

1 **Increasing Postpartum Primary Care Engagement through Default Scheduling and**  
2 **Tailored Messaging: A Randomized Clinical Trial**

3  
4 Mark A. Clapp, MD MPH<sup>1,2</sup>  
5 Alaka Ray, MD<sup>1,2</sup>  
6 Pichliya Liang, BS<sup>1</sup>  
7 Kaitlyn E. James, PhD MPH<sup>1,2</sup>  
8 Ishani Ganguli, MD MPH<sup>2,3</sup>  
9 Jessica Cohen, PhD<sup>4</sup>

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

15  
16 Corresponding Author:  
17 Mark A Clapp, MD MPH  
18 45 Fruit Street  
19 Massachusetts General Hospital  
20 Boston, MA 02459  
21 [mark.clapp@mgh.harvard.edu](mailto:mark.clapp@mgh.harvard.edu)  
22 617-726-2000

23  
24 Word count  
25 Abstract: 420  
26 Main text: 3,499

27 **KEY POINTS**

28 Question: What is the impact of a behavioral economic intervention designed to reduce patient  
29 administrative burden and information gaps on primary care practitioner (PCP) visit completion  
30 in the postpartum period?

31 Findings: In this randomized clinical trial of 360 patients, default PCP scheduling, tailored  
32 messages, and reminders increased postpartum PCP visit rates by 19 percentage points for  
33 individuals with or at high risk for chronic disease.

34 Meaning: A multi-faceted and relatively low-resource behavioral economic intervention may  
35 improve postpartum health and well-being.

36 **ABSTRACT**

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

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

44 Design: Individual-level randomized controlled trial conducted from November 3, 2022 to  
45 October 11, 2023.

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

48 Participants: Participants included English- and Spanish-speaking pregnant or recently  
49 postpartum adults with obesity, anxiety, depression, diabetes mellitus, chronic hypertension,  
50 gestational diabetes, or pregnancy-related hypertension, and a primary care practitioner (PCP)  
51 listed in their electronic health record (EHR).

52 Intervention: A behavioral economics-informed intervention bundle, including default scheduling  
53 of postpartum PCP appointments and tailored messages.

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

56 Results: 360 patients were randomized (Control: N=176, Intervention: N=184). Individuals had  
57 mean (SD) age 34.1 (4.9) years and median gestational age of 36.3 weeks (interquartile range  
58 (IQR) 34.0-38.6 weeks) at enrollment. The distribution of self-reported races was 7.4% Asian,  
59 6.8% Black, 15.0% multiple races or "Other," and 68.6% White. Most (75.8%) participants had  
60 anxiety or depression, 15.9% had a chronic or pregnancy-related hypertensive disorder, 19.8%  
61 had pre-existing or gestational diabetes, and 40.4% had a pre-pregnancy BMI  $\geq 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>.

62 Medicaid was the primary payer for 21.9% of patients. PCP visit completion within 4 months  
63 occurred in 22.0% in the control group and 40.0% in the intervention group. In regression  
64 models accounting for randomization strata, the intervention increased PCP visit completion by  
65 18.7 percentage points (95%CI 10.7-29.1). Intervention participants also had fewer postpartum  
66 readmissions (1.7 vs. 5.8%) and increased receipt of the following services by a PCP: blood  
67 pressure screening (42.8 vs. 28.3%), weight assessment (42.8 vs. 27.7%), and depression  
68 screening (32.8 vs. 16.8%).

69 Conclusions and Relevance: In this randomized trial of pregnant individuals with or at risk for  
70 chronic health conditions, default PCP visit scheduling, tailored messages, and reminders  
71 substantially improved postpartum primary care engagement. The current lack of support for  
72 postpartum transitions to primary care is a missed opportunity to improve recently pregnant  
73 individual's short- and long-term health. Reducing patient administrative burdens may represent  
74 relatively low-resource, high-impact approaches to improving postpartum health and wellbeing.

75 Trial Registration: NCT05543265.

## 76 INTRODUCTION

77 Although the chronic disease burden in pregnancy is high and growing in the U.S., most  
78 people with chronic conditions do not effectively transition to primary care management  
79 following delivery.<sup>1-9</sup> Over 30% of pregnant people have diabetes, hypertension, or obesity, and  
80 11-22% have anxiety or depression.<sup>10-12</sup> Furthermore, common pregnancy-related conditions  
81 (e.g., gestational diabetes and pregnancy-related hypertension) confer an increased risk of  
82 developing chronic disease.<sup>13-18</sup> Strong evidence underpins the benefits of managing chronic  
83 conditions through primary care and of managing these conditions earlier in life.<sup>19-22</sup> However,  
84 while pregnant people with these conditions are often carefully monitored during pregnancy,  
85 many receive no routine care after their pregnancy, and nearly half of those with chronic  
86 conditions do not see their primary care practitioner (PCP) at all in the postpartum year.<sup>23</sup> The  
87 abrupt drop off from high health system engagement and motivation during pregnancy to limited  
88 or no health care encounters postpartum has been termed a “postpartum cliff.”<sup>24</sup> Low rates of  
89 postpartum primary care engagement reflect a missed opportunity to improve the prevention  
90 and management of chronic disease.

