority of enrolled
230 patients in both locations (n=3,196 [80%] in TO; 2,062 [84%] in VC), while HbA1c measurements
231 were less frequently available (n=631 [61%] in TO; n=435 [41%] in VC). The proportion of enrollees
232 who were achieving the recommended BP target at baseline was 48% in TO vs 35% in VC; for HbA1c
233 the percentages were 54% and 49% for TO and VC respectively. Across sites, a considerable
234 percentage of enrolled HTN and DM patients with a baseline biomarker reading were not followed-
235 up and/or did not have an additional BP (63% in TO; 47% in VC) or HbA1c (72% in TO; 84% in VC)
236 reading recorded (Figure 1).

237

238 **Changes in blood pressure and HbA1c**

239 Figure 3 summarizes patients shifts in SBP (A) and HbA1c (B) categories between baseline and
240 endline in TO and VC. Overall, patients trended toward progress in lowering SBP or HbA1c levels
241 over time in both sites; however, shifts towards higher categories were also observed (Figure 3).

242

243

244 By the end of the program, a significantly higher number of patients met HTN treatment targets at
245 endline (52.2% [49.3;55%]) compared to baseline (48.3% [45.5;51.2%]; $p < 0.05$) in TO. TO HealthRise
246 patients also recorded statistically significant reductions in SBP (average decrease of -1.9 mmHg [-
247 3.1;-0.7]; $p < 0.01$), especially males. Even larger improvements occurred in VC, where a sizeable
248 increase in the percent of HTN individuals with SBP < 140 mmHg and DBP < 90 mmHg was observed
249 (10.5 percentage point rise [7.81;13.2; $p < 0.001$], and patients showed statistically significant
250 declines for SBP (-4.2 mmHg decline [-5.2;-3.1]; $p < 0.001$) over the course of the intervention.

251

252 For DM, more patients met treatment targets at endline (59.6% [52.3;67.0%]) than at baseline
253 [49.4% [42.0;56.9%]; $p < 0.01$) in TO, including 14.8% whom had A1c levels of 8% or higher at
254 enrollment; for VC, the percentage of HealthRise DM patients meeting treatment targets also
255 showed a statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) increase from baseline (36.8% [25.0;48.5%]) to endline
256 (61.8% [49.9;73.6%]). Statistically significant increases were seen among female participants only in
257 both locations. Improvements were also observed in terms of reducing HbA1c since enrollment, with
258 an average decrease of -0.6 ([-0.87;-0.36]; $p < 0.001$) in TO and of -0.9 ([-1.4;-0.5]; $p < 0.001$) in VC.
259 No significant changes in mean HbA1c levels were seen among male participants in TO.

260

261 **Qualitative findings**

262 Key themes emerged from the qualitative data collected at the intervention sites (Table 2). First,
263 providers described the program as reorganizing patient flows and health unit routines, resulting in
264 better and more structured care delivery. Providers also spoke positively about new training
265 opportunities, intensified group activities for patients, and an increased availability of select
266 specialized exams. In TO, specifically, the implementation of the clinical support system resulted in
267 an improved sense of confidence among frontline health workers according to providers, and was
268 highlighted as one of the main features of the program. Second, while patients demonstrated
269 limited understanding of HealthRise, they were able to recognize some of the main program aspects,
270 such as screening health fairs and some educational activities. The use of tablets by CHWs during
271 home visits and computers by FLHWs during consultations was also perceived positively by patients.
272 Individuals from TO more frequently reported enhanced access to specialized exams after the
273 implementation of HealthRise.

274

275 The third theme pertained to remaining challenges for disease management. Social determinants of
276 health, including poverty, low levels of health education, and limited access to affordable and
277 nutritious food were consistently reported across sites. Patients, providers, and policymakers also

278 highlighted challenges related to core health system functions, particularly adequate medication
279 supplies, sufficient staffing, reliable referral processes, and budget limitations within the public
280 health system.

281

282 Lastly, in both sites, FLHWs and CHWs requested additional and more periodic in-person training
283 opportunities. Specifically, CHWs frequently expressed interest in in-depth technical trainings that
284 would allow them to measure blood glucose and BP during home visits. Interviewees also expressed
285 the desire for a strengthened care coordination, with health professionals other than doctors and
286 nurses to be more closely involved in the project to support a truly multidisciplinary approach.
287 Finally, guaranteeing medication availability and increasing access to specialized exams at the local
288 level, without the need to refer patients to a central unit in a different municipality, would be key
289 improvements to the program and the local health systems.

