

1 Title Page

2 Title: Individual-level and neighborhood-level factors associated with longitudinal
3 changes in cardiometabolic measures in participants of a care coordination program

4 Short title: Cardiometabolic outcomes with care coordination

5 Sonal J Patil^{1*}, Mojgan Golzy², Angela Johnson³, Yan Wang¹, Jerry C Parker⁴, Debra
6 Haire-Joshu⁵, David R Mehr¹, Randi E Foraker^{6¶}, Robin L Kruse^{1¶}

7 ¹Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Missouri, Columbia,
8 Missouri.

9 ²Biostatistics and Research Design Unit, School of Medicine, University of Missouri,
10 Columbia, Missouri

11 ³Center for Applied Research and Engagement Systems (CARES), University of
12 Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

13 ⁴Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Missouri, Columbia,
14 Missouri

15 ⁵Brown School at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri

16 ⁶Division of General Medical Sciences, School of Medicine, Washington University, St.
17 Louis, Missouri

18 *Corresponding author information:

19 Email: patilso@health.missouri.edu (SJP)

21 ¶ RF and RK are Joint Senior Authors

25 **Abstract:**

26 **Introduction:** Identifying individual and neighborhood-level factors associated with less
27 improvement or worsening cardiometabolic measures in participants of clinic-based
28 interventions may help identify candidates for supplementary community-based
29 interventions.

30 **Methods:** *Study design:* Secondary data analysis of data from care coordination
31 program cohort, **L**everaging **I**nformation Technology to **G**uide **H**igh **T**ech, **H**igh **T**ouch
32 Care (LIGHT²). *Participants:* Medicare, Medicaid, or dual-eligible adults from the
33 University of Missouri Health System enrolled in LIGHT². *Intervention:* Nurse-led care
34 coordination in ten primary care clinics. *Outcomes:* Hemoglobin A1C, low-density-
35 lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, and blood pressure. Multivariable generalized linear
36 regression models assessed changes in outcomes after adjusting for clinical and
37 sociodemographic factors, neighborhood-level factors, and driving time to primary care
38 clinics.

39 **Results:** 6378 participants had pre-and post-intervention cardiometabolic measures
40 reported (61% women, 86.3% White, non-Hispanic ethnicity, mean age 62.7 [SD, 18.5]
41 years). In adjusted models, pre-intervention measures and female gender were
42 associated with worsening of all cardiometabolic measures. Women's LDL-cholesterol
43 worsened compared to men irrespective of pre-intervention levels (β 7.87, 95% CI 5.24

44 to 10.5, $p < .001$). Women with hemoglobin A1C $> 6.8\%$ had worsening hemoglobin A1C
45 compared to men (main effect $\beta -1.28$, 95% CI -1.95 to -0.61, $p < .001$; interaction effect
46 $\beta 0.19$, 95% CI 0.09 to 0.28, $p < .001$). Women with systolic blood pressure > 121 mm of
47 Hg had worsening diastolic blood pressure compared to men (main effect $\beta -5.42$, 95%
48 CI -9.8 to 0.098, $p = 0.016$; interaction effect $\beta 0.04$, 95% CI 0.01 to 0.078, $p = 0.009$).
49 Adding neighborhood-level factors or driving time to primary care clinics did not improve
50 the overall fit of the models.

51 **Conclusions:** In a solely clinic-based care coordination program, increasing baseline
52 cardiometabolic measures and female gender were associated with worsening
53 cardiometabolic outcomes. Further research to understand the causes of these
54 associations may help tailor clinic-community-linked interventions.

55

56

57 Introduction

58 Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is the leading cause of death in the US, and
59 cardiometabolic risk factors for CVD are prevalent and well-known.[1, 2] Despite the
60 availability of effective treatments, significant disparities in CVD and cardiometabolic
61 outcomes persist.[3-6] Care coordination can deliver better access and quality of care,
62 and community-based interventions can empower patients to address social and
63 behavioral determinants of cardiometabolic outcomes.[7-12] However, care coordination
64 research has primarily focused on healthcare costs with inconsistent results.[13-18] On
65 the other hand, clinical translation of successful multilevel clinic-community-linked
66 interventions that reduce cardiometabolic health disparities has been challenging.[9, 19-
67 21] Most primary care practices do not have time or resources to offer widespread care
68 coordination, individual-level social risk screenings, and community-based care.[20, 22-
69 26] Identifying those who do not benefit from clinic-based interventions can help focus
70 clinic and community-based resources.

71 We sought to identify potential candidates and high burden communities with
72 cardiometabolic disparities for community-based interventions.[11] We aimed to identify
73 individual and neighborhood-level factors associated with less improvement or
74 worsening cardiometabolic outcomes after participation in a 2-year clinic-based nurse-
75 led care coordination program. We hypothesized that worsening cardiometabolic

76 measures would be associated with living in an area with higher social risks or longer
77 driving time to primary care clinic locations.

78 **Methods**

79 We performed a secondary analysis of data from a prospective cohort of University
80 of Missouri Healthcare (MUHC) system patients enrolled in the **L**everaging **I**nformation
81 Technology to **G**uide **H**igh **T**ech, **H**igh **T**ouch Care (LIGHT²) project from July 1, 2013,
82 to June 30, 2015.[27] The University of Missouri institutional review board determined
83 the LIGHT² program to be a quality improvement activity not requiring institutional
84 review board review. We used the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational
85 Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guidelines for this study.[28]

86 **Study design and setting**

87 Funded with a Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) innovation
88 award, the LIGHT² program was a combination of information technology components
89 (High Tech) and health care coordination by nurse care managers (High Touch).[27, 29]
90 The High Tech component included dashboards and a patient portal for communication
91 with physicians and nurse care managers. The High Touch component was care
92 coordination provided by nurse care managers; 25 nurse care managers worked in 10
93 family and community medicine and internal medicine clinics providing services.
94 Patients were assigned tiers based on their chronic disease diagnoses and health care
95 utilization in the previous 12 months [20]. Tiers 1 and 2 were healthy patients with no

96 chronic diseases or 1 stable chronic condition, respectively. Tier 3 and 4 patients had at
97 least 1 chronic condition, 1 or more hospital visits, and several outpatient visits. Nurse
98 care managers provided as-needed education and support for Tier 1 and 2 patients
99 regarding new chronic disease diagnoses or worsening of chronic conditions; Tier 3 and
100 4 patients were contacted monthly. Hence, more patients in Tiers 3 and 4 (80%)
101 received nurse coordination services compared to patients in Tiers 1 and 2 (64%). A
102 documentation system measuring the frequency and time of nurse care manager
103 contacts was created using the Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)
104 care coordination atlas.[29, 31] The study compiled data on claims and participants'
105 electronic health record (EHR) data, including healthcare utilization, clinic visits, basic
106 demographic data, diagnosis, labs, and nurse care coordination contacts, along with
107 geocoded patient addresses. Cohort recruitment started in February 2013; 9932
108 participants were recruited by July 2013. Deaths and relocations decreased the number
109 of participants to 8593 by March 2015. The goals of the LIGHT² intervention were to
110 achieve net cost savings, increase preventive service use, and improve the
111 management of chronic diseases. The final evaluation of the program showed higher
112 spending than the comparison group, and most patients received recommended
113 preventive services.[27] The cardiometabolic measures monitored during LIGHT²
114 intervention were hemoglobin A1C (HbA1C), blood pressure (BP), and low density-
115 lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol. Primary results showed minimal changes in
116 cardiometabolic outcomes. Detailed results of primary outcomes, nurse care

117 coordination implementation, and fidelity of LIGHT² have been previously published.[27,
118 29]

119 **Participants**

120 Participants were all Medicare, Medicaid, or dual-eligible patients receiving primary
121 care services in any of 10 family and community medicine or internal medicine clinics in
122 the MUHC system during the project period. Because we examined factors associated
123 with a change in cardiometabolic measures in the presence of nurse-led care
124 coordination, we included only participants with HbA1C, LDL cholesterol, or BP reported
125 before and after the intervention completion.

