

**Title:**

General Health Checks in Adult Primary Care: A Review

**Authors:**

David T. Liss, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Toshiko Uchida, MD<sup>1</sup>; Cheryl L. Wilkes, MD<sup>2</sup>; Ankitha Radakrishnan, BA<sup>3</sup>;  
Jeffrey A. Linder, MD, MPH<sup>1</sup>

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup> Division of General Internal Medicine and Geriatrics, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine

<sup>2</sup> Northwestern Medicine

<sup>3</sup> Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine

**Correspondence:**

David T. Liss, PhD

Research Associate Professor

Division of General Internal Medicine & Geriatrics

Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine

750 N. Lake Shore Drive, 10th floor, Chicago, IL 60611

[david.liss@northwestern.edu](mailto:david.liss@northwestern.edu)

## ABSTRACT

**Importance:** General health checks—also known as general medical exams, periodic health evaluations, checkups, or wellness visits—to identify and prevent disease are extremely common in adult primary care. Although general health checks are often expected and advocated by patients, clinicians, payers, and health systems, others question their value. The current evidence was updated and recommendations provided for conducting general health checks in adults.

**Observations:** Randomized trials and observational studies with control groups from prior systematic reviews and an updated literature review through December 2020 were included. Out of 19 included randomized trials (906 to 59,616 participants; follow-up, 1 to 30 years), 5 evaluated a single general health check and 7 evaluated annual health checks. All of 12 included observational studies (240 to 471,415 participants; follow-up, cross-sectional to 5 years) evaluated a single general health check. General health checks were generally not associated with decreased mortality, cardiovascular events, or cardiovascular disease incidence. For example, in the South-East London Screening Study (n=7,229), adults age 40 to 64 who were invited to two health checks over two years experienced no 8-year mortality benefit (6% overall). However, general health checks were associated with increased detection of chronic diseases, such as depression and hypertension; moderate improvements in controlling risk factors such as blood pressure and cholesterol; increased clinical preventive service uptake, such as colorectal and cervical cancer screening; and improvements in patient-reported outcomes, such as quality of life and self-rated health. General health checks were sometimes associated with modest improvements in health behaviors such as physical activity and diet. For example, in the OXCHECK trial (n=4121), fewer intervention participants exercised less than once per month (68% versus 71%). Potential adverse effects in individual studies included an increased risk of stroke and increased mortality attributed to increased completion of advanced directives.

**Conclusions and Relevance:** General health checks were not associated with reduced mortality or cardiovascular events, but were associated with increased chronic disease recognition and treatment; risk factor control, preventive service uptake, and patient-reported outcomes. Primary care teams may reasonably offer general health checks, especially for groups at high risk of overdue preventive services, uncontrolled risk factors, low self-rated health, or poor connection to primary care.

## INTRODUCTION

General health checks – also known as general medical exams, periodic health evaluations, checkups, or wellness visits – are the second most common reason for ambulatory care visits in the United States (U.S.), accounting for about eight percent of the roughly 900 million annual U.S. ambulatory visits.<sup>1</sup> Nearly all insurers provide partial or full financial coverage for these visits through mechanisms such as preventive visits for commercially insured patients<sup>2</sup> and annual wellness visits for Medicare beneficiaries.<sup>3</sup>

Despite the prevalence of general health checks in everyday clinical care, questions persist about the value, goals, and components of these visits. For example, the Society of General Internal Medicine explicitly recommends *against* annual general health checks for asymptomatic adults.<sup>4</sup> Others have called for these exams to be optimized so that physician-led teams deliver an “annual health review” that promotes trusting therapeutic relationships.<sup>5</sup> An additional source of confusion is the term “annual physical,” a misnomer in that general health checks do not necessarily need to be delivered annually nor include a physical examination beyond blood pressure and body mass index.<sup>6</sup>

### Prior Systematic Reviews

Prior reviews reached varying conclusions about the value of general health checks (**Table 1**). In 2007, an Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Evidence Report/Technology Assessment<sup>7</sup> and accompanying review manuscript<sup>8</sup> found that periodic health evaluations were consistently associated with receipt of some cancer screenings and cholesterol screening, and could reduce patient worry. However, periodic health evaluations had mixed effects on mortality, other clinical outcomes, and costs. In 2016, a Cochrane review of systematic risk assessment for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease<sup>9</sup> found no effects on mortality or cardiovascular endpoints, but some evidence of reductions in total cholesterol and blood pressure. In 2019, a separate Cochrane review of general health checks in adults<sup>10</sup>

found little or no effect on total mortality, cancer mortality, or ischemic heart disease, and probably little or no effect on cardiovascular mortality or stroke. The three systematic reviews described the risk of bias in included studies as generally variable, high, or unclear.

However, prior review findings may have limited generalizability to modern primary care populations. Prior reviews differed with regard to exclusion<sup>10</sup> or inclusion<sup>8</sup> of trials in elderly patients (**Table 1**), thus omitting U.S.-based randomized trials among Medicare enrollees.<sup>11-14</sup> Many trials were conducted in European countries with “usual care” consisting of universally insured populations with population-level access to primary care and few cost-related access barriers.<sup>15</sup> Additionally, many trials were conducted before several modern pharmacotherapies—including statins, many antihypertensive medications, and smoking cessation medications—were available. Findings from prior reviews may not be generalizable to U.S. primary care settings.<sup>16</sup>

The literature on general health checks was reviewed to gain an up-to-date understanding of the evidence. In addition to considering results of randomized trials, controlled, observational evidence from the twenty-first century was also evaluated.

## **METHODS**

Complementary approaches were used to identify randomized trials (regardless of publication year) and observational studies (published between January 2000 and November 2019) that met inclusion criteria. In addition to considering all randomized trials included in prior systematic reviews;<sup>8-10</sup> we also considered observational studies from the prior review by Boulware et al.<sup>8</sup> that were published in 2000 or later. In addition, the Ovid MEDLINE database was queried on January 19, 2021 to identify articles published up to December 31, 2020. The MEDLINE query included three related searches (Supplement). First, a search for observational articles published between 2000 and 2020 was conducted. Then, to identify recently published randomized trials, the search strategy from each of the two prior Cochrane reviews<sup>9,10</sup> was

replicated, but restricted to articles published since each review's respective search date. One study author screened each study abstract; abstracts identified as potentially meeting inclusion criteria were then screened by an additional author. If both screeners agreed that the study might meet inclusion criteria, two authors then screened the full text manuscript. When an author pair disagreed about whether to include a study in the review, the full study team screened the relevant manuscript and jointly made a final inclusion decision. Reference lists of included studies were also hand searched for potentially eligible articles.

The review included controlled, randomized trials and controlled (i.e., with a comparator group), observational studies conducted in primary care among adults—with no upper age limit—with a total sample size of at least 200 patients to eliminate small studies that would be more likely to provide imprecise results. Disease-specific or condition-specific studies and studies conducted in settings outside of primary care practices, such as patients' homes, workplaces, or freestanding pharmacies were excluded. Articles that were not available in English and studies where outcome data were not yet published were excluded.

To be included, studies had to report outcome measures from at least one of the following seven categories: 1) mortality; 2) cardiovascular outcomes, including cardiac events, such as stroke, or incidence of conditions such as coronary heart disease or diabetes; 3) chronic disease detection, defined by a newly diagnosed chronic illness or initiation of chronic disease treatment (typically via pharmacotherapy); 4) risk factor control for outcomes such as weight, blood pressure, cholesterol, or overall cardiovascular risk; 5) uptake of clinical preventive services; 6) health behaviors such as exercise, diet, or smoking, and; 7) patient-reported outcomes such as quality of life or anxiety. For each included study, relevant data on these seven outcome categories were collected, along with any available data on potential adverse effects among patients exposed to general health checks.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

After screening 1,860 abstracts, a total of 31 studies met inclusion criteria: 19 were randomized trials and 12 were controlled observational studies (**Figure 1**).