290

291 Patient focus group discussions and staff interviews at comparison facilities echoed many of the
292 same themes as those from intervention areas. However, while complaints regarding the availability
293 of medication and specialized exams also arose in intervention facilities, these complaints were
294 clearly more escalated in comparison areas. Although facilitating the referral process to specialists
295 was a core component of HealthRise in both sites, this seemed to be a major barrier in comparison
296 facilities, according to patients, health providers, and PHC managers. Additionally, FLHWs in
297 comparison areas agreed that HTN and DM were not their main focus given other local competing
298 health priorities (i.e. maternal and child health). Patient adherence to standard HTN and DM
299 programs is low, according to health staff. Finally, providers in comparison facilities more frequently
300 indicated the need for additional training opportunities.

301

302 **Discussion**

303 The HealthRise program focused on overcoming barriers to effective care and improving clinical and
304 health outcomes for HTN and DM among underserved populations through community-based
305 interventions. Findings from this evaluation reveal that enrolled patients followed through endline
306 saw statistically significant reduction in blood pressure, and the proportion of patients meeting HTN
307 treatment targets increased in both sites, despite the short period of program implementation.
308 Similarly, HealthRise patients' HbA1c levels significantly decreased and patients experienced
309 improvements in DM management since baseline in both TO and VC. Observable effects varied
310 across genders and statistically significant positive trends were more frequently seen among women
311 compared to men. Results from the qualitative assessment pointed to the value of integrating

312 interventions covering health promotion, prevention, and treatment, and of strategies focused on
313 healthcare service organization; nonetheless, gaps related to core health system functions as well as
314 socioeconomic and cultural barriers to care provision and disease management were identified by
315 providers, managers, and patients from both intervention and comparison facilities.

316

317 Unlike most primary care interventions,¹⁸ HealthRise covered multiple domains, from organizing and
318 equipping healthcare facilities and teams to community-level actions and policymaking efforts,
319 which may have contributed to the observable effects of HealthRise across Brazil sites. A review of
320 comprehensive chronic care models indicated that the majority of them were effective in improving
321 healthcare practices and health outcomes within primary healthcare settings.²⁹ In Brazil, despite the
322 lack of previous overarching multicomponent efforts added to standard care, a number of programs
323 that have implemented at least one of the interventions covered by HealthRise were effective in
324 improving blood pressure and blood glucose measures, but at smaller levels.^{30–32} Further, the
325 country's longstanding investments in guaranteeing universal healthcare coverage, strengthening
326 primary care and establishing one of the world's largest CHW networks^{33,34} may have contributed to
327 the notable progress and may explain the lack of statistically significant results in other HealthRise
328 implementation sites.²³

329

330 Amid such promising findings, however, several operational challenges arose over the course of the
331 Brazilian programs and can inform future community-based interventions, especially those in
332 underserved communities. HealthRise programs screened thousands of individuals, yet relatively
333 few new diagnoses occurred through this process. Low yields from population-based screening
334 activities are not uncommon.^{35,36} Given the estimated size of undiagnosed patients in each
335 implementation site, large drop-off rates between screening above thresholds and then receiving
336 diagnostic confirmation via multiple clinic appointments may have contributed, at least partially, to
337 the low numbers, a challenge also identified elsewhere.³⁵ These findings support guidelines
338 recommending more selective screening of high-risk groups to improve cost-effectiveness.³⁷

339

340 As in other community-based interventions in resource-constrained settings,^{38,39} low follow-up rates
341 were observed in Brazil. Although the short time of implementation may have limited the amount of
342 HealthRise patients with multiple biomarker readings, persistent health systems barriers raised by
343 providers and managers in qualitative analyses, such as overburdened facilities, limited staff, and
344 lack of diagnostic tools, likely contributed to these findings. As such, innovative HTN and DM
345 programs need to develop better strategies to reach patients, increase follow-up opportunities,

346 reduce delays in medical appointments, and retain enrolled patients. Strengthening CHWs technical
347 abilities and promoting task shifts can potentially alleviate some of these barriers and better support
348 patients' needs. However, further work is needed to understand the capacity of CHW to incorporate
349 these other demands while dealing with both persistent and emergent – such as COVID-19 –
350 competing health priorities.