91 Postpartum transitions from obstetric to primary care are encouraged by guidelines yet  
92 stymied by numerous barriers. Specifically, obstetric clinical guidelines recommend that all  
93 individuals have a comprehensive postpartum visit within 12 weeks of their delivery; at that time,  
94 obstetric care clinicians typically counsel patients on the importance of ongoing primary care  
95 follow-up. Yet, a range of systemic, financial, and behavioral barriers often prevent postpartum  
96 people from effectively transitioning to primary care.<sup>25-29</sup> Patient administrative burden (e.g.,  
97 appointment scheduling, information seeking, insurance/billing issues) is increasingly  
98 recognized as a barrier to accessing care.<sup>30</sup> In a recent survey, 33% of patients reported that  
99 they delayed or did not seek health care because of the administrative burden.<sup>30</sup> The effects of  
100 this burden may be amplified in the postpartum period when new parents are sleep-deprived  
101 and face many competing demands, including caring for their newborn and family. This study

102 aimed to increase patient engagement in primary care after the immediate postpartum period for  
103 pregnant individuals with conditions that convey a long-term health risk by reducing  
104 administrative burden and motivating continued health activation through an intervention based  
105 on insights from behavioral economics.

106

## 107 **METHODS**

### 108 **Study Design**

109 This study was an individual-level, two-group, 1:1 stratified randomized controlled trial of  
110 the effectiveness of a behavioral economics-informed intervention to increase the rate of  
111 postpartum primary care visit completion. The study was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov  
112 (NCT05543265) on September 6, 2022, and conducted from November 3, 2022, to October 11,  
113 2023 (trial protocol and analysis plan included in Online Supplement). The Mass General  
114 Brigham Human Subjects Committee approved this study; participants provided verbal consent  
115 to participate. The Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) guidelines were  
116 followed in reporting the study and its results.

117

### 118 **Patient Eligibility**

119 Patients who had obesity (pre-pregnancy body mass index ( $\geq 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>)), anxiety or  
120 depressive mood disorder, type 1 or 2 diabetes mellitus, chronic hypertension, gestational  
121 diabetes, or pregnancy-related hypertension listed in their medical record were eligible to  
122 participate. Patients at high risk for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, defined as those who  
123 would be recommended for low-dose aspirin by US Preventative Services Task Force  
124 guidelines, were eligible. Patients with these conditions were prioritized for inclusion in the study  
125 as they were more likely to have ongoing care needs after pregnancy. Also, this study was  
126 limited to patients who had a PCP listed or identified in their medical record, as the barriers and  
127 solutions to post-delivery primary care re-engagement are different than establishing care with a

128 new PCP; a preliminary analysis of patients receiving obstetric care at the study institution  
129 revealed that 90% had a PCP listed in the EHR. Other eligibility criteria included: 1) pregnant or  
130 recently postpartum (defined as up to two weeks after their estimated due date (EDD)), 2)  
131 receipt of prenatal care at the study institution or its affiliated clinics, 3) enrolled and elected to  
132 receive messages in the study institution's EHR patient portal, 4) primary language of English or  
133 Spanish, 5) age  $\geq 18$  years at the time of enrollment, and 6) not actively undergoing a work-up  
134 for, or known to have, fetal demise at the time of enrollment.

135

### 136 **Enrollment and Randomization**

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

146

### 147 **Study Intervention**

148 The intervention was designed to increase the rate of postpartum primary care visit  
149 completion within 4 months after the patient's EDD. The bundle included a targeted introduction  
150 message about the importance of seeing their PCP after delivery and informed them that, to  
151 support them in this, a study staff member would be making an appointment on their behalf;  
152 they were allowed to opt-out or communicate about scheduling preferences. For those who did  
153 not opt-out, the study staff called the PCP office and requested that "health care maintenance"

154 or “annual visit” be scheduled within the target 4-month window. If a patient had already seen  
155 their PCP for an annual visit within the year, they were scheduled for this visit when they were  
156 next eligible (i.e., one year after their last annual exam), even if outside the 4-month study  
157 follow-up period. For those who had appointments scheduled, study-specific appointment  
158 reminders were sent approximately 1 month after the EDD and 1 week before the scheduled  
159 appointment via the EHR patient portal and SMS, both used salient labeling to describe the visit;  
160 examples are shown in Appendix (eFigure 1). If the PCP worked in the same health system and  
161 an appointment was scheduled, an electronic message was sent to the PCP from the study staff  
162 about the appointment scheduled by the study staff. For those for whom an appointment could  
163 not be scheduled, similar reminders were sent on the importance of PCP follow-up and  
164 encouraged the patient to contact their PCP’s office directly to schedule. Reminders included  
165 best practice wording from behavioral economic nudge “mega-studies,” including that the  
166 appointment had been “reserved for you.”<sup>31</sup> Using salient labeling, the appointment was  
167 described as the “Postpartum-to-Primary Care Transition Appointment.”

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

170

## 171 **Study Measures**

172 The primary outcome was completing a primary care visit for routine or chronic condition  
173 care within 4 months of the patient’s EDD. Specifically, we considered the outcome to have  
174 occurred if the patient attended a “health care maintenance” (i.e., “annual exam”) visit or a  
175 “problem-based visit” in which obesity, anxiety/depression, diabetes, or hypertension were  
176 addressed with a primary care clinician within 4 months after their EDD. This definition was  
177 chosen to include visits most likely to reflect primary care re-engagement after delivery instead  
178 of a visit for an acute illness or issue. This time frame was selected for two reasons: 1) to  
179 capitalize on the increased health activation and motivation that has been noted during



180 pregnancy and 2) because these patients were more likely to have conditions that required  
181 ongoing and active management outside of the traditional postpartum period (up to 12 weeks  
182 after delivery). We considered practitioners affiliated with internal medicine, family medicine,  
183 pediatric/adolescent medicine, and gynecology practices to provide primary care; however, we  
184 did not count designated postpartum visits to be primary care visits.