The studies were conducted in multiple countries, in different age groups, and varied in size. Seventeen studies (55%) were conducted in Europe (9 in Scandinavia, 8 in the United Kingdom [U.K.]), 11 (36%) in the U.S., and the remainder in Asia (6%) or Canada (3%). Six studies (19%) were restricted to patients between age 40 and 64, eight (26%) were restricted to patients age 65 and older, and 17 (55%) included patients in multiple or unspecified age groups. The number of included study subjects in randomized trials ranged from 906 to 59,616 and, in observational studies, from 240 to 471,415. Follow-up periods ranged from 6 months to 30 years. Fourteen included studies (45%) began prior to 1990 (i.e. before medications such as statins were widely available), 7 (23%) began during the 1990s, and 10 (32%) began during the twenty-first century.

Although a physician delivered at least some components of all included interventions, general health check intervention formats and components varied widely. The primary care physician conducted a physical examination in 16 (52%) included studies. Some general health check interventions included a single physician-led visit, while others included a multiphasic screening session with a non-physician, followed by a visit with a physician to review screening results. Many different forms of screening were employed, including interviews to assess patient-reported risk factors, laboratory testing of blood and urine, cancer screenings, and other diagnostic testing of lung, heart, or eye function. Lifestyle interventions and health behavior coaching sometimes accompanied general health check screenings.

The frequency of general health checks varied by study design. While all 12 included observational studies evaluated a single general health check, there was substantial variation across included randomized trials. Five of 19 (26%) trials evaluated a single, comprehensive general health check, 7 (37%) evaluated annual health checks, 1 (5%) evaluated biannual health checks, and 6 (32%) evaluated health checks delivered at other frequencies.

## Mortality

General health checks were not consistently associated with changes in mortality. In 13 randomized trials that evaluated mortality (**Table 2**),<sup>12,17-28</sup> eleven reported no significant all-cause mortality benefit.<sup>11,12,17-19,21-23,25-27</sup> For example, in the South-East London Screening Study (n=7,229), adults age 40 to 64 who were invited to two multiphasic screening sessions over two years experienced no benefit in eight-year mortality (6% overall)<sup>21</sup> or nine-year mortality (results not reported).<sup>29</sup> In the DanMONICA trial conducted among 17,845 Danes, invitation to screenings and interventions at baseline, five years, and 10 years led to no difference in 30-year all-cause mortality.<sup>25</sup>

General health checks showed a mortality benefit in two trials conducted in older adults. In the Senior Health Watch trial (n=4,195), Medicare beneficiaries were offered two annual preventive visits including a comprehensive exam, laboratory procedures, and immunizations, plus physician-recommended follow-up counseling visits.<sup>13</sup> Mortality was lower in the intervention group during the two-year intervention period (8% versus 11%<sup>13</sup>) and the four-year period including two years of post-intervention follow-up (19% versus 22%; P=0.02 in chi-square test conducted by our study team in Stata, version 14.2 [StataCorp; College Station, TX]). In the Viborg Vascular (VIVA) trial (n=50,156), Danish men aged 65 to 74 received a universal screening intervention—including portable ultrasound screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm, portable doppler screening for peripheral arterial disease, and hypertension screening. Over a median of 4.4 years follow-up, 10% of patients in the screening group died, compared to 11% of the non-screening group.<sup>24</sup>

## Cardiovascular Outcomes

In five included studies<sup>23-27</sup>—all randomized trials—that evaluated cardiovascular outcomes, general health checks consistently failed to reduce cardiovascular events or cardiovascular disease incidence. In the Inter99 trial (n=59,616), where Danish adults aged 30 to 60 received



up to four health checks over five years, there were no differences in 10-year incidence of ischemic heart disease or stroke.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, in the DanMONICA trial, there were no differences in 30-year ischemic heart disease incidence.<sup>25</sup>

### Chronic Disease Detection

In four randomized trials<sup>19,24,30,31</sup> and six observational studies,<sup>32-37</sup> detection of chronic disease was increased among patients receiving general health checks. In the recent Check-In Study trial among patients aged 45 to 64 with low levels of education, 5% of patients randomized to a single preventive health check, and 2% of those randomized to usual care, received a new antidepressant prescription over one year. However, there were no differences in detection of hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, or diabetes.<sup>31</sup> In a matched case-control study of patients from ethnically diverse areas of London with high levels of social deprivation (n=85,122), attending a National Health Service (NHS) Health Check was associated with higher odds of newly diagnosed diabetes (odds ratio [OR] 1.30), hypertension (OR 1.50), and stage 3-5 chronic kidney disease (OR 1.83). Additionally, 12% of NHS Health Check attendees received a new statin prescription, versus 8% in patients who did not attend a health check.<sup>33</sup>

### Risk Factor Control

In 11 studies,<sup>21,23,26,30-32,34,37-40</sup> 7 of which were trials, general health checks were associated with small or moderate improvements in measures such as blood pressure, cholesterol, and cardiovascular risk scores. In the Family Heart Study conducted in the U.K. (n=12,924), both women and men randomized to a general health check followed by tailored follow-up had reduced systolic blood pressure (6.4 mmHg reduction for women; 7.4 mmHg for men) and diastolic blood pressure (2.7 mmHg for women; 3.3 mmHg for men) after one year.<sup>38</sup> Similarly, in the Minnesota Heart Health Project (n=906), where rural adults aged 25 to 74 were randomized to a single general health check visit including multimodal screening and education,

the intervention group had a limited, but statistically significant, reduction in mean diastolic blood pressure (1.3 mmHg) and total cholesterol (4.6 mg/dl) after one year.<sup>30</sup>

General health checks had limited effect on weight. In the Family Heart Trial, mean weight among men in the intervention group was reduced by 1.2 kilograms (kg) after one year, and there were no weight differences between groups among women.<sup>38</sup> In the Ebeltoft Health Promotion Project trial (n=3,464), patients in a rural Danish area who were offered general health checks in two successive years had lower mean body mass index (BMI) at five-year follow-up than controls (26 vs 27 kg/m<sup>2</sup>).<sup>26</sup> However, in both the Minnesota Heart Health Project and the Check-In Study trial, a single general health check had no effect on BMI at one year.<sup>30,31</sup>

### Clinical Preventive Services

In four randomized trials<sup>12,13,20,41</sup> and five observational studies<sup>40,42-45</sup>—all of which were conducted in North America—patients receiving general health checks frequently had higher uptake of clinical preventive services. For example, in a propensity score-matched analysis of 2015 data from a U.S. Accountable Care Organization (n=8,917), a higher proportion of patients who received a Medicare Annual Wellness Visit (AWV) had completed colorectal cancer screening (69% vs 60%), breast cancer screening (81% vs 66%), fall risk screening (94% vs 15%), pneumococcal vaccination (86% vs 69%), tobacco screening and cessation intervention (91% vs 77%), and depression screening and follow-up planning (87% vs 18%). However, there were no differences in the proportion of patients using aspirin for ischemic vascular disease or completing influenza vaccination.<sup>40</sup>

Across included studies, there was variation in the persistence of preventive service increases after patients stopped attending general health check visits. In the A Healthy Future trial (n=2,558), where Medicare beneficiaries received a preventive services benefit package over two years, the intervention arm experienced relative increases in proportions of patients receiving influenza vaccination and completing advance directives at both two-year and four-

year follow-up (data not reported).<sup>11</sup> In contrast, the Senior Health Watch trial produced increases in the proportions of patients who were unscreened at baseline who received Pap smears (16% vs 13%) and rectal exams (23% vs 13%) during the two-year period when annual preventive visits were offered free of charge, but not in subsequent years.<sup>46</sup>