351
352 In both sites, males represented a smaller share of enrolled and followed-up patients, indicating that
353 some access barriers – especially facility working hours – might disproportionately affect males.
354 Although the smaller sample size may have impacted the results for males, gender-specific health
355 barriers and differences regarding healthcare-seeking behavior and health literacy are well
356 established in the literature.^{40,41} A combination of these aspects may have led to insufficient
357 exposure to the program's interventions and compromised management of chronic conditions
358 among male participants indicating that gender may need to be considered when designing similar
359 interventions.

360
361 Lastly, across sites, heterogeneous patterns in patient biometrics shifts since baseline underscore
362 the challenges of case management of HTN and DM, especially in environments with the
363 aforementioned health system fragilities and where social and cultural aspects heavily interfere with
364 access to care and adoption of the therapeutic plan, exacerbating health disparities. Interviewees
365 have pointed to persistent obstacles to accessing multidisciplinary care, unreliably stocked
366 medication, and lack of integrated care with specialized levels and providers, which may have
367 resulted in some hard-to-treat patients remaining in suboptimal treatment and thus not achieving
368 better disease management results. Identifying and prioritizing mechanisms for mitigating or
369 alleviating structural inequalities is mandatory so programs can reach their full potential. Given that
370 CHW are reported to be trusted and effective in reaching families and providing ongoing assistance
371 while also having a unique understanding of the experience, language, culture, and socioeconomic
372 reality of the communities that they serve, they are vital in the path towards health equity.

373

374 **Limitations**

375 Our study's findings should be interpreted in light of its limitations. First, since quantitative
376 comparison patient data were not collected, we cannot ascribe these patient-level improvements to
377 HealthRise program participation. Second, only patients with two or more biomarker readings by
378 endline were included in the analysis; these patients were considered to have been regularly
379 followed up and may not be representative of the potential target population for HealthRise

380 interventions (i.e. bias toward healthier or sicker patients; or towards females). There is also a
381 chance that patients ended up excluded from the analysis due to poor record keeping. Third, our
382 relatively small sample size, especially of DM patients, alongside with data availability limitations
383 precluded additional sub-group analysis as well as investigations regarding visit frequency, intensity
384 of intervention exposure, and medication use. Fourth, comprehensive information on intervention
385 reach and fidelity (i.e., the degree to which interventions were implemented per protocol) were not
386 available across sites and thus could not be included in the present study. Finally, given the open
387 enrollment, patient duration in the program varied and, for some, may not have been long enough
388 to detect significant effects.

389

390 **Conclusions**

391 Our findings demonstrate the potential for community based interventions to improve HTN and DM
392 outcomes; but also underscore how their reach and effectiveness can be hindered by broader health
393 system, infrastructure, and policy constraints. Longer-term evaluations of community-based
394 programs and continued work to understand which interventions may work best given local contexts
395 and healthcare gaps are needed. Irrespective of their increasingly vital role for underserved
396 populations, community-based programs can be hindered by the lack of underlying infrastructure
397 and resources and absence of more macro-level socioeconomic policies. It is imperative that models
398 of care explicitly tackle local contextual challenges and engage well beyond the formal health
399 system.

400

401 **Ethics and consent**

402 The overall study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Human Subjects Division at
403 the University of Washington. (Application Number: 51476) Institutional Review Board approval was
404 also obtained for both quantitative and qualitative data collection from the Universidade Federal dos
405 Vales do Jequitinhonha e Mucuri (CAAE:65808517.9.0000.5108 and CAAE:00865518.9.00005108)
406 and the Universidade Federal da Bahia, Instituto Multidisciplinar em Saúde-Campus Anísio Teixeira
407 (CAAE:62259116.0.0000.5556 and CAAE:99216918.5.0000.5556). All personal identifiers were
408 removed prior to the data being sent to IHME for analysis. Individuals participating in the study in TO
409 provided informed consent. Quantitative data from participants in VC were extracted from patient
410 charts and no informed consent was needed. All those participating in qualitative data collection
411 activities provided informed consent.