126 **Outcomes**

127 We extracted HbA1C, BP, and LDL-cholesterol levels before and after the LIGHT²
128 program. Recruitment was complete and the care coordination documentation system
129 was implemented on 1 July, 2013. We used measures reported within 6 months before
130 that date or before the first nurse care manager contact within the first 3 months of the
131 intervention as the pre-intervention values. For post-intervention measures, we used the
132 values reported within 6 months after the intervention completion date. If there were no
133 values reported in the 6 months after the completion of the intervention, we used the
134 last reported value within the last 3 months of the intervention. We used the average of
135 the last 2 reported BP readings if there were multiple readings in the defined pre-
136 intervention and post-intervention time-period. Individuals with very low pre-intervention

137 values were not included in the analyses. More specifically, if pre-intervention LDL<60
138 mg/dL, pre-intervention HbA1C<5.5%, pre-intervention diastolic BP (DBP)<40 mm of
139 Hg, and pre-intervention systolic BP (SBP)<90 mm of Hg, individuals were excluded.
140 We also excluded 2 extremely high values (above 350) of post-intervention LDL
141 cholesterol. The population comprised of 6378 individuals after exclusions.

142 **Variables**

143 We included clinical and geospatial variables accounting for social and behavioral
144 domains and measures recommended by the National Academy of Medicine (NAM).[32]
145 We identified clinical and area-level variables easily extracted from routinely collected
146 clinical and sociodemographic data in the EHR. The NAM recommended domains
147 include race and ethnicity, which were extracted from EHR; education, which we
148 extracted at neighborhood-level; financial resource strain was extracted as poverty at
149 neighborhood-level and access to healthy food as the distance to nearest grocery store;
150 stress and depression were denoted by the presence of mood disorders from EHR;
151 physical activity opportunities were extracted at neighborhood-level; tobacco and
152 alcohol status extracted from EHR; social connection or isolation measured by marital
153 status in EHR and neighborhood-level social capital; intimate partner violence
154 measured by neighborhood-level domestic violence injury rates. As the LIGHT² program
155 was focused on nurse care coordination for healthcare utilization and chronic disease
156 management, we adjusted for health resource utilization, nurse care manager contacts,
157 and the number of comorbidities. Additionally, as LIGHT² program was solely based in

158 primary care clinics, we examined driving time to the primary care clinic from the
159 patient's geocoded residential address. As baseline cardiometabolic health, including
160 BMI, are used by clinicians for CVD risk stratification, we adjusted for baseline values of
161 cardiometabolic measures.

162 We included basic demographic data such as age, sex, race/ethnicity, as well as
163 smoking status, alcohol status, and geocoded residential addresses from the EHR. We
164 extracted the total number of comorbidities, nurse care manager contacts, and
165 presence or absence of a mood disorder reported as of the last day of intervention
166 based on the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical
167 Modification diagnosis codes (ICD 9 codes). We measured healthcare utilization and
168 defined high-resource utilizers as individuals with 4 or more emergency room visits, or 2
169 or more inpatient encounters in the previous 12 months. The patient's residential
170 address and primary care physician's (PCP) clinic addresses were geocoded using
171 ArcGIS Online World Geocoding Service.[33] If a patient was seen at 2 or more primary
172 care clinic locations during the intervention period, we coded the distance to the clinic
173 as missing to avoid misattributions. Distance variables were calculated using an origin-
174 destination cost matrix network analysis using a StreetMap North America street
175 network dataset.[34] Supermarket locations were obtained from the Reference USA US
176 Businesses dataset.[35, 36] Socioeconomic status of patients' neighborhoods was
177 extracted from the US Census Bureau 2010-2014 American Community Survey (ACS)
178 5-Year Estimates.[37] The percentage of population <200% federal poverty level (FPL)

179 was extracted at patient's census-tract level, and the percentage of population without
180 high school diploma was determined at census block group-level.[38] Neighborhood
181 (ZIP-code level) social capital was assessed using the number of civic or social
182 organizations per capita, obtained by summarizing data from the 2017 US Census
183 Bureau ZIP code Business Patterns.[39] Domestic violence injury rates were extracted
184 at Zip-code level. To assess opportunities for physical activity, we generated
185 WalkScore™ values for each patient's census block.[40] Visual assessment found that
186 the WalkScore™ dataset may not represent physical activity opportunities in areas with
187 networks of unpaved trails such as our local county and rural areas; hence, we
188 excluded these measures. See S1 File for detailed information of included
189 neighborhood level variables.

190 **Statistical methods**

191 After adjusting for covariates, we examined the changes in HbA1C, LDL, and BP
192 from before the 1 July, 2013 nurse-led care coordination start date to after the end of
193 the project in June 2015. Dataset was created with clinical, sociodemographic, and
194 geospatial variables followed by data analysis between November 2019 and October
195 2020. We fitted a separate generalized linear model (GLM) for each of these measures
196 as the dependent variable. We adjusted for covariates, including pre-intervention risk
197 factor values and pre-intervention body mass index (BMI). The GLM model assumptions
198 were checked. Using the Pearson correlation between continuous variables, we chose
199 one variable from each group of variables. Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) were

200 calculated as 1/ (type I tolerance) of the GLM model for categorical variables. The cutoff
201 point was 5. The overall fit of the models was assessed using the coefficient of
202 determinations (R^2). We report statistical significance at $p < .01$. Results were
203 generated using SAS software.

204 *Model 1:* Included covariates readily available in the clinical chart: age, gender,
205 race/ethnicity, marital status, smoking status, alcohol use, healthcare utilization 12
206 months before the study's start date, pre-intervention cardiometabolic risk factor
207 levels, pre-intervention BMI, presence of mood disorder, total number of chronic
208 health conditions, and total number of nurse care manager contacts during the study
209 period. Significant interactions between the covariates and the pre-intervention values
210 were included in the model.

211 *Model 2:* Included the covariates in Model 1 and also included neighborhood-level
212 measures of poverty, education, social capital, and domestic violence injury rates.

213 *Model 3:* Included the covariates in Model 2 and added physical determinants of access
214 to healthy food (grocery store) and healthcare (PCP clinic location) from the patient's
215 geocoded address.

216 At the census block group level, we noted collinearity among the percentage of
217 population below 200% of the FPL and the Area Deprivation Index.[41] Thus, we
218 included only the percentage of the population below 200% of the FPL in our models.
219 We dichotomized driving time to PCP clinic location to 30 minutes or less, and over 30
220 minutes, as Health Professional Shortage Area (HPSA) designation utilizes driving time

221 of more than 30 to 40 minutes to the nearest source of care as one of the scoring
222 criteria.[42] Based on frequency distributions and outliers, we represented percentage
223 of the population without a high school diploma and the number of nurse care manager
224 contacts as categorical variables by quartiles.

225 **Sensitivity analysis**

226 We performed 2 additional analyses for each outcome: 1) We used a backward-
227 selection technique to remove non-significant factors step-by-step to obtain a
228 parsimonious model with only significant factors, and 2) we fit a mixed-effects model to
229 test for random variability across clinics.

230 **Results**

231 Of 8593 eligible participants in the LIGHT² cohort, 6378 participants had at least 1
232 cardiometabolic measure reported both before and after the intervention. Figure 1 Flow
233 Diagram illustrates the derivation of participants for each measure. The cohort
234 description is included in Table 1. Because our cohort was primarily White, non-
235 Hispanic ethnicity (86.3%), we dichotomized the race/ethnicity variable.