### Health Behaviors

Across nine randomized trials<sup>13,20,21,23,26,30,31,38,39</sup> and two observational studies,<sup>32,35</sup> some studies demonstrated an association between general health checks and modest improvements in health behaviors such as exercise- and diet-related outcomes. In the Oxford and Collaborators Health Check (OXCHECK) trial (n=4,121), where U.K. adults aged 35 to 64 were randomized to annual health checks over three years, fewer participants reported exercising less than once per month (68% vs 71%) and use of butter or hard margarine (22% vs 31%), but there were no differences in excessive alcohol consumption.<sup>39</sup> In the A Healthy Future trial, the intervention arm had greater improvements in physical activity and larger reductions in dietary fat after two years; however, these differences did not persist over four-year follow-up.<sup>11</sup>

General health check interventions generally did not reduce smoking rates. Although the proportion of smokers was lower among men in the Family Heart Trial's intervention arm (19% vs 23%) after one year, there was no significant difference among women.<sup>38</sup> Many other trials demonstrated no reductions in smoking.<sup>20,23,26,30-32,39</sup>

### Patient-Reported Outcomes

Of six randomized trials<sup>12,13,20,21,27,47</sup> evaluating patient-reported outcome measures, five produced one or more significant findings.<sup>12,13,20,21,27</sup> In three U.S.-based trials in Medicare beneficiaries, after two-year intervention periods the intervention group reported relative improvements in outcomes such as health worry,<sup>11</sup> quality of well-being,<sup>12,13</sup> quality of life,<sup>11,12</sup> and self-rated health.<sup>12</sup> In two European trials, general health check interventions separately led

to reduced anxiety (among men)<sup>48</sup> and improved self-rated health.<sup>49</sup> In the only included trial with null findings for patient-reported outcomes, a multiphasic screening exam and physician follow-up produced no change in patient-reported health status among low- and middle-income families in Salt Lake City, UT.<sup>47</sup>

### Potential Adverse Effects

Four trials demonstrated potential adverse effects of general health checks.<sup>20,24,25,27</sup> In the A Healthy Future trial testing a preventive services benefit package for Medicare beneficiaries, intervention arm participants aged 75 or greater had increased mortality over four years (19% vs 14%).<sup>11</sup> A follow-up analysis attributed this finding to the intervention group's increased completion of advance directives and decreased receipt of unwanted life-sustaining treatment in the face of serious medical events.<sup>20</sup>

In the Inter99 study—a population-based ischemic heart disease prevention trial in Denmark<sup>27</sup> (n=59,616)—women in the intervention group who lived in high-participation communities had 32% higher all-cause mortality risk than controls (hazard ratio [HR] 1.32),<sup>50</sup> which was driven by higher risks of lifestyle-related (HR 1.37) and cancer-related (HR 1.47) mortality. Study investigators had no explanation for this mortality increase, but hypothesized in a post-hoc analysis<sup>51</sup> the potential for high use of nutritional supplements that could have increased smoking-related cancers.<sup>52</sup>

In the DanMONICA trial, patients in the intervention group—who were invited to as many as three health checks between 1982 and 1994—had 14% higher stroke incidence over 30-year follow-up.<sup>25</sup> The authors hypothesized that this increase in strokes could be due to overdiagnosis, overtreatment, injury from testing, distress from test results, or false reassurance.

In the VIVA trial—in which mortality declined in the intervention group—of screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm, peripheral arterial disease, and hypertension among Danish men

aged 65 to 74, patients in the intervention group spent more days in the hospital for inpatient admissions related to COPD (incidence rate ratio [IRR] 1.13) and stroke or transient ischemic attack (IRR 1.05). However, treatments received during these inpatient stays may have contributed to the mortality reductions in the intervention group.<sup>24</sup>

## DISCUSSION

General health checks are not associated with reduced mortality or cardiovascular outcomes. General health checks are associated with increases in chronic disease detection, moderate improvements in risk factor control, increased uptake of clinical preventive services, and improvements in patient-reported outcomes. Despite being associated with limited changes in some health behaviors, general health checks were not associated with reductions in smoking. General health checks may have possible adverse effects. Benefits were frequently observed during the active intervention period or within a few years of general health check attendance; benefits were generally not observed more than five years after completion of an intervention.

Some findings from this review mirror those of prior reviews, such as the observed lack of mortality benefit,<sup>7,9,10</sup> increased clinical preventive service uptake,<sup>8</sup> and limited improvements in risk factor control.<sup>9</sup> However, in contrast to prior reviews, general health checks were found to improve patient-reported outcomes besides patient worry, with five of six included trials demonstrating benefits in outcomes such as quality of life and self-rated health.<sup>12,13,20,21,27</sup> These findings are particularly notable in light of the demonstrated association between self-rated health and mortality risk.<sup>53,54</sup> Additionally, this review included seven randomized trials from the U.S., more than any prior review.<sup>8-10</sup> The seven included U.S.-based trials generally produced positive findings, particularly for clinical preventive services and patient-reported outcomes. Given that the U.S. is unique among high-income countries in its lack of universal insurance and the access barriers faced by patients, it may be reasonable to conclude that general health

checks—by providing some of the benefits of available, accessible primary care<sup>55</sup>—are particularly effective in U.S. settings.

The Medicare AWV is one of the most common general health checks in the U.S. Although prior studies have produced mixed evidence on the potential benefits of AWVs,<sup>40,56</sup> the current review bolsters the case for several services covered within AWVs,<sup>57</sup> such as collection of patient-reported health status, assessment and review of risk factors, and updating a written schedule of recommended preventive services. However, not all AWV-covered services are necessarily beneficial. Cognitive screening is not recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF),<sup>58</sup> and an observational study included in this review detected no association between AWV uptake and incident diagnosis of Alzheimer’s disease and related dementia.<sup>42</sup> There are many unanswered questions about AWVs, such as whether annual AWVs confer greater benefits than less frequent AWVs.

Although many patients consider “the annual physical” necessary,<sup>59</sup> general health checks do not necessarily need to occur every year or include a physical exam. Although several studies in this review evaluated annual general health check delivery, these studies did not clearly demonstrate that health checks need to be offered this frequently. In addition, beyond blood pressure measurement, BMI assessment, and Pap smears for women, a regular screening physical examination has not been shown to improve health.<sup>6</sup> Given general health checks’ potentially limited but heterogeneous benefits across multiple domains, it seems rational to target populations with many preventive care needs or those at highest risk. For example, patients age 50 to 59 may be likely to benefit from general health checks because of the many USPSTF-recommended preventive services in this age group.<sup>58</sup> General health checks may also be especially beneficial for the increasingly large number of U.S. adults with no recent primary care physician visits,<sup>60</sup> and those at risk of high blood pressure, high cholesterol, low rates of preventive service uptake, or low reported quality of life or self-rated health. General

health checks may be particularly beneficial in historically underserved populations, and have the potential to decrease health care disparities.<sup>31,33</sup>

Current evidence provides no clear “blueprint” for how to systematically deliver general health checks in modern primary care settings. The frequency, number, and content of health checks varied substantially among studies (Table 2, ‘Intervention or Exposure’ column), so it remains unclear how many, or how often, general health checks should be delivered. However, intervention components should employ efficient—and likely team-based—approaches to address USPSTF A and B recommendations, recommended immunizations,<sup>61</sup> and ongoing risk factor control in diagnosed chronic illnesses. When providing general health checks, care teams should explicitly avoid delivery of non-recommended, low-value services. Depending on organizational resources and patient population risks, general health checks could also include screening and tailored support for patients’ social needs,<sup>62</sup> or allotted time for conversations to promote trusted, healing relationships.<sup>5</sup> Preventive services might be delivered “opportunistically,” outside of dedicated general health check visits. The COVID-19 pandemic has forced a reconsideration of traditional in-person care processes. Research should test new forms of general health checks that pair virtual components (e.g. telemedicine and patient portals) with brief in-person visits for services that cannot be delivered remotely (e.g. vaccinations). Additionally, pandemic-induced reductions in outpatient utilization<sup>63</sup> could exacerbate the underuse of recommended preventive services, while increasing rates of undiagnosed chronic illness. As such, there is now a need—and opportunity—for health systems to collaborate with patients to design and test new care delivery processes for general health checks that rely on minimal amounts of in-person services.