412

413

414 **References**

- 415
- 416 1. Stanaway JD, Afshin A, Gakidou E, Lim SS, Abate D, Abate KH, et al. Global, regional, and
417 national comparative risk assessment of 84 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and
418 metabolic risks or clusters of risks for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: a systematic
419 analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet*. 2018;392:1923–94.
- 420 2. Gragnolati M, World Bank, editors. Growing old in an older Brazil: implications of population
421 ageing on growth, poverty, public finance and service delivery. Washington D.C: World Bank;
422 2011. 299 p. (Directions in development. Human development).
- 423 3. Malta DC, Morais Neto OL de, Silva Junior JB da. Presentation of the strategic action plan for
424 coping with chronic diseases in Brazil from 2011 to 2022. *Epidemiologia e Serviços de Saúde*.
425 2011;20:425–38.
- 426 4. Malta DC, França E, Abreu DMX, Perillo RD, Salmen MC, Teixeira RA, et al. Mortality due to
427 noncommunicable diseases in Brazil, 1990 to 2015, according to estimates from the Global
428 Burden of Disease study. *Sao Paulo Med J*. 2017;135:213–21.
- 429 5. Brazil. Ministry of Health. VIGITEL 2018: Surveillance System of Risk and Protection Factors for
430 Chronic Diseases by Telephone Survey. Brasilia: Ministry of Health; 2018.
- 431 6. Flor LS, Campos MR. Prevalência de diabetes mellitus e fatores associados na população adulta
432 brasileira: evidências de um inquérito de base populacional. *Revista Brasileira de*
433 *Epidemiologia*. 2017;20:16–29.
- 434 7. Malta DC, Bernal RTI, Andrade SSC de A, da Silva MMA, Velasquez-Melendez G. Prevalence of
435 and factors associated with self-reported high blood pressure in Brazilian adults. *Rev Saude*
436 *Publica [Internet]*. 2017 [cited 2020 Apr 12];51. Available from:
437 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5676350/>
- 438 8. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). GBD Compare [Internet]. Seattle, WA:
439 IHME, University of Washington; 2019 [cited 2020 Apr 3]. Available from:
440 <http://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare>
- 441 9. Andrade MV, Coelho AQ, Xavier Neto M, Carvalho LR de, Atun R, Castro MC. Brazil’s Family
442 Health Strategy: factors associated with programme uptake and coverage expansion over 15
443 years (1998–2012). *Health Policy Plan*. 2018;33:368–80.
- 444 10. Sousa F de OS, Albuquerque PC de, Nascimento CMB do, Albuquerque LC de, Lira AC de, Sousa
445 F de OS, et al. The role of Family Health Support Center in assistance coordination of Primary
446 Health Care: limits and possibilities. *Saúde em Debate*. 2017;41:1075–89.
- 447 11. Neves RG, Flores TR, Duro SMS, Nunes BP, Tomasi E. Tendência temporal da cobertura da
448 Estratégia Saúde da Família no Brasil, regiões e Unidades da Federação, 2006-2016. *Epidemiol*
449 *Serv Saúde*. 2018;27:e2017170.
- 450 12. Pinto HA, Sousa ANA de, Ferla AA. The National Program for Access and Quality Improvement
451 in Primary Care: faces of an innovative policy. *Saúde em Debate*. 2014;38:358–72.
- 452 13. Geldsetzer P, Manne-Goehler J, Marcus M-E, Ebert C, Zhumadilov Z, Wesseh CS, et al. The state
453 of hypertension care in 44 low-income and middle-income countries: a cross-sectional study of