236 Figure 1 Title: Flow diagram of participants.

237 Flow diagram of **L**everaging **I**nformation Technology to **G**uide **H**igh **T**ech, **H**igh **T**ouch
238 Care (LIGHT²) program participants and final number of participants included in
239 analysis for each cardiometabolic measure

Table 1 Characteristics of the study sample (N=6378)

Variable	Total	
Demographics		
Age (mean years, SD ^a)	62.67	(18.5)
Sex [frequency(percentage)]		
Female	3928	(61.59)
Male	2450	(38.41)
Race [frequency (percentage)]		
White non-Hispanic	5507	(86.34)
Other	871	(13.66)
Marital status [frequency (percentage)]		
Married	2746	(43.05)
Other	892	(13.99)
Single	1622	(25.43)
Widowed	1118	(17.53)
Cardiometabolic measures (mean, SD ^a)		
Pre-intervention LDL ^b (mg/dL)	106.26	(31.55)
Post-intervention LDL ^b (mg/dL)	99.41	(36.22)
Pre-intervention HbA1c ^c (percentage)	6.94	(1.43)
Post-intervention HbA1c ^c (percentage)	7.09	(1.53)
Pre-intervention systolic BP ^d (mm of Hg)	132.74	(14.17)
Post-intervention systolic BP ^d (mm of Hg)	131.14	(17.61)
Pre-intervention diastolic BP ^d (mm of Hg)	75.83	(7.64)
Post-intervention diastolic BP ^d (mm of Hg)	75.05	(9.69)
Neighborhood characteristics		
Percentage of population below 200% of the FPL ^e (mean, SD ^f) for patient's census-tract	36.14	(14.30)
Percentage of population that did not graduate from high school for patient's census-block group [frequency (percentage)]		
Quartile 1: <3.17%	2049	(32.13)
Quartile 2: 3.17-8.79%	1519	(23.82)
Quartile 3: 8.79-14.06%	1325	(20.77)
Quartile 4 >14.06%	1485	(23.28)
Domestic violence injury rates (per 1,000) for patient zip codes, 2011-2015 (mean, SD ^a)	0.39	(0.37)
Distance to nearest grocery store from patient's geocoded address (miles)	3.42	(3.69)
Number of civic or social organizations per capita for patient zip codes (mean, SD ^a)	13.10	(4.9)
Health characteristics		
Number of comorbidities	4.89	(4.23)
Pre-intervention body mass index (kg/m ²)	30.35	(7.71)
Current smoking [frequency (percentage)]		
Yes	1455	(22.81)
No	4810	(75.42)

Parameter	β	SE	p-value	β	SE	p-value	β	SE	p-value
High-risk alcohol use [frequency (percentage)]									
Yes						110		(1.72)	
Unknown						6368		(98.28)	
Presence of mood disorder [frequency (percentage)]									
Yes						1475		(23.13)	
Unknown						4903		(76.87)	
Total number of nurse care manager contacts during the study period [frequency (percentage)]									
Quartile 1: <5						1504		(23.58)	
Quartile 2: 5-10						1489		(23.35)	
Quartile 3: 11-21						1745		(27.36)	
Quartile 4: >22						1640		(25.71)	
High vs low healthcare resource utilizer [frequency (percentage)]									
High utilizer						778		(12.2)	
Low utilizer						5600		(87.8)	
Travel time to PCP ^f office from geocoded addresses [frequency (percentage)]									
<=30 minutes						4004		(62.78)	
>30 minutes						1331		(20.87)	
Unknown						1043		(16.35)	

^a SD=standard deviation; ^b LDL=low density lipoprotein cholesterol, ^c HbA1c=glycosylated hemoglobin, ^d BP=blood pressure, ^e FPL=Federal poverty level, ^f PCP=primary care provider

240

241 We had LDL cholesterol outcomes for 2377 participants. See Table 2 for detailed
242 results and R² for all models. The final multivariable model for LDL cholesterol showed
243 significant deterioration associated with pre-intervention LDL cholesterol (β 0.56, 95%
244 CI 0.52 to 0.597, $p < .001$) and female gender compared to males (β 7.87, 95% CI 5.24
245 to 10.5, $p < .001$). Significant improvement in LDL cholesterol was associated with
246 increasing age (β -0.28, 95% CI -0.4 to -0.16, $p < .001$) and higher area-level domestic
247 violence injury rates (β -5.41, 95% CI -9.08 to -1.75, $p = 0.004$)

Intercept	64.33	6.18	<.001	67.99	6.62	<.0001	68.21	7.05	<.001
Pre-intervention BMI ^c	-0.24	0.085	.005	-0.201	0.085	.018	-0.19	0.085	.02
Pre-intervention LDL ^d	0.56	0.02	<.001	0.56	0.02	<.001	0.56	0.02	<.001
Female (ref ^e =Male)	7.87	1.34	<.001	7.72	1.34	<.001	7.87	1.34	<.001
Non-White race (ref ^e =White)	-4.16	1.91	.04	-3.21	1.94	.09	-3.24	1.96	.09
Age	-0.28	0.06	<.001	-0.28	0.06	<.0001	-0.28	0.06	<.001
Marital Status (ref ^e =married)									
Single	-1.74	1.88	.35	-0.66	1.90	.73	-0.41	1.91	.83
Widowed	-2.05	1.88	.28	-1.50	1.88	.42	-1.35	1.88	.47
Other	0.52	1.98	.79	1.72	1.99	.39	1.88	1.20	.35
High healthcare resource utilizer (ref ^e =low utilizer)	-2.07	2.18	.34	-2.12	2.18	.33	-1.82	2.18	.40
Mood disorder present (ref ^d =absent or unknown)	-1.56	1.79	.38	-1.75	1.79	.33	-1.73	1.70	.34
High risk alcohol use (ref ^e =unknown)	-3.88	6.09	.52	-3.53	6.07	.56	-3.45	6.07	.57
Nurse care contacts (ref ^e =Q1: <5)									
Quartile 2: 5-10	1.89	1.86	.31	1.77	1.86	.34	1.74	1.86	.39
Quartile 3: 11-22	0.31	1.78	.86	0.20	1.78	.91	0.05	1.78	.97
Quartile 4: >22	0.37	1.81	.83	0.45	1.81	.80	0.27	1.81	.88
Current smoker (ref ^e =No)									
Yes	-1.85	1.80	.30	-0.82	1.81	.65	-0.77	1.81	.67
Unknown	-9.97	6.29	.11	-9.85	6.27	.12	-9.78	6.29	.12
Number of comorbidities	-0.48	0.18	.007	-0.42	0.18	.017	-0.40	0.18	.026
Proportion area residents who did not graduate from high school (ref ^e =Q4: >14.06%)									
Quartile 1: <3.17%				1.40	1.90	.46	1.54	2.02	.44
Quartile 2: 3.17- 8.79%				2.57	1.91	.18	2.48	1.93	.19
Quartile 3: 8.79- 14.06%				-0.18	1.95	.93	-0.28	1.97	.88
Percentage of area population below 200% of the FPL ^f				-0.12	0.05	.01	-0.11	0.05	.031
Domestic violence injury rates				-5.22	1.82	.004	-5.41	1.87	.004

Distance to nearest grocery store			0.14	0.19	.47
Driving time to PCP ^g (ref ^e =<=30)					
>30 minutes			-0.11	1.80	.95
Unknown			-4.05	1.94	.04
Civic organizations per capita			-0.07	0.13	.58

^a β = regression coefficients; ^bSE = Standard Error; ^cBMI = Body Mass Index; ^dLDL=low density lipoprotein; ^eref=reference category, ^fFPL=Federal poverty level; ^gPCP=primary care provider; ^hR²=coefficient of determinations

248 The multivariable models for SBP (S1 Table) showed significant worsening with
249 higher BMI (β 0.09, 95% CI 0.043 to 0.147, $p < .001$), higher pre-intervention SBP (β
250 0.93, 95% CI 0.79 to 1.06, $p < .001$), and higher area-level interpersonal injury rates (β
251 2.04, 95% CI 0.93 to 3.16, $p < .001$). The interaction between female gender and pre-
252 intervention SBP levels (main effect β -8.93, 95% CI -16.7 to -1.19 $p = 0.02$; interaction
253 effect β 0.067, 95% CI 0.008 to 0.124, $p = 0.02$) indicates worsening trend in SBP for
254 women compared to men with pre-intervention SBP >134 mm Hg but results do not
255 reach the set statistical significance (S1 Figure). The final model for DBP (Table 3)
256 showed worsening of DBP associated with increasing BMI (β 0.078, 95% CI 0.048 to
257 0.108, $p < .001$), pre-intervention SBP (β 0.15, 95% CI 0.078 to 0.23, $p < .001$), pre-
258 intervention DBP (β 0.822, 95% CI 0.749 to 0.909, $p < .001$), smoking versus non-
259 smoking (β 0.80, 95% CI 0.22 to 1.38, $p = 0.007$), known hazardous alcohol use (β
260 2.44, 95% CI 0.76 to 4.11, $p = 0.004$), and area-level domestic violence injury rates (β
261 1.01, 95% CI 0.37 to 1.65, $p = 0.002$). There also was worsening DBP noted for women
262 compared to men with pre-intervention SBP >121 mm Hg (main effect β -5.42, 95% CI -
263 9.8 to 0.098. $p = 0.016$; interaction effect β 0.04. 95% CI 0.01 to 0.078. $p = 0.009$) (S2