This review has several limitations. First, unlike some prior reviews,<sup>9,10</sup> this review was not a meta-analysis, precluding our ability to calculate pooled effect sizes. Second, the “dose” of general health checks—both frequency and duration—was often quite low. Third, despite our findings that general health checks were associated with improvements in multiple outcome

domains, the benefits were sometimes quite small, particularly for risk factors such as blood pressure and cholesterol and health behaviors such as physical activity and diet. Fourth, general health check uptake is often high among relatively advantaged groups<sup>45,64</sup> that are likely to be healthy or already have conditions diagnosed in the absence of general health checks; this selection bias is likely present in included observational studies. However, there were some included studies where general health check attendance was associated with increased chronic disease detection and treatment among disadvantaged groups, such as those with low education and inner-city residents.<sup>31,33</sup> Fifth, the pragmatic nature of the evidence under study sometimes hindered our ability to isolate effects of general health check uptake in routine clinical practice settings. For example, in the Multiphasic Health Checkup Evaluation Study, patients randomized to the intervention attended a mean of seven general health checks over 16-year follow-up, versus three general health checks in the usual care group, thus producing a comparison of varying general health check exposures (but not a truly unexposed control group). Also, in the DanMONICA trial, although up to three general health checks over 10 years did not reduce 30-year mortality or ischemic heart disease incidence, it is unclear whether these findings should be attributed to the ineffectiveness of general health checks, “opportunistic” delivery of recommended preventive services outside of dedicated general health check visits,<sup>65</sup> or an intervention of insufficient duration. Sixth, general health checks’ potential adverse effects and costs have not been evaluated as fully as potential benefits. Seventh, included studies did not examine the relational benefits of a regular general health check.<sup>5</sup> Finally, there is a dearth of recent high-quality evidence. The majority of included trials were conducted at least 20 years ago, and most large studies were conducted prior to the introduction of statins, which are known to reduce outcomes such as blood cholesterol and stroke risk.<sup>66</sup>

## **CONCLUSION**



General health checks have no effect on mortality or cardiovascular outcomes, but are associated with increased chronic disease detection and preventive service uptake, improvements in patient-reported outcomes, and limited improvements in risk factor control and some health behaviors. Primary care practices and health systems that elect to offer general health checks should target groups of patients that can substantially benefit, and should investigate new approaches to maximizing general health checks' effectiveness in modern primary care populations.

### ***Acknowledgments***

We thank Jonna Peterson, MLIS (Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Galter Health Sciences Library and Learning Center) for her support and assistance throughout the study search and selection process, including the design and conduct of the MEDLINE search, support during the abstract review phase, and obtaining full text articles. Ms. Peterson received no compensation for her project contributions.

### ***Funding/Support***

No funding source had a role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication. Dr. Liss is supported by grants from the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (R18DK110741; R34DK114773), Health Resources & Services Administration/Bureau of Health Professions (UH1HP29963), and United HealthCare Services. Dr. Linder is supported by a contract from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (HHSP233201500020I) and grants from the National Institute on Aging (R33AG057383, R33AG057395, P30AG059988, R01AG069762), the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (R01HS026506, R01HS028127), and the Peterson Center on Healthcare.

### ***Access to Data and Data Analysis***

Dr. Liss had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

## References

1. Rui P, Okeyode T. *National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey: 2016 National Summary Tables*. National Center for Health Statistics;2019.
2. Kaiser Family Foundation. Preventive Services Covered by Private Health Plans under the Affordable Care Act. <https://www.kff.org/health-reform/fact-sheet/preventive-services-covered-by-private-health-plans/>. Published 2015. Accessed September 24, 2020.
3. Medicare.gov. Annual Wellness Visit Coverage. U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. <https://www.medicare.gov/coverage/yearly-wellness-visits>. Accessed January 2, 2020.
4. Wisely C. Society of General Int Med - Routine physicals. ABIM Foundation. <http://www.choosingwisely.org/clinician-lists/society-general-internal-medicine-general-health-checks-for-asymptomatic-adults/>. Published 2017. Accessed January 2, 2020.
5. Goroll AH. Toward Trusting Therapeutic Relationships--In Favor of the Annual Physical. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(16):1487-1489.
6. Bloomfield HE, Wilt TJ. Evidence Brief: Role of the Annual Comprehensive Physical Examination in the Asymptomatic Adult. In: *VA Evidence Synthesis Program Evidence Briefs*. Washington (DC)2011.
7. Boulware LE, Barnes GJ, Wilson RF, et al. Value of the periodic health evaluation. *Evid Rep Technol Assess (Full Rep)*. 2006(136):1-134.
8. Boulware LE, Marinopoulos S, Phillips KA, et al. Systematic review: the value of the periodic health evaluation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2007;146(4):289-300.
9. Dyakova M, Shantikumar S, Colquitt JL, et al. Systematic versus opportunistic risk assessment for the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016(1):CD010411.
10. Krogsboll LT, Jorgensen KJ, Gotzsche PC. General health checks in adults for reducing morbidity and mortality from disease. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2019;1:CD009009.
11. Patrick DL, Grembowski D, Durham M, et al. Cost and outcomes of Medicare reimbursement for HMO preventive services. *Health Care Financ Rev*. 1999;20(4):25-43.
12. Morrissey JP, Harris RP, Kincade-Norburn J, et al. Medicare reimbursement for preventive care. Changes in performance of services, quality of life, and health care costs. *Med Care*. 1995;33(4):315-331.
13. German PS, Burton LC, Shapiro S, et al. Extended coverage for preventive services for the elderly: response and results in a demonstration population. *Am J Public Health*. 1995;85(3):379-386.
14. Elder JP, Williams SJ, Drew JA, Wright BL, Boulan TE. Longitudinal effects of preventive services on health behaviors among an elderly cohort. *Am J Prev Med*. 1995;11(6):354-359.
15. Rubin R. Debating Whether Checkups Are Time Wasted or Time Misused. *JAMA*. 2019;322(2):101-102.
16. Schneider EC, Sarnak DO, Squires D, Shah A, Doty MM. *Mirror, Mirror 2017: International Comparison Reflects Flaws and Opportunities for Better U.S. Health Care*. The Commonwealth Fund;2017.
17. Theobald H, Bygren LO, Carstensen J, Hauffman M, Engfeldt P. Effects of an assessment of needs for medical and social services on long-term mortality: a randomized controlled study. *Int J Epidemiol*. 1998;27(2):194-198.