- 454 nationally representative individual-level data from 1.1 million adults. *Lancet*. 2019;394:652–
455 62.
- 456 14. Mendes ABV, Fittipaldi JAS, Neves RCS, Chacra AR, Moreira ED. Prevalence and correlates of
457 inadequate glycaemic control: results from a nationwide survey in 6,671 adults with diabetes in
458 Brazil. *Acta Diabetol*. 2010;47:137–45.
- 459 15. Picon RV, Dias-da-Costa JS, Fuchs FD, Olinto MTA, Choudhry NK, Fuchs SC. Hypertension
460 Management in Brazil: Usual Practice in Primary Care—A Meta-Analysis. *Int J Hypertens*
461 [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 Apr 13];2017. Available from:
462 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5511660/>
- 463 16. Viana LV, Leitão CB, Kramer CK, Zucatti ATN, Jezini DL, Felício J, et al. Poor glycaemic control in
464 Brazilian patients with type 2 diabetes attending the public healthcare system: a cross-
465 sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3:e003336.
- 466 17. Zhang D, Wang G, Joo H. A Systematic Review of Economic Evidence on Community
467 Hypertension Interventions. *Am J Prev Med*. 2017;53:S121–30.
- 468 18. Correia JC, Lachat S, Lager G, Chappuis F, Golay A, Beran D. Interventions targeting
469 hypertension and diabetes mellitus at community and primary healthcare level in low- and
470 middle-income countries:a scoping review. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2020 Apr
471 1];19. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6873661/>
- 472 19. Newman PM, Franke MF, Arrieta J, Carrasco H, Elliott P, Flores H, et al. Community health
473 workers improve disease control and medication adherence among patients with diabetes
474 and/or hypertension in Chiapas, Mexico: an observational stepped-wedge study. *BMJ Glob
475 Health*. 2018;3:e000566.
- 476 20. O’Neil DS, Lam WC, Nyirangirimana P, Burton WB, Baganizi M, Musominali S, et al. Evaluation
477 of care access and hypertension control in a community health worker driven non-
478 communicable disease programme in rural Uganda: the chronic disease in the community
479 project. *Health Policy Plan*. 2016;31:878–83.
- 480 21. Sharp A, Riches N, Mims A, Ntshalintshali S, McConalogue D, Southworth P, et al.
481 Decentralising NCD management in rural southern Africa: evaluation of a pilot implementation
482 study. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20:44.
- 483 22. Micikas M, Foster J, Weis A, Lopez-Salm A, Lungelow D, Mendez P, et al. A Community Health
484 Worker Intervention for Diabetes Self-Management Among the Tz’utujil Maya of Guatemala.
485 *Health Promotion Practice*. 2015;16:601–8.
- 486 23. Flor LS, Wilson S, Bhatt P, Bryant M, Burnett A, Camarda JN, et al. Community-based
487 interventions for detection and management of diabetes and hypertension in underserved
488 communities: a mixed-methods evaluation in Brazil, India, South Africa and the USA. *BMJ Glob
489 Health* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 22];5. Available from:
490 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7279660/>
- 491 24. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). *HealthRise Evaluation Final Report*. Seattle,
492 WA: IHME, University of Washington; 2019.

- 493 25. Flor LS, Phillips B, McNellan CR, Gabert R, Wollum A, Bryant M, et al. HealthRise Needs
494 Assessment, Brazil: Vitória da Conquista and Teófilo Otoni. Seattle, WA: IHME, University of
495 Washington; 2016.
- 496 26. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2017.
- 497 27. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [Internet]. Vienna,
498 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2018. Available from: [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org)
499 [project.org](https://www.R-project.org)
- 500 28. Braun V, Clarke V. Thematic analysis. In: Cooper H, Camic PM, Long DL, Panter AT, Rindskopf D,
501 Sher KJ, editors. APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol 2: Research designs:
502 Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological [Internet]. Washington: American
503 Psychological Association; 2012 [cited 2020 Apr 13]. p. 57–71. Available from:
504 <http://content.apa.org/books/13620-004>
- 505 29. Davy C, Bleasel J, Liu H, Tchan M, Ponniah S, Brown A. Effectiveness of chronic care models:
506 opportunities for improving healthcare practice and health outcomes: a systematic review.
507 BMC Health Services Research. 2015;15:194.
- 508 30. Almeida-Pititto B de, Griffin SJ, Sharp SJ, Hirai AT, Gimeno SGA, Ferreira SRG. A behavioral
509 intervention in a cohort of Japanese-Brazilians at high cardiometabolic risk. *Revista de Saúde*
510 *Pública*. 2012;46:602–9.
- 511 31. Lima STRM, Souza BSN, França AKT, Salgado JV, Salgado-Filho N, Sichieri R. Reductions in
512 glycemic and lipid profiles in hypertensive patients undergoing the Brazilian Dietary Approach
513 to Break Hypertension: a randomized clinical trial. *Nutr Res*. 2014;34:682–7.
- 514 32. Cortez DN, Macedo MML, Souza DAS, dos Santos JC, Afonso GS, Reis IA, et al. Evaluating the
515 effectiveness of an empowerment program for self-care in type 2 diabetes: a cluster
516 randomized trial. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 Apr 9];17. Available from:
517 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5219728/>
- 518 33. Paim J, Travassos C, Almeida C, Bahia L, Macinko J. The Brazilian health system: history,
519 advances, and challenges. *Lancet*. 2011;377:1778–97.
- 520 34. Perry HB, Zulliger R, Rogers MM. Community health workers in low-, middle-, and high-income
521 countries: an overview of their history, recent evolution, and current effectiveness. *Annu Rev*
522 *Public Health*. 2014;35:399–421.
- 523 35. Janssen PGH, Gorter KJ, Stolk RP, Rutten G. Low yield of population-based screening for Type 2
524 diabetes in the Netherlands: the ADDITION Netherlands study. *Fam Pract*. 2007;24:555–61.
- 525 36. Toscano CM, Zhuo X, Imai K, Duncan BB, Polanczyk CA, Zhang P, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a
526 national population-based screening program for type 2 diabetes: the Brazil experience.
527 *Diabetol Metab Syndr*. 2015;7:95.
- 528 37. American Diabetes Association. Screening for Diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2002;25:s21–4.
- 529 38. Adler AJ, Laar A, Prieto-Merino D, Der RMM, Mangortey D, Dirks R, et al. Can a nurse-led
530 community-based model of hypertension care improve hypertension control in Ghana? Results
531 from the ComHIP cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9:e026799.