264 Figure). Age was associated with decreasing SBP when pre-intervention SBP was <153
 265 mm Hg and decreasing DBP when pre-intervention SBP was < 119 mm Hg. A
 266 significant interaction of the percentage of population <200% FPL with pre-intervention
 267 DBP was observed in the SBP and DBP outcomes models. The association of the
 268 increasing percentage of population <200% FPL switches from worsening to small
 269 improvements in SBP and DBP at pre-intervention DBP cutoff point of 75mm Hg and 78
 270 mm Hg, respectively.

Table 3: Multivariable models of diastolic blood pressure for 4619 participants with pre-and post-intervention measures.

Parameter	Model 1 (R ² 0.39)			Model 2 (R ² 0.39)			Model 3 (R ² 0.39)		
	β^a	SE ^b	p-value	β^a	SE ^b	p-value	β^a	SE ^b	p-value
Intercept	0.58	4.48	0.89	-7.47	5.51	0.17	-7.81	5.54	0.16
Pre-intervention BMI ^c	0.08	0.015	<.001	0.07	0.015	<.001	0.078	0.015	<.001
Pre-intervention SBP ^d	0.14	0.038	<.001	0.15	0.038	0.001	0.15	0.039	<.001
Pre-intervention DBP ^e	0.73	0.019	<.001	0.82	0.041	<.001	0.82	0.041	<.001
Female (ref ^s =Male)	-4.89	2.26	0.03	-5.43	2.26	0.016	-5.42	2.26	0.016
Pre-intervention SBP ^d * Female	0.041	0.017	0.017	0.045	0.017	0.008	0.045	0.02	0.009
Race Other than White (ref ^f =White)	-0.61	0.34	0.06	-0.58	0.34	0.09	-0.55	0.34	0.113
Age	0.28	0.06	<.001	0.31	0.06	<.001	0.31	0.06	<.001
Pre-intervention SBP ^d *age	-0.002	0.0005	<.001	-0.002	0.0005	<.001	-0.002	0.0005	<.001
High Healthcare Resource Utilizer (ref ^f Low Healthcare Resource Utilizer)	-0.10	0.33	0.76	-0.054	0.33	0.89	-0.063	0.33	0.85
Q1: <5 Nurse care contacts (ref ^f)									
Q2: 5-10 Nurse care contacts	-0.60	0.33	0.07	-0.55	0.32	0.09	-0.56	0.32	0.08
Q3: 11-21 Nurse care contacts	-0.09	0.31	0.78	-0.09	0.31	0.77	-0.10	0.31	0.74
Q4: >22 Nurse care contacts	-0.89	0.32	0.005	-0.88	0.32	0.005	-0.88	0.32	0.006
Smoker Yes (ref ^f =No)	1.01	0.29	<.001	0.82	0.30	0.006	0.80	0.30	0.007

Smoking status missing (ref ^f =No)	-1.20	1.02	0.24	-1.25	1.01	0.22	-1.23	1.01	0.22
Marital Status (Married) ref ^f									
Marital Status Single	0.016	0.33	0.96	-0.005	0.33	0.99	0.018	0.33	0.95
Marital Status Widowed	-0.35	0.33	0.28	-0.40	0.33	0.22	-0.39	0.33	0.23
Marital Status Other	0.76	0.35	0.031	0.66	0.35	0.06	0.68	0.36	0.06
Mood Disorder present (ref ^f =Mood Disorder absent or unknown)	-0.37	0.29	0.19	-0.39	0.29	0.18	-0.39	0.29	0.18
High risk Alcohol use (ref ^f Alcohol use unknown)	2.41	0.86	0.005	2.39	0.85	0.005	2.44	0.86	0.004
Number of comorbidities	0.08	0.03	0.005	0.07	0.03	0.010	0.07	0.03	0.011
Proportion not graduated high school in the area, Q4 >14.06% (ref ^f)									
Q1 <3.17%				-0.68	0.33	0.041	-0.59	0.35	0.08
Q2 3.17-8.79 %				-0.79	0.33	0.017	-0.74	0.33	0.028
Q3 8.79- 14.06%				0.001	0.33	0.99	0.03	0.34	0.93
Percentage of area population below 200% of the FPL ^g				0.18	0.076	0.014	0.19	0.07	0.014
Pre-intervention DBP ^e Poverty200FPL ^g				-0.002	0.001	0.015	-0.0024	0.001	0.016
Domestic violence injury rates				0.94	0.32	0.003	1.011	0.33	0.002
Distance to nearest grocery store							0.05	0.034	0.14
Time to PCP<=30 (ref ^f)									
Time to PCP ^h >30							-0.26	0.31	0.40
Time to PCP unknown							0.16	0.31	0.60
Civic organizations per capita							0.012	0.02	0.61

^aβ = Regression coefficient; ^bSE = Standard Error; ^c BMI=body mass index (kg/m²), ^d SBP=systolic blood pressure, ^e DBP=diastolic blood pressure, ^f ref=reference category, ^gFPL=Federal poverty level; ^hPCP = primary care provider, ⁱR²=coefficient of determinations

- 271 The multivariable models for HbA1C (Table 4) showed significant deterioration
- 272 associated with increasing baseline HbA1C (β 0.51, 95% CI 0.43 to 0.586, p<.001).
- 273 There was a significant interaction between pre-intervention HbA1C and female gender

274 (main effect β -1.28, 95% CI -1.95 to -0.61, $p < .001$; interaction effect β 0.19, 95% CI
 275 0.09 to 0.28, $p < .001$), with HbA1C worsening if the pre-intervention HbA1C is more than
 276 6.8% in women compared to men (S3 Figure). Similarly, non-White race/ethnicity was
 277 associated with improved HbA1C (main effect β -1.159, 95% CI -1.95 to -0.367, $p =$
 278 .004, interaction effect β 0.14, 95% CI 0.033 to 0.25, $p = .011$), but the HbA1C worsens
 279 for non-White patients with a pre-intervention HbA1C greater than 8.1%. Age and
 280 smoking status were associated with improved HbA1C across the intervention.

Table 4: Multivariable models of hemoglobin A1C for 1290 participants with pre-and post-intervention measures.