18. Lannerstad O, Sternby NH, Isacson SO, Lindgren G, Lindell SE. Effects of a health screening on mortality and causes of death in middle-aged men. A prospective study from 1970 to 1974 of men in Malmö, born 1914. *Scand J Soc Med*. 1977;5(3):137-140.
19. Friedman GD, Collen MF, Fireman BH. Multiphasic Health Checkup Evaluation: a 16-year follow-up. *J Chronic Dis*. 1986;39(6):453-463.
20. Patrick DL, Beresford SA, Ehreth J, et al. Interpreting excess mortality in a prevention trial for older adults. *Int J Epidemiol*. 1995;24 Suppl 1:S27-33.
21. A controlled trial of multiphasic screening in middle-age: results of the South-East London Screening Study. The South-East London Screening Study Group. *Int J Epidemiol*. 1977;6(4):357-363.
22. Tibblin G, Welin L, Larsson B, Ljungberg IL, Svardsudd K. The influence of repeated health examinations on mortality in a prospective cohort study, with a comment on the autopsy frequency. The study of men born in 1913. *Scand J Soc Med*. 1982;10(1):27-32.
23. Wilhelmsen L, Berglund G, Elmfeldt D, et al. The multifactor primary prevention trial in Göteborg, Sweden. *Eur Heart J*. 1986;7(4):279-288.
24. Lindholt JS, Sogaard R. Population screening and intervention for vascular disease in Danish men (VIVA): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2017;390(10109):2256-2265.
25. Skaaby T, Jorgensen T, Linneberg A. Effects of invitation to participate in health surveys on the incidence of cardiovascular disease: a randomized general population study. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2017;46(2):603-611.
26. Engberg M, Christensen B, Karlsmose B, Lous J, Lauritzen T. General health screenings to improve cardiovascular risk profiles: a randomized controlled trial in general practice with 5-year follow-up. *J Fam Pract*. 2002;51(6):546-552.
27. Jorgensen T, Jacobsen RK, Toft U, Aadahl M, Glumer C, Pisinger C. Effect of screening and lifestyle counselling on incidence of ischaemic heart disease in general population: Inter99 randomised trial. *BMJ*. 2014;348:g3617.
28. Chiou CJ, Chang HY. Do the elderly benefit from annual physical examination? An example from Kaohsiung City, Taiwan. *Prev Med*. 2002;35(3):264-270.
29. Stone DH, D'Souza MF. Multiphasic screening in middle age: results and implications of a controlled trial in British general practice. *Isr J Med Sci*. 1981;17(2-3):215-221.
30. Murray DM, Luepker RV, Pirie PL, et al. Systematic risk factor screening and education: a community-wide approach to prevention of coronary heart disease. *Prev Med*. 1986;15(6):661-672.
31. Kamstrup-Larsen N, Dalton SO, Gronbaek M, et al. The effectiveness of general practice-based health checks on health behaviour and incidence on non-communicable diseases in individuals with low socioeconomic position: a randomised controlled trial in Denmark. *BMJ open*. 2019;9(9):e029180.
32. Chang KC-M, Lee JT, Vamos EP, et al. Impact of the National Health Service Health Check on cardiovascular disease risk: a difference-in-differences matching analysis. *CMAJ*. 2016;188(10):E228-E238.
33. Robson J, Dostal I, Madurasinghe V, et al. NHS Health Check comorbidity and management: an observational matched study in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2017;67(655):e86-e93.
34. Hama Y, Masumori K, Tagami H, Fujiwara K, Kusano S. Preassignment examination for personnel on Iwo Jima. *Mil Med*. 2001;166(8):721-724.
35. Forster AS, Burgess C, Dodhia H, et al. Do health checks improve risk factor detection in primary care? Matched cohort study using electronic health records. *Journal of public health (Oxford, England)*. 2016;38(3):552-559.

36. Caley M, Chohan P, Hooper J, Wright N. The impact of NHS Health Checks on the prevalence of disease in general practices: a controlled study. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2014;64(625):e516-521.
37. Kennedy O, Su F, Pears R, Walmsley E, Roderick P. Evaluating the effectiveness of the NHS Health Check programme in South England: a quasi-randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(9):e029420.
38. Randomised controlled trial evaluating cardiovascular screening and intervention in general practice: principal results of British family heart study. Family Heart Study Group. *BMJ*. 1994;308(6924):313-320.
39. Effectiveness of health checks conducted by nurses in primary care: final results of the OXCHECK study. Imperial Cancer Research Fund OXCHECK Study Group. *BMJ*. 1995;310(6987):1099-1104.
40. Beckman AL, Becerra AZ, Marcus A, et al. Medicare Annual Wellness Visit association with healthcare quality and costs. *Am J Manag Care*. 2019;25(3):e76-e82.
41. Belcher DW. Implementing preventive services. Success and failure in an outpatient trial. *Arch Intern Med*. 1990;150(12):2533-2541.
42. Fowler NR, Campbell NL, Pohl GM, et al. One-Year Effect of the Medicare Annual Wellness Visit on Detection of Cognitive Impairment: A Cohort Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2018;66(5):969-975.
43. Pfoh E, Mojtabei R, Bailey J, Weiner JP, Dy SM. Impact of Medicare Annual Wellness Visits on Uptake of Depression Screening. *Psychiatric services (Washington, DC)*. 2015;66(11):1207-1212.
44. Somkin CP, McPhee SJ, Nguyen T, et al. The effect of access and satisfaction on regular mammogram and Papanicolaou test screening in a multiethnic population. *Med Care*. 2004;42(9):914-926.
45. Finkelstein MM. Preventive screening. What factors influence testing? *Can Fam Physician*. 2002;48:1494-1501.
46. Burton LC, German PS, Shapiro S. A preventive services demonstration. Health status, health behaviors, and cost outcomes 2 years after intervention. The Johns Hopkins Medicare Preventive Services Demonstration Team. *Med Care*. 1997;35(11):1149-1157.
47. Olsen DM, Kane RL, Proctor PH. A controlled trial of multiphasic screening. *N Engl J Med*. 1976;294(17):925-930.
48. Stone DH, Crisp AH. The effect of multiphasic screening on aspects of psychiatric status in middle age: results of a controlled trial in general practice. *Int J Epidemiol*. 1978;7(4):331-334.
49. Pisinger C, Ladelund S, Glumer C, Toft U, Aadahl M, Jorgensen T. Five years of lifestyle intervention improved self-reported mental and physical health in a general population: the Inter99 study. *Prev Med*. 2009;49(5):424-428.
50. Bender AM, Jorgensen T, Pisinger C. Do high participation rates improve effects of population-based general health checks? *Prev Med*. 2017;100:269-274.
51. Bender AM, Jorgensen T, Pisinger C. Higher mortality in women living in high-participation areas of a population-based health check and lifestyle intervention study. *International journal of public health*. 2019;64(1):107-114.
52. Alpha-Tocopherol, Beta Carotene Cancer Prevention Study Group. The effect of vitamin E and beta carotene on the incidence of lung cancer and other cancers in male smokers. *N Engl J Med*. 1994;330(15):1029-1035.
53. Lorem G, Cook S, Leon DA, Emaus N, Schirmer H. Self-reported health as a predictor of mortality: A cohort study of its relation to other health measurements and observation time. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1):4886.
54. Schnittker J, Bacak V. The increasing predictive validity of self-rated health. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(1):e84933.

55. Levine DM, Landon BE, Linder JA. Quality and Experience of Outpatient Care in the United States for Adults With or Without Primary Care. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2019;179(3):363-372.
56. Ganguli I, Souza J, McWilliams JM, Mehrotra A. Association Of Medicare's Annual Wellness Visit With Cancer Screening, Referrals, Utilization, And Spending. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2019;38(11):1927-1935.
57. Medicare Learning Network. Annual Wellness Visit. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services [https://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/Medicare-Learning-Network-MLN/MLNProducts/downloads/AWV\\_chart\\_ICN905706.pdf](https://www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/Medicare-Learning-Network-MLN/MLNProducts/downloads/AWV_chart_ICN905706.pdf). Published 2018. Accessed August 28, 2020.
58. US Preventive Services Task Force. USPSTF A and B Recommendations. <https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/Page/Name/uspstf-a-and-b-recommendations/>. Updated January 2021. Accessed January 25, 2021.
59. Oboler SK, Prochazka AV, Gonzales R, Xu S, Anderson RJ. Public expectations and attitudes for annual physical examinations and testing. *Ann Intern Med*. 2002;136(9):652-659.
60. Ganguli I, Shi Z, Orav EJ, Rao A, Ray KN, Mehrotra A. Declining Use of Primary Care Among Commercially Insured Adults in the United States, 2008-2016. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;172(4):240-247.
61. Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices. Recommended Adult Immunization Schedule for ages 19 years or older: United States 2020. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/schedules/downloads/adult/adult-combined-schedule.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed January 25, 2021.
62. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *Integrating Social Care into the Delivery of Health Care: Moving Upstream to Improve the Nation's Health*. Washington, DC: 2019.
63. Mehrotra A, Chernew M, Linetsky D, Hatch H, Cutler D, Schneider EC. The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Outpatient Visits: Changing Patterns of Care in the Newest COVID-19 Hot Spots. Commonwealth Fund. <https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/2020/aug/impact-covid-19-pandemic-outpatient-visits-changing-patterns-care-newest>. Published 2020. Accessed September 24, 2020.
64. Pill R, French J, Harding K, Stott N. Invitation to attend a health check in a general practice setting: comparison of attenders and non-attenders. *J R Coll Gen Pract*. 1988;38(307):53-56.
65. Luft HS, Liang SY, Eaton LJ, Chung S. Primary care physician practice styles and quality, cost, and productivity. *Am J Manag Care*. 2020;26(4):e127-e134.
66. Adhyaru BB, Jacobson TA. Safety and efficacy of statin therapy. *Nat Rev Cardiol*. 2018;15(12):757-769.
67. Skaaby T, Jorgensen T, Linneberg A. A randomized general population study of the effects of repeated health checks on incident diabetes. *Endocrine*. 2018;60(1):122-128.
68. Burton LC, Steinwachs DM, German PS, et al. Preventive services for the elderly: would coverage affect utilization and costs under Medicare? *Am J Public Health*. 1995;85(3):387-391.
69. Kanstrup H, Refsgaard J, Engberg M, Lassen JF, Larsen ML, Lauritzen T. Cholesterol reduction following health screening in general practice. *Scand J Prim Health Care*. 2002;20(4):219-223.
70. Thomsen JL, Karlsmose B, Parner ET, Thulstrup AM, Lauritzen T, Engberg M. Secondary healthcare contacts after multiphasic preventive health screening: a randomized trial. *Scand J Public Health*. 2006;34(3):254-261.