- 532 39. Sobry A, Kizito W, Van den Bergh R, Tayler-Smith K, Isaakidis P, Cheti E, et al. Caseload,
533 management and treatment outcomes of patients with hypertension and/or diabetes mellitus
534 in a primary health care programme in an informal setting. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2014;19:47–
535 57.
- 536 40. Heise L, Greene ME, Opper N, Stavropoulou M, Harper C, Nascimento M, et al. Gender
537 inequality and restrictive gender norms: framing the challenges to health. *The Lancet*.
538 2019;393:2440–54.
- 539 41. WHO. World Health Statistics 2019: Monitoring health for the SDGs [Internet]. WHO. 2019
540 [cited 2020 Apr 15]. Available from:
541 http://www.who.int/gho/publications/world_health_statistics/2019/en/

542

Table 1. Overview of Brazil HealthRise interventions

		Teófilo Otoni region	Vitória da Conquista
Technologies for care coordination	Common across sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equipped primary health care units with computers, notebooks, tablets, and internet; 	
	Site-specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed and implemented two Clinical Decision Support System for health providers' use, one for screening and one with web-based medical records which generates alerts, reminders, and an individualized therapeutic plan based on the information entered, in 34 health care units; Linked health facilities to Central Telehealth Units. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implemented Brazilian web-based medical record system (e-SUS) in 16 primary health care units; Developed digital screening and job aid tools on promoting healthy lifestyles for CHWs.
Healthcare service organization	Common across sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchased equipment for specialized exams (made available at secondary care level clinics) and supported teams with referral process; Evaluation and optimization of human resources and patient flows for a better organization of the care for hypertension and diabetes; 	
	Site-specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly web meetings with representatives of each municipality for evaluation of the processes and results of the intervention. Establishment of a routine for laboratory tests, including hiring a Laboratory to visit the remote municipalities and perform the exams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In agreement with the municipal health department, implemented one weekly shift for nurse consultations and two weekly shifts for medical consultations for patients with HTN and/or DM; Hired a physician and provided evening consultations at Social Service for Industries (SESI); Increased the number of specialists in cardiology, endocrinology, angiology, and ophthalmology to perform specialized exams.
Workforce development	Common across sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivered in-person skill-based training on HTN and DM care management and use of new technologies to all primary care providers and community-based health worker roles; Provided online courses focused on providing routine HTN and DM care, including strategies for disease management and healthy nutrition targeted to all primary care providers and community health workers. 	
	Site-specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed in-person training material; Developed web-based courses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Screening & recruitment	Common across sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performed community-based screening events. 	