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

193 We examined secondary outcomes measuring unscheduled care: obstetric triage visit,  
194 emergency room or urgent care use, and readmission within 4 months after the delivery. We  
195 also measured the likelihood of a patient having a PCP visit that included specific primary care  
196 services within 4 months: weight screening, blood pressure screening, mood screening, plan for  
197 diabetes screening, plan for mental health care, and contraception planning. Content of care  
198 outcomes were also compared within population subgroups related to the eligibility health  
199 condition. All outcomes are defined in detail in Appendix (eTable 1).

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

204

205 **Sample Size Calculation**

206           Based on a historical cohort, we estimated that 33% of the targeted study population  
207 would have a PCP visit within 4 months of delivery. We estimated the intervention would  
208 increase the rate of PCP visit attendance by at least 15 percentage points, a conservative  
209 estimate based on a prior study that examined the impact of default scheduling of postpartum  
210 obstetric care appointments (24 percentage point increase).<sup>32</sup> Assuming an alpha of 0.05 and  
211 power of 80% and using a two-sided z-test, 334 patients were needed to detect a 15-  
212 percentage point difference. To account for individuals who may be lost to follow-up or withdraw,  
213 we planned to randomize 360 patients.

214

## 215 **Statistical Analysis**

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

224           A heterogeneity analysis was performed to understand the potential impact of the  
225 intervention among patient factors known or hypothesized to be disproportionately affected by  
226 administrative burdens. The primary outcome was compared among subgroups based on site of  
227 prenatal care (hospital- vs. community-based clinic), chronic conditions (anxiety/depression,  
228 diabetes, hypertension, obesity, and multi-morbidity, defined as >1 of the listed conditions), race  
229 (self-described Asian, Black, White, Other or multiple races), ethnicity (self-described Hispanic  
230 or non-Hispanic), individual earnings/income (<\$30,000, \$30-75,000, or >\$75,000), primary

231 payer for delivery hospitalization (Medicaid or Private/Other), and self-reported physical and  
232 mental health status at time of enrollment.<sup>30,33</sup>

233 Stata 16.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX) was used for the analysis. P-values were  
234 reported for the primary outcome; a p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. As  
235 this project was not designed to have statistical power to detect the intervention's impact on  
236 secondary outcomes or differences across subgroups, a plan for multiple hypothesis testing was  
237 not planned or prespecified. Results from secondary analyses are presented with 95%  
238 confidence intervals that are not adjusted for multiple hypothesis testing. These secondary  
239 analyses should be considered exploratory, and results may not be reproducible.

240

## 241 **RESULTS**

242 Initially, 574 patients were identified as likely to be eligible based on pre-defined eligibility  
243 filters within the EHR (Figure 1). Upon chart review, 35 were determined ineligible. Of those  
244 confirmed eligible, 77 could not be contacted and 102 declined. 360 patients were randomized:  
245 176 to the control group and 184 to the intervention group. Six patients were excluded from the  
246 final analysis because they transferred their care to another institution before delivery (3 in each  
247 group). One patient in the intervention group withdrew from the study before the end of the  
248 follow-up period. The final number of patients analyzed in each group was 173 in the control  
249 group and 180 in the intervention group. Among study participants, 345/353 (97.7%) accessed  
250 study-related messages in the online patient portal. The proportion of patients in the intervention  
251 group who received each component of the intervention bundle is included in the Appendix  
252 (eTable 2); the study staff scheduled appointments for 137 participants (76.1%), of whom only 6  
253 (4.4%) did not present for or cancel their appointment. The most common reason the study staff  
254 did not schedule an appointment was that a PCP appointment was already scheduled 21/43  
255 (49%) (see eTable 3 for the full list). Of all participants, 61.8% completed the online electronic  
256 survey 5 months after the EDD.

257           The intervention and control groups were balanced in all baseline patient characteristics  
258 (Table 1). Individuals included in the trial had mean (SD) age of 34.1 (4.9) years old and median  
259 gestational age of 36.3 weeks (interquartile range (IQR) 34-38.6 weeks) at enrollment. The  
260 distribution of self-reported races was 7.4% Asian, 6.8% Black, 15.0% multiple races or “Other,”  
261 and 68.6% White; 2.3% declined to report their race. The distribution of self-reported ethnicities  
262 was 22.1% Hispanic ethnicity and 75.4% non-Hispanic ethnicity; 2.5% declined to report their  
263 ethnicity. Of the eligibility conditions, which were not mutually exclusive, 75.8% of all participants  
264 had anxiety or depression, 15.9% had a chronic or pregnancy-related hypertensive disorder,  
265 19.8% had pre-existing or gestational diabetes, and 40.4% had a pre-pregnancy BMI  $\geq 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>.  
266 Medicaid was the primary payer for the delivery encounter for 21.9% of patients. When  
267 surveyed, 11.6% reported their physical health and 19.6% reported their mental health as “fair”  
268 or “poor” condition. At enrollment, 34.3% had not seen any PCP within the prior 3 years, and  
269 29.2% were receiving obstetric care at one of the hospital’s satellite or affiliated health center  
270 clinics.