71. Rasmussen SR, Thomsen JL, Kilsmark J, et al. Preventive health screenings and health consultations in primary care increase life expectancy without increasing costs. *Scand J Public Health*. 2007;35(4):365-372.
72. Bernstorff M, Deichgraeber P, Bruun NH, Dalsgaard E-M, Fenger-Gron M, Lauritzen T. A Randomised Trial Examining Cardiovascular Morbidity and All-Cause Mortality 24 years Following General Health Checks: the Ebeltoft Health Promotion Project (EHPP). *BMJ open*. 2019;9(10):e030400.
73. Jorgensen T, Ladelund S, Borch-Johnsen K, et al. Screening for risk of cardiovascular disease is not associated with mental distress: the Inter99 study. *Prev Med*. 2009;48(3):242-246.
74. Lau CJ, Pisinger C, Husemoen LLN, et al. Effect of general health screening and lifestyle counselling on incidence of diabetes in general population: Inter99 randomised trial. *Prev Med*. 2016;91:172-179.
75. Chang KC-M, Vamos EP, Palladino R, Majeed A, Lee JT, Millett C. Impact of the NHS Health Check on inequalities in cardiovascular disease risk: a difference-in-differences matching analysis. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2019;73(1):11-18.

**Table 1: Characteristics of prior systematic reviews**


Review Topic	Included Study Designs	Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria	Outcomes	Description of Included Trials	Locations of Included Trials (n)	Main Findings
Periodic health evaluations <sup>7,8</sup>	Randomized trials and observational studies	Attended visit assessing overall health and risk factors for preventable disease. Excluded studies where all patients under age 18.	Clinical preventive services, clinical outcomes, and costs	10 trials published between 1973 and 1999  Participant range, 112 to 32,186	<i>Asia</i> (1): Japan (1)  <i>Europe</i> (2): Sweden (1), U.K. (1)  <i>North America</i> (7): Canada (1), U.S. (6)	PHEs associated with receipt of gynecologic exams, Papanicolaou smears, cholesterol screening, and FOBT (medium or high quality of evidence). PHEs reduced patient worry (medium quality of evidence), but had mixed effects on other clinical outcomes and costs.
Systematic risk assessment for primary prevention of CVD <sup>9</sup>	Randomized trials	Healthy adults, including those at moderate or high CVD risk. Excluded studies of patients with known CVD.	<i>Primary:</i> all-cause and cardiovascular mortality, non-fatal cardiovascular endpoints  <i>Secondary:</i> major CVD risk factors, intermediate program outcomes, harms, costs	9 trials published between 1980 and 2014  Participant range, 501 to 145,441	<i>Europe</i> (6): Denmark (2), Sweden (1), U.K. (2), multiple countries (1)  <i>North America</i> (3): Canada (1), U.S. (2)	Systematic risk assessment had no effect on mortality or cardiovascular endpoints (low quality of evidence). Some favorable effects on total cholesterol, systolic blood pressure, and diastolic blood pressure (low or very low quality of evidence).
General health checks in adults <sup>10</sup>	Randomized trials	Adults in a primary care or community setting. Excluded studies targeting older adults and populations with	<i>Primary:</i> total mortality and disease-specific mortality	15 trials published between 1965 and 2017	<i>Europe</i> (12): Denmark (3), Sweden (4), U.K. (4), multiple	GHCs had little or no effect on total mortality, cancer mortality, or ischemic heart disease (high certainty of evidence). Probably



		specific risk factors/ conditions.	<i>Secondary:</i> several, including cardiovascular events	Participant range, 533 to 61,301	countries (1) <i>North America</i> (3): U.S. (3)	little or no effect on cardiovascular mortality or stroke (moderate certainty of evidence).
--	--	------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	---	---

Abbreviations: FOBT, fecal occult blood testing; PHE, periodic health evaluation; U.K., United Kingdom; U.S., United States

**Figure 1: Summary of Evidence Search and Selection**



**Table 2: Summary of included studies, by study design and whether mortality evaluated**

Study Name Sources	Country (Year of Initiation)	Study Sample (N)	Intervention or Exposure	Comparison	Length of Follow-Up	Main Findings
<b>Randomized Controlled Trials</b>						
<i>Randomized controlled trials that evaluated mortality</i>						
<b>Study of Men Born in 1913</b> Tibblin et al, <sup>22</sup> 1982	Sweden (1963)	Community- dwelling men 50 y (N=2,966)	Interview, physical examination and laboratory screening at baseline, 4 years, and 10 years	No study screening	15 years	No difference in total mortality (15%) or mortality from cardiovascular disease, cancer, violence, or other causes of death.
<b>Multiphasic Health Checkup Evaluation Study</b> Friedman et al, <sup>19</sup> 1986	Oakland and San Francisco, California (1964)	Kaiser Foundation Health Plan members 35- 54 y (N=10,713)	Annual medical questionnaire, physical examination and screening tests	No invitation to health checkups	16 years	After 10 years, increased detection of hypertension (22% vs 18%). After 16 years, decreased mortality from "potentially postponable" diseases (largely colorectal cancer and hypertension; 1% vs 2%). No difference in total mortality (11%).
<b>South-East London Screening Study</b> South-East London Screening Study Group, <sup>21</sup> 1977 Stone et al, <sup>29</sup> 1981	U.K. (1967)	Patients at two large group practices 40- 64 y (N=7,229)	Screening at baseline and 2- years for risk factors and cardiovascular, pulmonary, malignant diseases with questionnaire, interview, physical examination and laboratory testing	No invitation to screening	9 years	No difference in self-reported health status, cardiopulmonary symptoms, diastolic blood pressure, smoking, or morbidity, except intervention men had lower anxiety scores. No differences in 8-year mortality (6% overall) or 9-year mortality (results not reported).
Lannerstad et al, <sup>18</sup> 1977	Sweden (1969)	Community- dwelling men 55 y (N=1,613)	One-time examination and testing focusing on cardiovascular	No invitation to examination	5 years	No difference in total mortality (7%) or deaths from cancer, violence, or miscellaneous causes. Lower cardiovascular mortality (2% vs 4%).