Parameter	Model 1 (R ² 0.396)			Model 2 (R ² 0.399)			Model 3 (R ² 0.40)		
	β^a	SE ^b	p-value	β^a	SE ^b	p-value	β^a	SE ^b	p-value
Intercept	4.08	0.43	<.001	4.11	0.45	<.001	3.88	0.46	<.001
Pre-intervention BMI ^c	0.001	0.004	0.75	0.0005	0.004	0.89	0.0004	0.004	0.92
Pre-intervention A1C ^d	0.52	0.04	<.001	0.51	0.04	<.001	0.51	0.04	<.001
Female (ref ^e =male)	-1.24	0.34	<.001	-1.25	0.34	<.001	-1.28	0.34	<.001
Pre-intervention A1C ^d x female sex	0.18	0.05	<.001	0.18	0.05	<.001	0.19	0.048	<.001
Non-White race (ref ^e =White)	-1.17	0.40	0.004	-1.16	0.40	0.004	-1.159	0.40	<.004
Pre-intervention A1C ^d x non-White race	0.14	0.05	0.014	0.14	0.05	0.014	0.14	0.06	.011
Age	-0.006	0.003	0.05	-0.006	0.003	0.06	-0.007	0.003	0.05
Marital status (ref ^e =married)									
Single	-0.04	0.097	0.70	-0.02	0.10	0.85	-0.009	0.10	0.93
Widowed	-0.04	0.09	0.67	-0.04	0.09	0.66	-0.04	0.09	0.66
Other	-0.10	0.10	0.34	-0.09	0.10	0.37	-0.09	0.105	0.41
High healthcare resource utilizer (ref ^e =low utilizer)	-0.024	0.10	0.82	-0.02	0.10	0.82	-0.002	0.10	0.98
Mood disorder present (ref ^e =absent or unknown)	-0.06	0.09	0.50	-0.05	0.09	0.59	-0.05	0.09	0.55
High risk alcohol use (ref ^e =unknown)	-0.24	0.28	0.40	-0.25	0.28	0.37	-0.27	0.28	0.35
Nurse care contacts (ref ^e =Q1: <5)									
Quartile 2: 5-10	-0.18	0.098	0.06	-0.19	0.098	0.051	-0.19	0.098	0.06
Quartile 3: 11-21	-0.14	0.09	0.12	-0.14	0.09	0.13	-0.14	0.09	0.13

Current smoker (ref ^e =No)									
Yes	-0.18	0.09	0.05	-0.19	0.09	0.04	-0.19	0.09	0.04
Unknown	-0.54	0.29	0.06	-0.53	0.296	0.07	-0.56	0.296	0.058
Number of comorbidities	0.003	0.008	0.71	0.002	0.009	0.78	0.002	0.009	0.79
Proportion area residents who did not graduate from high school (ref ^e =Q4: >14.06%)									
Quartile 1: <3.17%				-0.022	0.099	0.83	0.02	0.10	0.85
Quartile 2: 3.17-8.79%				0.12	0.10	0.23	0.14	0.10	0.15
Quartile 3: 8.79-14.06%				0.18	0.10	0.07	0.21	0.10	0.035
Percentage of area population below 200% of the FPL ^f				-0.002	0.002	0.47	-0.002	0.003	0.44
Interpersonal violence rates				0.05	0.09	0.56	0.10	0.10	0.29
Distance to nearest grocery store							0.008	0.01	0.41
Driving time to PCP ^g (ref ^e =<=30)									
Unknown							0.09	0.09	0.34
>30 minutes							0.019	0.09	0.83
Civic organizations per capita							0.02	0.007	0.02

^a β = Regression coefficient; ^bSE = Standard Error; ^cBMI=body mass index (kg/m²), ^dA1C=hemoglobin A1C, ^eref=reference category; ^fFPL=Federal poverty level; ^gPCP=primary care provider; R²=coefficient of determinations

281 Sensitivity Analysis

282 The results from both the parsimonious model and the mixed-effects model for
 283 clinics show no important changes in the parameter estimates for significant
 284 associations. See S2-9 Tables.

285 Discussion:

286 We hypothesized that individuals from neighborhoods with higher area-level social
 287 risks and longer travel time to PCP locations might show less improvement or

288 worsening in cardiometabolic outcomes with clinic-based nurse-led care coordination.
289 Results did not support our hypothesis. We found individuals with higher pre-
290 intervention cardiometabolic measures got worse despite clinic-based nurse-led care
291 coordination. Additionally, women's LDL-cholesterol worsened compared to men
292 irrespective of pre-intervention levels, and women with high pre-intervention HbA1C (>
293 6.8%) and BP (>121 mm Hg SBP) got worse compared to men despite clinic-based,
294 nurse-led care coordination. Hence, women with suboptimal or uncontrolled diabetes
295 and hypertension showed worsening of HbA1C and BP, respectively. Patients from
296 areas with higher poverty showed small improvements in BP when adjusted for pre-
297 intervention DBP and in LDL-cholesterol with care coordination. While there were some
298 inconsistent findings across outcomes, the addition of neighborhood-level risks based
299 on geocoded residential addresses did not significantly change associations or fit of
300 models compared to models based on variables that are routinely available in clinical
301 charts.

302 Gender is the only socially stratifying factor present in >50% of our cohort, and we
303 found female gender was associated with the worsening of all measured
304 cardiometabolic outcomes.[43] Our findings of worsening outcomes in women
305 compared to men are noteworthy because screening and interventions for social
306 determinants of health for adults in primary care have focused little on social
307 determinants largely associated with women, like availability of affordable childcare,
308 adult caregiving, and disparities in employment opportunities for single mothers.[44-49]

309 Moreover, mortality due to cardiovascular diseases has increased in middle-aged
310 women over the last decade.[5, 50, 51] Chronic disease self-management includes 1)
311 Medical management: taking medications, self-monitoring, and lifestyle modifications; 2)
312 Role management: maintaining meaningful life roles with family, friends, and work; 3)
313 Emotional management: coping with anger, fear, frustration, and sadness.[52] Our
314 findings may indicate that individuals, especially women, with suboptimal control of
315 cardiometabolic conditions have additional daily lived behavioral, emotional, and role
316 management contexts, not captured by EHR or neighborhood-level risks, that diminish
317 their ability to benefit from solely clinic-based interventions.[6, 48, 53-56] A study of
318 nationally representative data found that older women had more behavioral and social
319 risks compared to men.[57] Previous studies have shown nurse case management
320 improves diabetes and hypertension control, but increasing baseline measures were
321 associated with worsening of all cardiometabolic measures in our study of nurse-led
322 care coordination.[58, 59] Nurse-led care coordination and chronic disease education
323 may need to be combined with additional tailored disease management components or
324 community-based interventions to improve cardiometabolic outcomes.[58-61]

325 We found no studies examining patient-level moderating factors of cardiometabolic
326 outcomes with care coordination. An analysis of the Johns Hopkins Community Health
327 Partnership (J-CHiP) program looked at the additional effects of a community-based
328 program addressing social determinants along with nurse case management and found

329 improvement trends in healthcare utilization in Medicaid beneficiaries, but not Medicare
330 beneficiaries.[62]

331 *Strengths:* Our study is the first study to examine the interaction of baseline
332 cardiometabolic risk factors with clinical factors and neighborhood-level social risks to
333 identify individuals who may get less benefit or not benefit from solely clinic-based
334 interventions for CVD prevention. We included variables widely available in clinical
335 charts and neighborhood-level social risks based on patients' residential addresses to
336 avoid burdening PCPs with additional individual social risk screenings.[24, 25, 63] In
337 addition to variables accounting for most social and behavioral domains recommended
338 by the National Academy of Medicine, our study included 1 factor associated with each
339 of 5 key areas of social determinants of health included in the place-based organizing
340 framework developed by Healthy People 2020, namely, economic stability, education,
341 social and community context, neighborhood environment, and healthcare.[32, 64]

342 *Limitations of Study:* We acknowledge several limitations. First, the cohort consists of
343 Medicaid, Medicare, or dual-eligible beneficiaries of predominantly White, non-Hispanic
344 ethnicity from primary care clinics in central Missouri, which may limit the
345 generalizability of our findings. Second, physical activity is one of the primary CVD risk
346 factors, but we could not identify reliable neighborhood-level measures of physical
347 activity opportunities for our cohort.[65, 66] Third, though burdensome, individual-level
348 social risks, rather than neighborhood-level risks, can improve the ability to predict
349 which patients may benefit from supplementary community-based interventions [67-69]

350 Lastly, we acknowledge that the LIGHT² care coordination program focused on super-
351 utilizers and reducing care fragmentation rather than reducing health disparities.[27]

352 **Conclusions:**

353 We found increasing cardiometabolic measures and women with uncontrolled
354 baseline cardiometabolic measures were commonly associated with worsening
355 cardiometabolic outcomes in participants of a clinic-based care coordination program.
356 Further research on social and behavioral contexts to understand the causes of these
357 associations is needed. Integration of neighborhood-level risks based on patients'
358 residential address did not change estimates of associations beyond routinely collected
359 clinical and sociodemographic data in EHR.