271           Table 2 shows the effects of the intervention on completion of a primary care visit for  
272 routine or chronic condition care within 4 months of the patient’s EDD. This primary outcome  
273 occurred in 40.0% (95% confidence interval (CI) 33.1-47.4%) of the intervention group and  
274 22.0% (95%CI 6.4-28.8%) of the control group ( $p < 0.001$ ). When adjusting for pre-specified  
275 randomization strata, the intervention increased the primary outcome by 18.7 percentage points  
276 (pp) (95%CI 9.1-28.2 pp). The effects on the primary outcome were similar in the sensitivity  
277 analyses (Table 3). There were no effects on obstetric triage visits or emergency or urgent care  
278 use. However, the intervention group had fewer postpartum readmissions: 1.7% (95%CI 0.5-  
279 5.1%) vs. 5.8% (95%CI 3.1-10.4%).

280           Figure 2 compares the secondary outcomes related to the content or provision of care  
281 between the two groups. Intervention group participants had higher likelihood of having a PCP  
282 visit with a weight screening (42.8 (95%CI 35.7-50.1 %) vs. 27.7% (95%CI 21.6-34.9%)), blood

283 pressure screening (42.8 (95%CI 35.7-50.1%) vs. 28.3% (95%CI 22.1-35.1%)), and mood  
284 screening (32.8 (95%CI 26.3-40.0%) vs. 16.8% (95%CI 11.9-23.1%)). Intervention group  
285 participants were also more likely to have a PCP visit with a plan documented about their  
286 mental health (37.2 (95%CI 30.5-44.5%) vs. 23.1% (95%CI 17.4-30.0%)) and with a  
287 documented contraception plan (19.4 (95%CI 14.3-25.9%) vs 11.0% (95%CI 7.1-16.6%)). There  
288 was no difference in a documented plan for diabetes screening between the two groups.  
289 Comparisons of the secondary outcomes related to the content of care among subgroups of  
290 health conditions are shown in eTable 4 in the Appendix; many were limited by small sample  
291 sizes.

292 There was treatment effect heterogeneity across health conditions, demographic  
293 characteristics, and baseline self-reported physical and mental health (eTable 5). While the  
294 study was not powered to detect outcomes within subgroups, the intervention was associated  
295 with increases in PCP visits among nearly all subgroups examined.

296

## 297 **DISCUSSION**

298 Among pregnant people with common comorbidities, a behavioral economics-informed  
299 intervention bundle, including default appointment scheduling, tailored messaging, and nudge  
300 reminders, increased PCP visit completion within 4 months postpartum by approximately 20  
301 percentage points, a nearly 2-fold increase. The primary finding was robust to multiple  
302 definitions or variations of the primary outcome, including self-reported PCP visit attendance.  
303 The effects on the primary outcome appeared largely consistent among population subgroups,  
304 though small sample sizes limited power in these comparisons. Not only did the intervention  
305 increase PCP visit completion, but it also resulted in more individuals receiving important  
306 screening tests and services. There were no observed changes in emergent or urgent care  
307 visits between the two groups. However, any potential effects of facilitated primary care

308 engagement on emergent care use are more likely to occur later in the postpartum year or  
309 beyond, and we intend to measure longer-term care utilization and outcomes in future studies.

310 Our results suggest that behavioral economic-informed interventions that reduce patient  
311 administrative burden have the potential to be relatively low-resource, high-impact approaches  
312 to increasing primary care use, a critical priority in the context of declining and inequitable  
313 primary care engagement in the U.S.<sup>34,35</sup> Behavioral economics research examines how people  
314 make predictable decision errors and tests interventions that leverage these insights to remove  
315 behavioral barriers (“nudges”).<sup>36–46</sup> These interventions often try to make it easier for people to  
316 make choices they already want to undertake but do not. In-kind, the underlying hypothesis of  
317 the present study was that many postpartum individuals with or at high risk for chronic  
318 conditions who have a PCP assigned want to be under the care of their PCP but face multiple  
319 barriers to primary care engagement in the postpartum period, including identifying who their  
320 PCP is and scheduling with them. Our study design was built to address two common  
321 behavioral barriers, namely, inattention and status-quo bias, and demonstrated how default  
322 primary care appointment scheduling, a salient label for the appointment, and tailored SMS  
323 messages and appointment reminders can increase postpartum primary care engagement.  
324 Similar approaches have effectively motivated other health behaviors, including in obstetric and  
325 postpartum care.<sup>46–50</sup>

326 This study builds on prior efforts to improve postpartum health and wellbeing.<sup>51–58</sup> Our  
327 study is most closely aligned with the intervention research on postpartum care navigation, in  
328 which patient navigators identify and holistically address patient-level barriers to care and assist  
329 with care coordination.<sup>51,59</sup> Although obstetric care navigators hold great promise for improving  
330 postpartum health care use, that level of intervention intensity and cost may not be necessary  
331 for most postpartum people needing primary care. Results from this study suggest that reducing  
332 some patient administrative barriers may be a relatively resource-conscious but highly effective  
333 approach to encouraging postpartum primary care transitions. Specifically, we demonstrated

334 this intervention could be delivered consistently, with the successful scheduling of an “annual  
335 visit” appointment for 76% of participants and a low “no-show” appointment rate of only 4%.  
336 Future work should focus on examining the health impacts and cost-effectiveness of the  
337 intervention.