			and pulmonary function			
Theobald et al, <sup>17</sup> 1998	Sweden (1969)	Community-dwelling adults 18-65 y (N=32,186)	One health screening including interviews for medical, psychiatric, and social needs	No study screening	20 years	No difference in adjusted all-cause mortality, adjusted cardiovascular disease, cancer, or accidents/intoxications.
<b>Primary Prevention Trial in Göteborg, Sweden</b> Wilhelmsen et al, <sup>23</sup> 1986	Sweden (1970)	Community-dwelling men 47-55 y (N=30,022)	Screening questionnaire, physical examination, and intervention at baseline, 4 years, and 10 years (20% subsample) for cardiovascular risk factors	No study screening	10 years	No difference in total mortality (13%), stroke (2%), coronary heart disease (8%), cancer death (4%), smoking or other individual risk factors but a summary risk score predicted lower mortality risk at 10 years (8.1% vs 8.3%).
<b>DanMONICA Trial</b> Skaaby et al, <sup>25</sup> 2017 Skaaby et al, <sup>67</sup> 2018	Denmark (1982)	Community-dwelling adults 30, 40, 50, and 60 y (N=17,845)	Screening questionnaire, physical examination, testing, and counseling at baseline, 5 years, and 10 years for risk factors and chronic diseases	No invitation to screening	30 years	After 24 years, no difference in diabetes incidence. After 30 years, no difference in all-cause mortality or ischemic heart disease incidence. Increased stroke incidence.
Morrissey et al, <sup>12</sup> 1995	North Carolina, U.S. (1985)	Medicare beneficiaries ≥65 y (N=1,914)	Annual immunizations, clinical screening, functional screening, and health promotion counseling	Usual care offered at control practices	2 years	Increase in influenza vaccination (72% vs 52%), pneumococcal vaccination (80% vs 35%), breast exams (86% vs 42%), FOBT (93% vs 43%), Pap smears (85% vs 31%), depression screening (94% vs 28%), vision screening (93% vs 22%), hearing screening (93% vs 6%), incontinence screening (92% vs 19%).

						Less deterioration in 3 quality-of-life scores. No differences in deaths.
<b>Senior Health Watch</b> German et al, <sup>13</sup> 1995 Burton et al, <sup>68</sup> 1995 Burton et al, <sup>46</sup> 1997	Baltimore, MD (1989)	Medicare beneficiaries ≥65 y (N=4,195)	Two free preventive visits for history, physical exam, immunizations, labs, and counseling	Usual care from primary care provider	4 years	Over 2 years, lower mortality in intervention group (8% vs 11%), and increased proportions of previously unscreened patients who received Pap smears (16% vs 13%) and rectal exams (23% vs 13%). No differences in smoking, problem alcohol use or sedentary lifestyle. After 4 years, no difference in Quality of Well-Being score, Pap smears, or rectal exams.
<b>A Healthy Future</b> Patrick et al, <sup>20</sup> 1995 Patrick et al, <sup>11</sup> 1999	Seattle, WA (1989)	Medicare beneficiaries ≥65 y (N=2,558)	Baseline health risk assessment, and 2 years of annual health-promotion and disease prevention visits with follow-up classes	Usual care at comparison medical centers	4 years	After 2 years, increased physical activity, completion of advance directives, and receipt of influenza vaccination, and significantly greater reduction in dietary fat (results not reported). Increased quality of life and self-rated health. Decreased mean depression score and health worry. No differences in several health behaviors (e.g. smoking) and physical/mental status outcomes (e.g. vision). At 4 years, increased mortality among patients aged 75 or greater at baseline (19% vs 14%)
<b>Ebeltoft Health Promotion Project</b> Engberg et al, <sup>26</sup> 2002 Kanstrup et al, <sup>69</sup> 2002 Thomsen et al, <sup>70</sup> 2006 Rasmussen et al, <sup>71</sup> 2007	Denmark (1991)	Patients of all GPs in Ebeltoft 30-49 y (N=3,464)	Baseline questionnaire, physical exam and laboratory testing with a subset offered a health discussion with their GP at baseline, 1 year, and 5 years	Questionnaire at baseline and health screening at 5 years	25 years	After 5 years, decrease in elevated cardiovascular risk score, BMI (26 vs 27 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), and cholesterol levels (5.5 vs 5.7 mmol/L). After 25 years, no difference in all-cause mortality.

Bernstorff et al, <sup>72</sup> 2019						
<b>Inter99 Study</b> Jorgensen et al, <sup>73</sup> 2009 Pisinger et al, <sup>49</sup> 2009 Jorgensen et al, <sup>27</sup> 2014 Lau et al, <sup>74</sup> 2016 Bender et al, <sup>50</sup> 2017 Bender et al, <sup>51</sup> 2019	Denmark (1999)	Community- dwelling adults 30-60 y (N=59,616)	Screening, personal risk assessment and lifestyle counseling at baseline and 5 years. High-risk participants had additional checks at years 1 and 3	No invitation to screening or counseling	10 years	After 5 years, improved physical and mental health scores. After 10 years, no difference in total mortality or incidence of diabetes, ischemic heart disease, stroke, or combined events. In post-hoc analysis, women in high-participation areas had increased risk of death (4.5% vs 3.6%), particularly cancer- and lifestyle-related deaths.
<b>Viborg Vascular (VIVA) Trial</b> Lindholt et al, <sup>24</sup> 2017	Denmark (2008)	Community- dwelling men 65-74 y (N=50,156)	Screening and intervention at baseline, with 1 year check if positive screen for abdominal aortic aneurysm, peripheral arterial disease, or hypertension	No invitation to screening	5 years	Decreased all-cause mortality (10% vs 11%) and slight increases in initiation of anti-thrombotic, lipid-lowering, and anti- hypertensive therapies in the first 6 months. Increase in inpatient days for COPD and stroke/TIA. No differences in incidence of diabetes, intracerebral hemorrhage, renal failure, or cancer.
<i>Randomized controlled trials that did not evaluate mortality</i>						
Olsen et al, <sup>47</sup> 1976	Salt Lake City, UT (1972)	Lower- and middle-income families (N=574 families)	Physical examination, electrocardiogram , spirometry, x- rays, blood and urine tests, with results sent to their physician	No study screening	1 year	No differences in health status index, days of disability, or total physician visits
<b>Disease Prevention and Health</b>	Seattle, WA (1981)	Male veterans (N=1,224)	Annual interview, physical examination, screening tests	Not invited to health promotion clinic	5 years	Patients referred to a health promotion clinic had seemingly increased assessment of blood pressure (83% vs 78%), smoking (71% vs 30%), alcohol

<b>Maintenance Program Trial</b> Belcher et al, <sup>41</sup> 1990			and counseling for health behaviors			use (70% vs 24%), and fecal occult blood testing screening (70% vs 20%; statistical comparisons not reported). Influenza vaccination appeared decreased (56% vs 67%).
<b>Minnesota Heart Health Project</b> Murray et al, <sup>30</sup> 1986	Minnesota, U.S. (1982)	Community-dwelling adults 25-74 (N=906)	Single visit with screening, education, physical examination, labs, and counseling	No care at Heart Health Center	1 year	Lower levels of cholesterol (207 vs 212 mg/dl), diastolic blood pressure (73 vs 74 mmHg), resting heart rate (71 vs 73 bpm), and expired carbon monoxide (31 vs 35 ppm). Increased self-reported physical activity (33% vs 26%) and use of antihypertensive medications (14% vs 10%). No differences in BMI, systolic blood pressure, or smoking.
<b>OXCHECK Study</b> OXCHECK Study Group <sup>39</sup> 1995	U.K. (1988)	Community-dwelling adults 35-64 y (N=4,121)	Annual health checks including questionnaire, medical history, physical examination, and laboratory testing	No study health checks	3 years	Decrease in cholesterol (6.0 vs 6.2 mmol/l), systolic blood pressure (127 vs 129 mmHg), and diastolic blood pressure (76 vs 77 mmHg). Fewer participants exercised less than once per month (68% vs 71%), used full cream milk (23% vs 31%), or used butter or hard margarine (22% vs 31%). No difference in smoking or excessive alcohol use.
<b>Family Heart Study</b> Family Heart Study Group <sup>38</sup> 1994	U.K. (1990)	Community-dwelling men 40-59 y and their partners (N=12,924)	Baseline and 1-year screening for cardiovascular risk factors via interview, physical examination, laboratory testing and lifestyle counseling with follow-up every 2-6 months	Screening for cardiovascular risk factors and lifestyle counseling at 1 year only	1 year	Decreased Dundee coronary risk score, systolic blood pressure (123 vs 130 mmHg for women, 132 vs 139 mmHg for men), diastolic blood pressure (79 vs 81 mmHg for women, 83 vs 87 mmHg for men), weight (80 vs 81 kg for men), smoking (19% vs 23% for men), and cholesterol (5.6 vs 5.7 mmol/L for men). No difference in blood glucose (both sexes) or, among women, weight, smoking, or cholesterol.