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367 **Acknowledgements**

368 **Additional contributions:** We are thankful to Ms. Cynthia Haydon for her

369 manuscript editing services.

370

371 **References:**

- 372 1. National Center for Health Statistics. Health, United States, 2015: with special feature on racial
373 and ethnic health disparities Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2016 [cited
374 2020 1 December]. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27308685/>.
- 375 2. Benjamin EJ, Virani SS, Callaway CW, Chamberlain AM, Chang AR, Cheng S, et al. Heart disease
376 and stroke statistics-2018 update: a report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*.
377 2018;137(12):e67-e492. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000558. PubMed PMID: 29386200.
- 378 3. Cunningham TJ, Croft JB, Liu Y, Lu H, Eke PI, Giles WH. Vital signs: racial disparities in age-specific
379 mortality among Blacks or African Americans - United States, 1999-2015. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*
380 *Rep*. 2017;66(17):444-56. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6617e1. PubMed PMID: 28472021.
- 381 4. Sterling MR, Echeverría SE, Commodore-Mensah Y, Breland JY, Nunez-Smith M. Health equity
382 and implementation science in heart, lung, blood, and sleep-related research: emerging themes from
383 the 2018 Saunders-Watkins Leadership Workshop. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*.
384 2019;12(10):e005586. Epub 2019/10/15. doi: 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.119.005586. PubMed PMID:
385 31610713.
- 386 5. Shah NS, Molsberry R, Rana JS, Sidney S, Capewell S, O'Flaherty M, et al. Heterogeneous trends
387 in burden of heart disease mortality by subtypes in the United States, 1999-2018: observational analysis
388 of vital statistics. *BMJ*. 2020;370:m2688. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m2688. PubMed PMID: 32816805; PubMed
389 Central PMCID: PMC7424397.
- 390 6. Shen X, DiMario S, Philip K. Gender disparities in health resource utilization in patients with
391 atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease: a retrospective cross-sectional study. *Adv Ther*.
392 2019;36(12):3424-34. Epub 2019/10/19. doi: 10.1007/s12325-019-01107-0. PubMed PMID: 31625131;
393 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6860468.
- 394 7. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Care coordination Rockville, MD: Agency for
395 Healthcare Research and Quality; 2016 [cited 2020 30 November]. Available from:
396 <https://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/prevention-chronic-care/improve/coordination/index.html>.
- 397 8. Gunderson JM, Wieland ML, Quirindongo-Cedeno O, Asiedu GB, Ridgeway JL, O'Brien MW, et al.
398 Community health workers as an extension of care coordination in primary care: a community-based
399 cosupervisory model. *J Ambul Care Manage*. 2018;41(4):333-40. Epub 2018/07/18. doi:
400 10.1097/JAC.0000000000000255. PubMed PMID: 30015685; PubMed Central PMCID:
401 PMC6112848.
- 402 9. Community Preventive Services Task Force. Engaging community health workers recommended
403 to prevent cardiovascular disease Atlanta, GA: The Community Guide; 2015 [cited 2020 10 December].

- 404 Available from: [https://www.thecommunityguide.org/content/engaging-community-health-workers-](https://www.thecommunityguide.org/content/engaging-community-health-workers-recommended-prevent-cardiovascular-disease)
405 [recommended-prevent-cardiovascular-disease.](https://www.thecommunityguide.org/content/engaging-community-health-workers-recommended-prevent-cardiovascular-disease)
- 406 10. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Clinical-community linkages Rockville, MD: Agency
407 for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2016 [cited 2020 5 December]. Available from:
408 <https://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/prevention-chronic-care/improve/community/index.html>.
- 409 11. Mensah GA, Cooper RS, Siega-Riz AM, Cooper LA, Smith JD, Brown CH, et al. Reducing
410 cardiovascular disparities through community-engaged implementation research: a national heart, lung,
411 and blood institute workshop report. *Circ Res.* 2018;122(2):213-30. doi:
412 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.312243. PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5777283.
- 413 12. Patil SJ. Task sharing chronic disease self-management training with lay health coaches to
414 reduce health disparities. *Ann Fam Med.* 2020;18(1):2-3. doi: 10.1370/afm.2513. PubMed PMID:
415 31937525.
- 416 13. McWilliams JM. Cost containment and the tale of care coordination. *N Engl J Med.*
417 2016;375(23):2218-20. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1610821. PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5506340.
- 418 14. Finkelstein A, Zhou A, Taubman S, Doyle J. Health care hotspotting - a randomized, controlled
419 trial. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(2):152-62. Epub 2020/01/09. doi: 10.1056/NEJMs1906848. PubMed
420 PMID: 31914242.
- 421 15. Marcotte LM, Reddy A, Liao J. Addressing avoidable healthcare costs: time to cool off on
422 hotspotting in primary care? *J Gen Intern Med.* 2019;34(11):2634-6. Epub 2019/08/28. doi:
423 10.1007/s11606-019-05285-z. PubMed PMID: 31452041; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6848529.
- 424 16. Rogers A, Hu YR, Schickedanz A, Gottlieb L, Sharp A. Understanding High-Utilizing Patients Based
425 on Social Risk Profiles: a Latent Class Analysis Within an Integrated Health System. *J Gen Intern Med.*
426 2020;35(7):2214-6. Epub 2020/01/11. doi: 10.1007/s11606-019-05510-9. PubMed PMID: 31919728;
427 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7351894.
- 428 17. Meyers DJ, Chien AT, Nguyen KH, Li Z, Singer SJ, Rosenthal MB. Association of team-based
429 primary care with health care utilization and costs among chronically ill patients. *JAMA Intern Med.*
430 2019;179(1):54-61. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.5118. PubMed PMID: 30476951.
- 431 18. Zulman DM, Pal Chee C, Ezeji-Okoye SC, Shaw JG, Holmes TH, Kahn JS, et al. Effect of an
432 Intensive Outpatient Program to Augment Primary Care for High-Need Veterans Affairs Patients: A
433 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Internal Medicine.* 2017;177(2):166-75. doi:
434 10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.8021.
- 435 19. Agurs-Collins T, Persky S, Paskett ED, Barkin SL, Meissner HI, Nansel TR, et al. Designing and
436 Assessing Multilevel Interventions to Improve Minority Health and Reduce Health Disparities. *American*
437 *journal of public health.* 2019;109(S1):S86-S93. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2018.304730. PubMed PMID:
438 30699029.
- 439 20. Sigmund CD, Carey RM, Appel LJ, Arnett DK, Bosworth HB, Cushman WC, et al. Report of the
440 National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Working Group on Hypertension: Barriers to Translation.
441 *Hypertension.* 2020;75(4):902-17. Epub 2020/02/18. doi: 10.1161/hypertensionaha.119.13887. PubMed
442 PMID: 32063061; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7067675.
- 443 21. Haire-Joshu D, Hill-Briggs F. Treating Obesity-Moving From Recommendation to
444 Implementation. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2018;178(11):1447-9. Epub 2018/11/14. doi:
445 10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.5259. PubMed PMID: 30422261.