### 338 Limitations

339 The study had several limitations. First, the study tested a bundled intervention; we were  
340 unable to measure the effectiveness of the individual components for increasing PCP visits.  
341 Next, we observed health care encounters within a single health system, though the health  
342 system is large (>1,300 PCPs). This study was also conducted in Massachusetts, in which  
343 pregnancy-related Medicaid coverage extends for 12 months postpartum and may impact the  
344 generalizability of our findings. We could not observe PCP visits for clinicians who do not use or  
345 are not affiliated with the health system's common EHR (Epic). As an alternate measure, we did  
346 examine self-reports of PCP visits, which was highly consistent with results using EHR data.  
347 However, the response rate of approximately 62% (balanced across treatment and control  
348 groups) may also limit generalizability of self-reported outcomes. This study focused on  
349 individuals who had an identified PCP at enrollment; given the limited availability of PCPs in  
350 certain areas, the effect of the intervention may be lessened for individuals seeking to establish  
351 care with a new PCP. Last, the study was not powered to detect differences in many secondary  
352 outcomes related to the content of primary care within health conditions, and larger studies are  
353 needed to ascertain the impact of the intervention on the quality of primary care for specific  
354 conditions.

### 355 Conclusions

356 In conclusion, a behavioral economics-informed intervention to improve postpartum  
357 transitions to primary care substantially increased postpartum primary care visit completion for  
358 patients with or at risk for common comorbidities. Targeting this population at a time of high  
359 health activation and motivation, this intervention represents a potentially scalable approach to

360 increasing primary care engagement and ongoing health condition management in the  
361 postpartum months and beyond. Ongoing follow-up related to this study seeks to analyze the  
362 intervention's impact on condition-specific management (i.e., the content and quality of care  
363 provided in the postpartum period) and its long-term impact on health outcomes. Similarly, as  
364 many individuals still did not attend a PCP appointment within 4 months, even with the  
365 assistance of this intervention, additional investigations should focus on identifying and  
366 addressing remaining barriers to transitioning to primary care after pregnancy.



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

370  
371 Presentations: Initial results from this study were presented at the University of Pennsylvania  
372 Center for Health Incentives and Behavioral Economics Research Conference (October 30,  
373 2023; Philadelphia, PA), the 2023 Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management  
374 (APPAM) Fall Research Conference (November 9-11, 2023; Atlanta, GA) and the American  
375 Economic Association Annual Meeting (January 5-7, 2024; San Antonio, TX). The study will be  
376 presented at the 2024 American Society for Health Economists conference (June 16-19, 2024;  
377 San Diego, CA).

378  
379 Previous Publication: A version of this manuscript was posted on the preprint server medrxiv.org  
380 (<https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.21.24301585>) so that it could be referenced in a recent grant  
381 proposal.

382  
383 Funding: This study was funded by the National Institute on Aging via the MIT Roybal Center for  
384 Translational Research to Improve Health Care for the Aging (P30AG064190) and the NBER  
385 Roybal Center for Behavior Change in Health (P30AG034532). Dr. Ganguli was supported by  
386 K23AG068240 from the National Institute on Aging. Additional support was provided by the  
387 National Academy of Medicine's Health Catalyst Award. The funders had no role in the design  
388 and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data;  
389 preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or the decision to submit the manuscript for  
390 publication.

391

392 Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Hasan Quadri and Fowsia Warsame for  
393 assisting in conducting this trial and Amanda Lee and Fatima Vakil from J-PAL North America for  
394 providing Research Management Support. Drs. Clapp and Cohen had full access to all the data  
395 in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data  
396 analysis.

397  
398 Data Sharing Statement: Primary data and source code will be made publicly available at the  
399 Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab Dataverse (<https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/jpal>)  
400 once planned secondary analyses have been completed (expected by August 2026).