<b>Check-In Study</b> Kamstrup-Larsen et al, <sup>31</sup> 2019	Denmark (2014)	Patients of GPs in Copenhagen 45-64 y with low socioeconomic position (N=1,104)	Questionnaire and laboratory testing; interview, physical examination and consultation with GP	Usual care with no study screening	1 year	Increase in starts of antidepressant medications (5% vs 2%). No difference in smoking, alcohol use, physical activity, BMI, or metabolic risk factors.
<b>Observational Studies</b>						
<i>Observational studies that evaluated mortality</i>						
Chiou et al, <sup>28</sup> 2002	Taiwan (1993)	Community-dwelling adults ≥65 y (N=1,193)	Free annual health screening for risk factors and chronic diseases	Taiwanese residents ≥65 y who did not have an annual health exam	5 years	Residents who ever utilized the annual health exam had lower relative risk of mortality (0.50).
<i>Observational studies that did not evaluate mortality</i>						
Finkelstein et al, <sup>45</sup> 2002	Ontario, Canada (1994)	Community-dwelling women ≥20 y (N=2,232)	Preventive services uptake among women who had a periodic health exam	Women who had not had a periodic health exam	Cross-sectional	Having a periodic health exam associated with receipt of Pap smears (OR 6.69), mammograms (OR 3.67), bone densitometry (OR 3.70), and cholesterol testing (OR 3.00).
Hama et al, <sup>34</sup> 2001	Japan (1999)	Male military personnel (N=240)	Screening physical exam and labs	Military personnel who did not have screening exam or labs	1 year	Non-screened population had an increased prevalence of hypertension (11% vs 4%), hyperlipidemia (16% vs 3%), and severe obesity (4.5% vs 0.5%).
<b>Pathfinders Project</b> Somkin et al, <sup>44</sup> 2004	Alameda County, California (1999)	Community-dwelling women 40-74 y (N=1,463)	Telephone survey of factors associated with preventive services uptake	N/A	3 years	Higher odds of regular mammograms (OR 2.28) and Pap smears (OR 4.38) among women who completed a check-up in the past year.
Chang et al, <sup>32</sup> 2016 Chang et al, <sup>75</sup> 2019	U.K. (2009)	NHS enrollees 40-74 y (N=138,788)	NHS Health Check for cardiovascular risks with	People who did not have a Health Check	2 years	Health Check attendees had slightly lower modeled cardiovascular risk, and higher rates of diagnosed hypertension (4.1% vs 0.8%), type 2 diabetes (1.6%



			questionnaire, medical history, physical examination and laboratory testing			vs 0.2%), and chronic kidney disease (0.3% vs 0.1%). In difference-in-difference analyses, Health Check attendance associated with relative decreases in systolic blood pressure (-2.5 mmHg), diastolic blood pressure (-1.5 mmHg), BMI (-0.3 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), and total cholesterol (-0.15 mmol/L), and relative increases in proportion of patients prescribed a statin (3.8%) and antihypertensive medication (1.4%).
Robson et al, <sup>33</sup> 2017	U.K. (2009)	Urban NHS enrollees 40-74 y (N=85,122)	NHS Health Check for cardiovascular risks with questionnaire, medical history, physical examination and laboratory testing	People who did not have a Health Check	5 years	Health Check attendees had more new statin prescriptions (12% vs 8%) and more new diagnoses of diabetes (OR 1.30), hypertension (OR 1.50) and chronic kidney disease (OR 1.83).
Caley et al, <sup>36</sup> 2014	U.K. (2010)	Rural and urban NHS enrollees 40-74 y (N=not reported)	Practices that provided NHS Health Check for cardiovascular risks with questionnaire, medical history, physical examination and laboratory testing	Practices that did not provide Health Checks	3 years	No differences in change in prevalence of diabetes, hypertension, coronary heart disease, chronic kidney disease, or atrial fibrillation.
Pfoh et al, <sup>43</sup> 2015	Maryland and Washington DC (2010)	Medicare beneficiaries ≥65 y (N=4,245)	Medicare AWW with medical history, physical examination and laboratory testing	No Medicare AWW	Cross-sectional	No difference in depression screening.

Forster et al, <sup>35</sup> 2016	U.K. (2010)	NHS enrollees 40-74 y (N=257,368)	NHS Health Check for cardiovascular risks with questionnaire, medical history, physical examination and laboratory testing	People who did not have a Health Check	4 years	Health Check attendees were more likely to be diagnosed with hypercholesterolemia (men: 59% vs 26%, women: 62% vs 30%) and obesity (men: 23% vs 15%, women: 23% vs 19%) and to be prescribed statins (11% vs 8%), and less likely to be smokers (men: 21% vs 26%, women: 16% vs 21%). Men were more likely to be diagnosed with hypertension (36% vs 31%).
Fowler et al, <sup>42</sup> 2018	U.S. (2011)	Medicare beneficiaries ≥65 y (N=471,415)	Medicare AWW with medical history, physical examination and laboratory testing	No Medicare AWV	1 year	No clinically meaningful differences in incident diagnosis of ADRD or initiation of ADRD medications.
Kennedy et al, <sup>37</sup> 2019	U.K. (2011)	Rural and urban NHS enrollees 35- 71 y (N=366,005)	NHS Health Check for cardiovascular risks with questionnaire, medical history, physical examination, and laboratory testing	People who were not invited for Health Check	6 months - 3.5 years	Compared to a control cohort, four intervention cohorts had higher proportions of subjects detected with CVD risk >10% (range of differences, 2.0% to 3.6%), total cholesterol >5.5mmol/L (4.1% to 7.0%), total cholesterol >7.5mmol/L (0.3% to 0.4%), blood pressure >140/90 mmHg (1.0% to 2.1%), and BMI >30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> (0.9% to 2.5%). Health Check cohorts more likely to have diagnoses of hypertension (0.3% to 0.6%), and starts of statins (0.2% to 0.9%) and anti-hypertensives (0.2% to 0.6%). No differences in detection of AF or CKD, or in prescriptions of NRT, antiglycemics, or antiobesity medications.
Beckman et al, <sup>40</sup> 2019	U.S. (2014)	Medicare beneficiaries ≥65 y	Medicare AWW with medical history, physical	No Medicare AWV	Cross- sectional	Medicare AWW associated with greater occurrence of fall risk screening (94% vs 15%), pneumococcal vaccination (86%

		(N=8,917)	examination and laboratory testing			vs 69%), tobacco screening and cessation intervention (91% vs 77%), depression screening and follow-up planning (87% vs 18%), colorectal cancer screening (69% vs 60%), breast cancer screening (81% vs 66%), and controlled hemoglobin a1c (77% vs 65%). No difference in use of aspirin for ischemic vascular disease, controlled hypertension, BMI screening, blood pressure control, or influenza vaccination.
--	--	-----------	------------------------------------	--	--	--

Abbreviations: ADRD, Alzheimer’s disease and related dementia; AF, atrial fibrillation; ARR, Absolute Risk Reduction; AWV, Annual Wellness Visit; BMI, body mass index; BP, blood pressure; bpm, beats per minute; CI, Confidence Interval; CKD, chronic kidney disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; FOBT, fecal occult blood test; GP, general practitioner; HR, Hazard Ratio; NHS, National Health Service; NRT, nicotine replacement therapy; OR, Odds Ratio; ppm, parts per million; SE, Standard Error; TIA, transient ischemic attack; U.K., United Kingdom; U.S., United States; Y, year