- 446 22. Prasad K, Poplau S, Brown R, Yale S, Grossman E, Varkey AB, et al. Time pressure during primary
447 care office visits: a prospective evaluation of data from the Healthy Work Place Study. *J Gen Intern Med.*
448 2020;35(2):465-72. Epub 2019/12/05. doi: 10.1007/s11606-019-05343-6. PubMed PMID: 31797160;
449 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7018911.
- 450 23. Kaufman A, Dickinson WP, Fagnan LJ, Duffy FD, Parchman ML, Rhyne RL. The role of health
451 extension in practice transformation and community health improvement: lessons from 5 case studies.
452 *The Annals of Family Medicine.* 2019;17(Suppl 1):S67-S72. doi: 10.1370/afm.2409.
- 453 24. Schickedanz A, Hamity C, Rogers A, Sharp AL, Jackson A. Clinician experiences and attitudes
454 regarding screening for social determinants of health in a large integrated health system. *Med Care.*
455 2019;57(Suppl 6 2):S197-S201. Epub 2019/05/17. doi: 10.1097/mlr.0000000000001051. PubMed PMID:
456 31095061; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6721844.
- 457 25. Cottrell EK, Dambrun K, Cowburn S, Mossman N, Bunce AE, Marino M, et al. Variation in
458 Electronic Health Record Documentation of Social Determinants of Health Across a National Network of
459 Community Health Centers. *Am J Prev Med.* 2019;57(6 Suppl 1):S65-s73. Epub 2019/11/23. doi:
460 10.1016/j.amepre.2019.07.014. PubMed PMID: 31753281.
- 461 26. Taylor LA, Tan AX, Coyle CE, Ndumele C, Rogan E, Canavan M, et al. Leveraging the social
462 determinants of health: what works? *PLoS One.* 2016;11(8):e0160217. Epub 2016/08/18. doi:
463 10.1371/journal.pone.0160217. PubMed PMID: 27532336; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6721844.
- 464 27. Rojas Smith L, Amico P, Hoerger T, Jacobs S, Payne J, Renaud J. Evaluation of the health care
465 innovation awards: community resource planning, prevention, and monitoring Research Triangle Park,
466 NC: RTI International; 2017 [cited 2020 8 December]. Third Annual Report Addendum:[Available from:
467 <https://downloads.cms.gov/files/cmml/hcia-crppm-thirdannrptaddendum.pdf>.
468
- 468 28. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening
469 the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting
470 observational studies. *Ann Intern Med.* 2007;147(8):573-7. Epub 2007/10/17. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-
471 147-8-200710160-00010. PubMed PMID: 17938396.
- 472 29. Popejoy LL, Jaddoo J, Sherman J, Howk C, Nguyen R, Parker JC. Monitoring resource utilization in
473 a health care coordination program. *Prof Case Manag.* 2015;20(6):310-20. doi:
474 10.1097/NCM.0000000000000120.
- 475 30. Sheets L, Popejoy L, Aprn GB, Khalilia M, Petroski G, Parker JC. Identifying patients at risk of high
476 healthcare utilization. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc.* 2016;2016:1129-38.
- 477 31. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Care coordination measures atlas update Rockville,
478 MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2014 [cited 2020 30 November]. Available from:
479 [https://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/prevention-chronic-
480 care/improve/coordination/atlas2014/index.html](https://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/prevention-chronic-care/improve/coordination/atlas2014/index.html).
- 481 32. Committee on the Recommended Social and Behavioral Domains and Measures for Electronic
482 Health Records, Board on Population Health and Public Health Practice, Institute of Medicine. Capturing
483 social and behavioral domains and measures in electronic health records: phase 2. Washington DC:
484 National Academies Press; 2015.
- 485 33. ArcGIS Online World Geocoding Service. Redlands, CA: Environmental Systems Research
486 Institute; 2019.
- 487 34. ESRI. ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10. Redlands, CA: Environmental Systems Research Institute;
488 2018.

- 489 35. Infogroup Inc. ReferenceUSA [dataset] 2019 [cited 2020 November 5]. Available from:
490 <http://www.referenceusa.com>.
- 491 36. Rhone A, Ver Ploeg M, Dicken C, Williams R, Breneman V. Low-income and low-supermarket-
492 access census tracts, 2010-2015: Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; 2017
493 [cited 2020 8 November]. Available from: [https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-
495 details/?pubid=82100](https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-
494 details/?pubid=82100).
- 495 37. 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates [Data File]2015.
- 496 38. U.S. Census Bureau. 2014 TIGER/Line Shapefiles (machine-readable data files): U.S. Department
497 of Commerce; 2014 [cited 2020 2 November]. Available from:
498 <https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/tiger-line-file.2014.html>.
- 499 39. Rupasingha A, Goetz SJ, Freshwater D. The production of social capital in US counties. *J Socio*
500 *Econ*. 2006;35(1):83-101. doi: 10.1016/j.socec.2005.11.001.
- 501 40. Walk Score Professional. Walk Score API Sign Up 2020 [cited 2020 5 November]. Available from:
502 <https://www.walkscore.com/professional/api-sign-up.php>.
- 503 41. Maroko AR, Doan TM, Arno PS, Hubel M, Yi S, Viola D. Integrating Social Determinants of Health
504 With Treatment and Prevention: A New Tool to Assess Local Area Deprivation. *Prev Chronic Dis*.
505 2016;13:E128. Epub 2016/09/17. doi: 10.5888/pcd13.160221. PubMed PMID: 27634778; PubMed
506 Central PMCID: PMC5027849.
- 507 42. Bureau of Health Workforce. Shortage designation application and review process: U.S.
508 Department of Health and Human Services; 2020 [cited 2020 December 5]. Available from:
509 <https://bhw.hrsa.gov/shortage-designation/application-review-process>.
- 510 43. O'Neill J, Tabish H, Welch V, Petticrew M, Pottie K, Clarke M, et al. Applying an equity lens to
511 interventions: using PROGRESS ensures consideration of socially stratifying factors to illuminate
512 inequities in health. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2014;67(1):56-64. doi:
513 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.08.005.
- 514 44. Kramer KZ, Myhra LL, Zuiker VS, Bauer JW. Comparison of poverty and income disparity of single
515 mothers and fathers across three decades: 1990–2010. *Gender Issues*. 2016;33(1):22-41. doi:
516 10.1007/s12147-015-9144-3.
- 517 45. Alderwick HAJ, Gottlieb LM, Fichtenberg CM, Adler NE. Social prescribing in the U.S. and
518 England: emerging interventions to address patients' social needs. *Am J Prev Med*. 2018;54(5):715-8.
519 Epub 2018/03/20. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2018.01.039. PubMed PMID: 29551326.
- 520 46. Gottlieb L, Cottrell EK, Park B, Clark KD, Gold R, Fichtenberg C. Advancing social prescribing with
521 implementation science. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2018;31(3):315-21. Epub 2018/05/11. doi:
522 10.3122/jabfm.2018.03.170249. PubMed PMID: 29743213.
- 523 47. Ikeda A, Iso H, Kawachi I, Yamagishi K, Inoue M, Tsugane S. Living arrangement and coronary
524 heart disease: the JPHC study. *Heart*. 2009;95(7):577-83. Epub 2008/12/11. doi:
525 10.1136/hrt.2008.149575. PubMed PMID: 19066191.
- 526 48. Stewart AL, Magnani JW, Barinas-Mitchell E, Matthews KA, Khoudary SRE, Jackson EA, et al.
527 Social role stress, reward, and the American Heart Association Life 2019 Simple 7 in midlife women: the
528 study of women 2019 health across the nation. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2020;9(24):e017489. doi:
529 10.1161/JAHA.120.017489.