401 **REFERENCES**

- 402
- 403 1. Admon LK, Winkelman TNA, Moniz MH, Davis MM, Heisler M, Dalton VK. Disparities in  
404 Chronic Conditions Among Women Hospitalized for Delivery in the United States, 2005-  
405 2014. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2017;130(6):1319-1326. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002357
- 406 2. Bateman BT, Bansil P, Hernandez-Diaz S, Mhyre JM, Callaghan WM, Kuklina EV.  
407 Prevalence, trends, and outcomes of chronic hypertension: a nationwide sample of delivery  
408 admissions. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2012;206(2):134.e1-8. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2011.10.878
- 409 3. Bardenheier BH, Imperatore G, Gilboa SM, et al. Trends in Gestational Diabetes Among  
410 Hospital Deliveries in 19 U.S. States, 2000-2010. *Am J Prev Med.* 2015;49(1):12-19.  
411 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2015.01.026
- 412 4. Flegal KM, Carroll MD, Kit BK, Ogden CL. Prevalence of Obesity and Trends in the  
413 Distribution of Body Mass Index Among US Adults, 1999-2010. *JAMA.* 2012;307(5):491-  
414 497. doi:10.1001/jama.2012.39
- 415 5. Li M, Gong W, Wang S, Li Z. Trends in body mass index, overweight and obesity among  
416 adults in the USA, the NHANES from 2003 to 2018: a repeat cross-sectional survey. *BMJ  
417 Open.* 2022;12(12):e065425. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-065425
- 418 6. Fisher SC, Kim SY, Sharma AJ, Rochat R, Morrow B. Is obesity still increasing among  
419 pregnant women? Prepregnancy obesity trends in 20 states, 2003–2009. *Prev Med.*  
420 2013;56(6):372-378. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2013.02.015
- 421 7. Thomas DT, Benson G, Gan A, Schwager S, Okeson B, Baechler CJ. Fourth Trimester:  
422 Assessing Women’s Health Equity and Long-Term Cardiovascular Outcomes in a Large  
423 Midwestern Health System in 2021. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes.*  
424 2024;17(1):e010157. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.123.010157
- 425 8. Lewey J, Levine LD, Yang L, Triebwasser JE, Groeneveld PW. Patterns of Postpartum  
426 Ambulatory Care Follow-up Care Among Women With Hypertensive Disorders of  
427 Pregnancy. *Journal of the American Heart Association.* 2020;9(17):e016357.  
428 doi:10.1161/JAHA.120.016357
- 429 9. D’Amico R, Dalmacy D, Akinduro JA, et al. Patterns of Postpartum Primary Care Follow-up  
430 and Diabetes-Related Care After Diagnosis of Gestational Diabetes. *JAMA Network Open.*  
431 2023;6(2):e2254765. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.54765
- 432 10. NVSS - Birth Data. Published April 10, 2023. Accessed May 1, 2023.  
433 <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/births.htm>
- 434 11. Bauman BL. Vital Signs: Postpartum Depressive Symptoms and Provider Discussions  
435 About Perinatal Depression — United States, 2018. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.*  
436 2020;69. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6919a2
- 437 12. Rokicki S, Steenland MW, Geiger CK, et al. Trends in postpartum mental health care before  
438 and during COVID-19. *Health Serv Res.* 2022;57(6):1342-1347. doi:10.1111/1475-  
439 6773.14051

- 440 13. Gestational Hypertension and Preeclampsia: ACOG Practice Bulletin, Number 222. *Obstet*  
441 *Gynecol.* 2020;135(6):e237-e260. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003891
- 442 14. Vounzoulaki E, Khunti K, Abner SC, Tan BK, Davies MJ, Gillies CL. Progression to type 2  
443 diabetes in women with a known history of gestational diabetes: systematic review and  
444 meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2020;369:m1361. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1361
- 445 15. Diaz-Santana MV, O'Brien KM, Park YMM, Sandler DP, Weinberg CR. Persistence of Risk  
446 for Type 2 Diabetes After Gestational Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Care.* 2022;45(4):864-870.  
447 doi:10.2337/dc21-1430
- 448 16. Wang YX, Arvizu M, Rich-Edwards JW, et al. Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy and  
449 Subsequent Risk of Premature Mortality. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2021;77(10):1302-1312.  
450 doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2021.01.018
- 451 17. Wu P, Haththotuwa R, Kwok CS, et al. Preeclampsia and Future Cardiovascular Health: A  
452 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes.*  
453 2017;10(2):e003497. doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.116.003497
- 454 18. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 190: Gestational Diabetes Mellitus. *Obstet Gynecol.*  
455 2018;131(2):e49-e64. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002501
- 456 19. Ashburner JM, Horn DM, O'Keefe SM, et al. Chronic disease outcomes from primary care  
457 population health program implementation. *Am J Manag Care.* 2017;23(12):728-735.
- 458 20. Sung NJ, Markuns JF, Park KH, Kim K, Lee H, Lee JH. Higher quality primary care is  
459 associated with good self-rated health status. *Fam Pract.* 2013;30(5):568-575.  
460 doi:10.1093/fampra/cmt021
- 461 21. Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health.  
462 *Milbank Q.* 2005;83(3):457-502. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0009.2005.00409.x
- 463 22. Hughes LS, Cohen DJ, Phillips RL Jr. Strengthening Primary Care to Improve Health  
464 Outcomes in the US—Creating Oversight to Address Invisibility. *JAMA Health Forum.*  
465 2022;3(9):e222903. doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2022.2903
- 466 23. Bennett WL, Chang HY, Levine DM, et al. Utilization of primary and obstetric care after  
467 medically complicated pregnancies: an analysis of medical claims data. *J Gen Intern Med.*  
468 2014;29(4):636-645. doi:10.1007/s11606-013-2744-2
- 469 24. Cohen JL, Daw JR. Postpartum Cliffs—Missed Opportunities to Promote Maternal Health in  
470 the United States. *JAMA Health Forum.* 2021;2(12):e214164.  
471 doi:10.1001/jamahealthforum.2021.4164
- 472 25. Bellerose M, Rodriguez M, Vivier PM. A systematic review of the qualitative literature on  
473 barriers to high-quality prenatal and postpartum care among low-income women. *Health*  
474 *Services Research.* 2022;57(4):775-785. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.14008
- 475 26. Ruderman RS, Dahl EC, Williams BR, et al. Provider Perspectives on Barriers and  
476 Facilitators to Postpartum Care for Low-Income Individuals. *Womens Health Rep (New*  
477 *Rochelle).* 2021;2(1):254-262. doi:10.1089/whr.2021.0009