	Site-specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented targeted household visits by CHWs for identification of new patients and eligible participants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workplace screening events at SESI.
Disease management & health promotion	Common across sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensured follow-up with patients who missed appointments, failed to pick up medications, and/or were not meeting treatment targets; • Reinforced home visits targeting patients with out of target blood pressure and glucose levels; • Increased the availability of specialized exams, including ECG, echocardiogram, fundus oculi photography, and A1c point-of-care; • Developed text message system to help foster adherence to treatment and regular consultations; as well as to promote healthy lifestyle habits. 	
	Site-specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoted cooking workshops and physical educational sessions supported by NASF teams. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented three outdoor gyms at primary health care units.
Patient empowerment & health education	Common across sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouraged the creation, expansion, and reorganization of support groups to allow patient exchange to improve self-care and health literacy, with an emphasis on healthy nutrition and habits; • Coordinated educational workshops; • Developed printed educational materials to be used during consultations and home visits. • Supported the creation of the municipal association for individuals with HTN and DM and assisted to engage them in the federal network of DM associations. 	
	Site-specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produced educational cartoons to be aired on waiting rooms.


544

545

Table 2. Summary of key themes, components, and quotes from qualitative data synthesized across Brazil HealthRise sites.

HealthRise thematic area component and contexts	Sample thematic quotes
Theme 1: Program strengths	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved provider experience from reorganized patient flows, new training opportunities, and increased availability of exams; • Introduction of tablets to aid in patient record-keeping and care decisions in Teófilo Otoni; • Implementation of Electronic Medical Records in Vitória da Conquista. 	<p><i>“HealthRise has brought some changes to our work process. It has changed some of the things that were not working before.” – FLHW</i></p> <p><i>“I think the EMR resulted in a better way of communicating about the patient...any professional can now access the information stored in there.” – FLHW</i></p> <p><i>“With the Decision Support System I feel more confident now, and I know exactly what I need to do.” – FLHW</i></p> <p><i>“In my opinion, one of the main goals of the project was to bring back to the system those patients who didn’t use to care about their diabetes or hypertension.” – CHW</i></p>
Theme 2: Patients experiences with HealthRise	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening events and educational activities identified as HealthRise-specific activities; • Increased access to specialized exams; • Positive view of new technologies for care coordination (i.e. tablets and computers). 	<p><i>“They got a device that you take home with you to monitor your blood pressure.” – Patient</i></p> <p><i>“The health fair was really good. There were some educational activities in there.” – Patient</i></p> <p><i>“It was because of this project that I found out about my condition.” – Patient</i></p> <p><i>“I was even able to get my eyes examined!” – Patient</i></p> <p><i>“Now I feel more confident. We need to go to the health unit frequently, to get some tests frequently, you need to collect blood more frequently as well.” – Patient</i></p> <p><i>“They didn’t use computers before and now they use it. And there is everything in there...the frequency we go to the health unit, the medication we take...” – Patient</i></p>
Theme 3: Remaining challenges	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of social determinants of health on NCD risk, onset, and treatment; • Barriers to disease management from local food culture and health system constraints; • Moderate-low knowledge about NCDs and low adherence to therapeutic plan 	<p><i>“I really like eating rice, but we can’t. But I eat it anyway.” – Patient</i></p> <p><i>“The main challenge is to bring the patient to the health unit.” – FLHW</i></p> <p><i>“Not always we can refer a patient to the nutritionist or to the physiotherapist, there are too many patients to such a reduced team.” – FLHW</i></p> <p><i>“The main barrier is to not have a doctor here every day. There is no pharmacist.” – Facility manager</i></p>
Theme 4: Recommendations for improvement	

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional training opportunities;• Strengthened care coordination with a focus on multidisciplinary approaches;• To overcome health systems obstacles to high quality care.	<p><i>“The trainings were good, but they need to be permanent...” – FLHW</i></p> <p><i>“A more intense multidisciplinary approach...I missed that a lot. A psychologist, a nutritionist...so that we could discuss the cases together.” – FLHW</i></p>
--	--



547

548

Figure 1. Flowchart of participants, by condition and site.





Figure 2. HealthRise screening and diagnosis outputs for Teófilo Otoni (A) and Vitória da Conquista (B).

A) Hypertension



B) Diabetes




Figure 3. HealthRise patient shifts in biomarker ranges between baseline and endline for hypertension (A) and diabetes (B). The height of each column reflects 100% of patients at each time point (baseline and endline), while the categories within each column represents the percentage of patients in each category at baseline and endline. Patient groups are color-coded by their categorization at endline (right column per site) and flow from their categorization at baseline (left column per site).