- 530 49. National Academies of Sciences E, Medicine, Health, Medicine D, Board on Population H, Public
531 Health P. In: Alper J, Martinez RM, editors. Investing in Interventions That Address Non-Medical, Health-
532 Related Social Needs: Proceedings of a Workshop. Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2019.
- 533 50. Mauvais-Jarvis F, Bairey Merz N, Barnes PJ, Brinton RD, Carrero J-J, DeMeo DL, et al. Sex and
534 gender: modifiers of health, disease, and medicine. *Lancet* (London, England). 2020;396(10250):565-82.
535 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31561-0. PubMed PMID: 32828189; PubMed Central PMCID:
536 PMCPMC7440877.
- 537 51. Wilmot KA, O'Flaherty M, Capewell S, Ford ES, Vaccarino V. Coronary Heart Disease Mortality
538 Declines in the United States From 1979 Through 2011: Evidence for Stagnation in Young Adults,
539 Especially Women. *Circulation*. 2015;132(11):997-1002. Epub 2015/08/24. doi:
540 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.115.015293. PubMed PMID: 26302759; PubMed Central PMCID:
541 PMCPMC4828724.
- 542 52. Bodenheimer T, Lorig K, Holman H, Grumbach K. Patient self-management of chronic disease in
543 primary care. *JAMA*. 2002;288(19):2469-75. doi: 10.1001/jama.288.19.2469. PubMed PMID: 12435261.
- 544 53. Chiang JJ, Turiano NA, Mroczek DK, Miller GE. Affective reactivity to daily stress and 20-year
545 mortality risk in adults with chronic illness: Findings from the National Study of Daily Experiences. *Health*
546 *Psychol*. 2018;37(2):170-8. Epub 2017/11/21. doi: 10.1037/hea0000567. PubMed PMID: 29154603;
547 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5794509.
- 548 54. Johnson PJ, Jou J, Upchurch DM. Psychological distress and access to care among midlife
549 women. *J Aging Health*. 2020;32(5-6):317-27. Epub 2019/01/08. doi: 10.1177/0898264318822367.
550 PubMed PMID: 30614361.
- 551 55. Low CA, Thurston RC, Matthews KA. Psychosocial factors in the development of heart disease in
552 women: current research and future directions. *Psychosom Med*. 2010;72(9):842-54. Epub 2010/09/14.
553 doi: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e3181f6934f. PubMed PMID: 20841557.
- 554 56. Cramer H, Lauche R, Adams J, Frawley J, Broom A, Sibbritt D. Is depression associated with
555 unhealthy behaviors among middle-aged and older women with hypertension or heart disease?
556 *Womens Health Issues*. 2020;30(1):35-40. Epub 2019/11/16. doi: 10.1016/j.whi.2019.09.003. PubMed
557 PMID: 31727443.
- 558 57. Byhoff E, Tripodis Y, Freund KM, Garg A. Gender differences in social and behavioral
559 determinants of health in aging adults. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2019;34(11):2310-2. doi: 10.1007/s11606-019-
560 05225-x. PubMed PMID: 31385211.
- 561 58. Norris SL, Nichols PJ, Caspersen CJ, Glasgow RE, Engelgau MM, Jack L, et al. The effectiveness of
562 disease and case management for people with diabetes. A systematic review. *Am J Prev Med*. 2002;22(4
563 Suppl):15-38. Epub 2002/05/03. doi: 10.1016/s0749-3797(02)00423-3. PubMed PMID: 11985933.
- 564 59. Proia KK, Thota AB, Njie GJ, Finnie RK, Hopkins DP, Mukhtar Q, et al. Team-based care and
565 improved blood pressure control: a community guide systematic review. *Am J Prev Med*. 2014;47(1):86-
566 99. Epub 2 June 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2014.03.004. PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4672378.
- 567 60. Jacob V, Chattopadhyay SK, Hopkins DP, Reynolds JA, Xiong KZ, Jones CD, et al. Economics of
568 Community Health Workers for Chronic Disease: Findings From Community Guide Systematic Reviews.
569 *Am J Prev Med*. 2019;56(3):e95-e106. Epub 2019/02/20. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2018.10.009. PubMed
570 PMID: 30777167; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6501565.
- 571 61. Kastner M, Cardoso R, Lai Y, Treister V, Hamid JS, Hayden L, et al. Effectiveness of interventions
572 for managing multiple high-burden chronic diseases in older adults: a systematic review and meta-

573 analysis. CMAJ. 2018;190(34):E1004-E12. Epub 2018/08/29. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.171391. PubMed PMID:
574 30150242; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6110649 the Canadian Institutes of Health Research and
575 the Government of Ontario during the conduct of the study; he also reports receiving personal fees from
576 Diabetes Canada, outside the submitted work. Noah Ivers held a volunteer position as Chair of the
577 Ontario Vascular Coalition, which envisioned a multicondition approach to management of chronic
578 diseases and risk factors in primary care. Sharon Marr reports a patent issued for the trademark for the
579 Geriatric Certificate program (February 2013). Geoff Wong reports that his salary is partly supported by
580 The Evidence Synthesis Working Group of the National Institute for Health Research School for Primary
581 Care Research (Project Number 390). He is Deputy Chair of the UK National Institute of Health Research
582 Health Technology Assessment Out-of-Hospital Panel. No other competing interests were declared.

583 62. Murphy SME, Hough DE, Sylvia ML, Sherry M, Dunbar LJ, Zollinger R, et al. Going beyond clinical
584 care to reduce health care spending: findings from the J-CHiP community-based population health
585 management program evaluation. Med Care. 2018;56(7):603-9. Epub 2018/05/22. doi:
586 10.1097/mlr.0000000000000934. PubMed PMID: 29781923.

587 63. Bolen SD, Sage P, Perzynski AT, Stange KC. No moment wasted: the primary-care visit for adults
588 with diabetes and low socio-economic status. Prim Health Care Res Dev. 2016;17(1):18-32. Epub
589 2015/05/21. doi: 10.1017/s1463423615000134. PubMed PMID: 25991075; PubMed Central PMCID:
590 PMC64697285.

591 64. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. Healthy People 2030: Social determinants of
592 health: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2020 [cited 2020 December 10]. Available from:
593 <https://health.gov/healthypeople/objectives-and-data/social-determinants-health>.

594 65. Tamura K, Langerman SD, Ceasar JN, Andrews MR, Agrawal M, Powell-Wiley TM. Neighborhood
595 Social Environment and Cardiovascular Disease Risk. Curr Cardiovasc Risk Rep. 2019;13(4). Epub
596 2019/09/05. doi: 10.1007/s12170-019-0601-5. PubMed PMID: 31482004; PubMed Central PMCID:
597 PMC6720128.

598 66. Hansen AY, Umstattd Meyer MR, Lenardson JD, Hartley D. Built Environments and Active Living
599 in Rural and Remote Areas: a Review of the Literature. Curr Obes Rep. 2015;4(4):484-93. Epub
600 2015/09/14. doi: 10.1007/s13679-015-0180-9. PubMed PMID: 26364307.

601 67. Chen M, Tan X, Padman R. Social determinants of health in electronic health records and their
602 impact on analysis and risk prediction: A systematic review. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2020;27(11):1764-
603 73. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocaa143.

604 68. Cottrell EK, Hendricks M, Dambrun K, Cowburn S, Pantell M, Gold R, et al. Comparison of
605 community-level and patient-level social risk data in a network of community health centers. JAMA
606 Netw Open. 2020;3(10):e2016852. Epub 2020/10/30. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.16852.
607 PubMed PMID: 33119102; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC67596576.

608 69. Zulman DM, Maciejewski ML, Grubber JM, Weidenbacher HJ, Blalock DV, Zullig LL, et al. Patient-
609 Reported Social and Behavioral Determinants of Health and Estimated Risk of Hospitalization in High-
610 Risk Veterans Affairs Patients. JAMA Network Open. 2020;3(10):e2021457-e. doi:
611 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.21457.

612

613 **Supplemental material**

614 S1 File: Detailed methods for determining area-level social risks and driving time to the
615 grocery store and PCP clinic location. Includes geocoding precision, variables in poverty
616 calculation, variables in educational attainment calculation, area-level variables used in
617 models

618 S1 Table Multivariable models of Systolic BP for 4618 participants with pre-and post-
619 intervention measures.

620 S2 Table: Parsimonious model for low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol

621 S3 Table: Parsimonious model for HbA1C

622 S4 Table: Parsimonious model for systolic blood pressure (BP)

623 S5 Table: Parsimonious model for diastolic BP

624 S6 Table: Solution for Random Effects by clinics- LDL outcome

625 S7 Table: Solution for Random Effects by clinics: HbA1C Outcome

626 S8 Table: Solution for Random Effects by clinics: Systolic BP outcome

627 S9 Table: Solution for Random Effects by clinics: Diastolic BP outcome

628 S1 Figure: Interaction of female sex with pre-intervention systolic BP on adjusted
629 change in systolic BP

630 S2 Figure: Interaction of female sex with pre-intervention systolic BP on adjusted

631 change in diastolic BP

632 S3 Figure: Interaction of female sex with pre-intervention HbA1C on adjusted change in

633 HbA1C

634

635

636


637

638

639

640

Figure 1: Flow diagram of participants



Flow diagram of **L**everaging **I**nformation **T**echnology to **G**uide **H**igh **T**ech, **H**igh **T**ouch Care (LIGHT²) program participants and final number of participants included in analysis for each cardiometabolic measure