- 478 27. Admon LK, Daw JR, Interrante JD, Ibrahim BB, Millette MJ, Kozhimannil KB. Rural and  
479 Urban Differences in Insurance Coverage at Prepregnancy, Birth, and Postpartum.  
480 *Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2023;141(3):570. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000005081
- 481 28. Johnston EM, McMorrow S, Alvarez Caraveo C, Dubay L. Post-ACA, More Than One-Third  
482 Of Women With Prenatal Medicaid Remained Uninsured Before Or After Pregnancy. *Health*  
483 *Affairs*. 2021;40(4):571-578. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2020.01678
- 484 29. Saldanha IJ, Adam GP, Kanaan G, et al. Health Insurance Coverage and Postpartum  
485 Outcomes in the US: A Systematic Review. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(6):e2316536.  
486 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.16536
- 487 30. Kyle MA, Frakt AB. Patient administrative burden in the US health care system. *Health Serv*  
488 *Res*. 2021;56(5):755-765. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.13861
- 489 31. Milkman KL, Patel MS, Gandhi L, et al. A megastudy of text-based nudges encouraging  
490 patients to get vaccinated at an upcoming doctor's appointment. *Proceedings of the*  
491 *National Academy of Sciences*. 2021;118(20):e2101165118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2101165118
- 492 32. Polk S, Edwardson J, Lawson S, et al. Bridging the Postpartum Gap: A Randomized  
493 Controlled Trial to Improve Postpartum Visit Attendance Among Low-Income Women with  
494 Limited English Proficiency. *Women's Health Reports*. 2021;2(1):381-388.  
495 doi:10.1089/whr.2020.0123
- 496 33. Sav A, Whitty JA, McMillan SS, et al. Treatment Burden and Chronic Illness: Who is at Most  
497 Risk? *Patient*. 2016;9(6):559-569. doi:10.1007/s40271-016-0175-y
- 498 34. Ganguli I, Lee TH, Mehrotra A. Evidence and Implications Behind a National Decline in  
499 Primary Care Visits. *J GEN INTERN MED*. 2019;34(10):2260-2263. doi:10.1007/s11606-  
500 019-05104-5
- 501 35. Rao A, Shi Z, Ray KN, Mehrotra A, Ganguli I. National Trends in Primary Care Visit Use and  
502 Practice Capabilities, 2008-2015. *The Annals of Family Medicine*. 2019;17(6):538-544.  
503 doi:10.1370/afm.2474
- 504 36. Rice T. The Behavioral Economics of Health and Health Care. *Annual Review of Public*  
505 *Health*. 2013;34(1):431-447. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031912-114353
- 506 37. Jenssen BP, Buttenheim AM, Fiks AG. Using Behavioral Economics to Encourage Parent  
507 Behavior Change: Opportunities to Improve Clinical Effectiveness. *Acad Pediatr*.  
508 2019;19(1):4-10. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2018.08.010
- 509 38. Matjasko JL, Cawley JH, Baker-Goering MM, Yokum DV. Applying Behavioral Economics to  
510 Public Health Policy. *Am J Prev Med*. 2016;50(5 Suppl 1):S13-S19.  
511 doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2016.02.007
- 512 39. Milkman KL, Gromet D, Ho H, et al. Megastudies improve the impact of applied behavioural  
513 science. *Nature*. 2021;600(7889):478-483. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-04128-4
- 514 40. Chapman GB, Li M, Colby H, Yoon H. Opting in vs opting out of influenza vaccination.  
515 *JAMA*. 2010;304(1):43-44. doi:10.1001/jama.2010.892

- 516 41. Waddell KJ, Mehta SJ. Designing Effective and Appropriate Opt-Out Approaches for Patient  
517 Outreach. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2023;183(11):1194-1195.  
518 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2023.4628
- 519 42. Mehta SJ, Khan T, Guerra C, et al. A Randomized Controlled Trial of Opt-in Versus Opt-Out  
520 Colorectal Cancer Screening Outreach. *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2018;113(12):1848-1854.  
521 doi:10.1038/s41395-018-0151-3
- 522 43. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine; Division of Behavioral and  
523 Social Sciences and Education; Board on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences;  
524 Committee on Future Directions for Applying Behavioral Economics to Policy. *Behavioral*  
525 *Economics: Policy Impact and Future Directions.* (Beatty A, Moffitt R, Buttenheim A, eds.).  
526 National Academies Press (US); 2023. Accessed February 16, 2024.  
527 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK591019/>
- 528 44. Gelfand SD. The Meta-Nudge - A Response to the Claim That the Use of Nudges During the  
529 Informed Consent Process is Unavoidable. *Bioethics.* 2016;30(8):601-608.  
530 doi:10.1111/bioe.12266
- 531 45. Ghebreyesus TA. Using behavioural science for better health. *Bull World Health Organ.*  
532 2021;99(11):755. doi:10.2471/BLT.21.287387
- 533 46. Sabety A, Gruber J, Bae JY, Sood R. Reducing Frictions in Health Care Access: The  
534 ActionHealthNYC Experiment for Undocumented Immigrants. *American Economic Review:*  
535 *Insights.* 2023;5(3):327-346. doi:10.1257/aeri.20220126
- 536 47. Bogale B, Mørkrid K, O'Donnell B, et al. Development of a targeted client communication  
537 intervention for pregnant and post-partum women: a descriptive study. *Lancet.* 2021;398  
538 Suppl 1:S18. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01504-X
- 539 48. South EC, Lee K, Oyekanmi K, et al. Nurtured in Nature: a Pilot Randomized Controlled  
540 Trial to Increase Time in Greenspace among Urban-Dwelling Postpartum Women. *J Urban*  
541 *Health.* 2021;98(6):822-831. doi:10.1007/s11524-021-00544-z
- 542 49. McConnell M, Rothschild CW, Ettenger A, Muigai F, Cohen J. Free contraception and  
543 behavioural nudges in the postpartum period: evidence from a randomised control trial in  
544 Nairobi, Kenya. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2018;3(5):e000888. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000888
- 545 50. Triebwasser JE, Lewey J, Walheim L, Sehdev HM, Srinivas SK. Electronic Reminder to  
546 Transition Care After Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy: A Randomized Controlled Trial.  
547 *Obstet Gynecol.* 2023;142(1):91-98. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000005237
- 548 51. Yee LM, Martinez NG, Nguyen AT, Hajjar N, Chen MJ, Simon MA. Using a Patient Navigator  
549 to Improve Postpartum Care in an Urban Women's Health Clinic. *Obstet Gynecol.*  
550 2017;129(5):925-933. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000001977
- 551 52. Himes KP, Donovan H, Wang S, Weaver C, Grove JR, Facco FL. Healthy Beyond  
552 Pregnancy, a Web-Based Intervention to Improve Adherence to Postpartum Care:  
553 Randomized Controlled Feasibility Trial. *JMIR Human Factors.* 2017;4(4):e7964.  
554 doi:10.2196/humanfactors.7964

- 555 53. Kabakian-Khasholian T, Campbell OMR. A simple way to increase service use: triggers of  
556 women's uptake of postpartum services. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics &*  
557 *Gynaecology*. 2005;112(9):1315-1321. doi:10.1111/j.1471-0528.2004.00507.x
- 558 54. Polk S, Edwardson J, Lawson S, et al. Bridging the Postpartum Gap: A Randomized  
559 Controlled Trial to Improve Postpartum Visit Attendance Among Low-Income Women with  
560 Limited English Proficiency. *Women's Health Reports*. 2021;2(1):381-388.  
561 doi:10.1089/whr.2020.0123
- 562 55. Attanasio LB, Ranchoff BL, Cooper MI, Geissler KH. Postpartum Visit Attendance in the  
563 United States: A Systematic Review. *Women's Health Issues*. 2022;32(4):369-375.  
564 doi:10.1016/j.whi.2022.02.002
- 565 56. Wilcox A, Levi EE, Garrett JM. Predictors of Non-Attendance to the Postpartum Follow-up  
566 Visit. *Matern Child Health J*. 2016;20(1):22-27. doi:10.1007/s10995-016-2184-9
- 567 57. Masho SW, Cha S, Karjane N, et al. Correlates of Postpartum Visits Among Medicaid  
568 Recipients: An Analysis Using Claims Data from a Managed Care Organization. *Journal of*  
569 *Women's Health*. 2018;27(6):836-843. doi:10.1089/jwh.2016.6137
- 570 58. Soffer MD, Rekawek P, Pan S, Overbey J, Stone J. Improving Postpartum Attendance  
571 among Women with Gestational Diabetes Using the Medical Home Model of Care. *Am J*  
572 *Perinatol*. 2023;40(3):313-318. doi:10.1055/s-0041-1727216
- 573 59. McKenney KM, Martinez NG, Yee LM. Patient navigation across the spectrum of women's  
574 health care in the United States. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;218(3):280-286.  
575 doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2017.08.009
- 576  
577

578 **TABLES**

579

580 **Table 1.** Baseline Characteristics of the Analytical Sample

581

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



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

582  
583 <sup>a</sup> Self-reported.  
584 <sup>b</sup> Patients could select "Other" as a race option if they did not self-identify with the other options: American  
585 Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White.  
586 Abbreviation: PCP, Primary care practitioner  
587

588 **Table 2. Effects on Care Utilization**

589

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

590

591 Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval; EDD, estimated due date; PCP, Primary care practitioner.

592 More descriptive definitions for all outcomes are included in the Appendix (eTable 2).

593

594 <sup>a</sup> To account for randomization strata, regressions include indicator variables for whether or not the  
 595 participant had any PCP visit in the 3 years before randomization and whether the participant received  
 596 prenatal care from a hospital or health center.

597

598

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

600

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

601

602 <sup>a</sup> To account for randomization strata, regressions include indicator variables for whether or not the  
603 participant had any PCP visit in the 3 years before randomization and whether the participant received  
604 prenatal care from a hospital or health center.


605

606 **FIGURES**

607

608 **Figure 1. Consort Diagram**


609



610

611

612 **Figure 2. Effects on Content of Care Received by a Primary Care Practitioner**  
613



614  
615  
616 The figure presents the effects of the intervention on the percent of participants in each arm who had a  
617 primary care practitioner (PCP) visit that included the receipt of individual services (as listed in the  
618 horizontal axis) within 4 months postpartum. Outcomes are not contingent on having a primary care visit.