Effectiveness of shared medical appointments delivered in primary care for improving health outcomes in patients with long-term conditions: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials

Mei Yee Tang[1,+], Fiona Graham[1,+,*], Amy O'Donnell[1], Fiona R Beyer[1], Catherine Richmond[2], Falko F Sniehotta[1,3+] ,Eileen Kaner[1,+]

[1] NIHR Policy Research Unit in Behavioural Science, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

[2] Population Health Science Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

[3] Department of Public Health, Preventive and Social Medicine, Mannheim Medical Faculty Heidelberg University, Germany

*Corresponding author: Fiona.graham@newcastle.ac.uk

[+]Mei Yee Tang and Fiona Graham contributed equally to this paper as first co-authors. Falko Sniehotta and Eileen Kaner contributed equally to this paper as last co-authors.

Funding

This study is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) [Policy Research Unit in Behavioural Science (project reference PR-PRU-1217-20501)]. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the following authors for providing additional data used in this review: Dr Renee E Cole, Dr Connor Drake, Dr William Yancy, and Professor Tracey Taveria. We would also like to thank Professor Dawn Craig for her comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

ABSTRACT

Background: Shared medical appointments (SMAs) have the potential to address interlinked challenges of limited capacity in primary healthcare and rising prevalence of patients with multiple long-term conditions (LTCs). This review aimed to examine the effectiveness of SMAs compared to one-to-one appointments in primary care at improving health outcomes and reducing demand on healthcare services.

Methods: We searched for randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of SMAs involving patients with LTCs in primary care across six databases from 2013 and added eligible papers identified from previous relevant reviews. Data were extracted and outcomes narratively synthesised, meta-analysis was undertaken where possible.

Results: Twenty-three unique trials were included. SMA models varied in terms of components, mode of delivery and target population. Most trials recruited patients with a single LTC, mostly commonly diabetes (n=13), although eight trials selected patients with multiple LTCs. There was substantial heterogeneity in outcome measures which we categorised into health outcomes (biomedical indicators, psychological and well-being measures), behavioural outcomes, and resource use. Meta-analysis showed that participants in SMA groups had lower diastolic blood pressure than those in usual care (d=-0.123, *95%CI* = -0.22, -0.03, k=8). No statistically significant differences were found across other outcomes. Where individual studies showed significant differences (patient self-efficacy), these trended in favour of SMAs. Compared with usual care, SMAs had no significant effect on healthcare service use.

Conclusions: SMAs were at least as effective as usual care in terms of health outcomes and did not lead to increased healthcare service use in the short-term. They show some potential in improving self-efficacy which may boost self-care. To strengthen the evidence base, future studies should target standardised behavioural and health outcomes and clearly report SMA components so key behavioural ingredients can be identified. Similarly, transparent approaches to measuring costs would improve comparability between studies.

PROSPERO: *CRD42020173084*

Keywords: *shared medical appointments, long-term conditions, systematic review, meta-analysis*

INTRODUCTION

Shared Medical Appointments (SMAs), also known as group consultations, are a model of care with the potential to address the interlinked challenges of limited capacity in primary care and rising prevalence of patients with multiple long-term conditions (LTCs)[1,2]. SMAs are longer appointments (typically 60-120 minutes) whereby patients with the same LTCs meet with their physician together[3]. SMAs are typically co-led and/or facilitated by healthcare professionals, such as nurses, pharmacists, psychologists, and physiotherapists. The group typically consists of between 6-10 patients and may include family members and caregivers[4]. There are various models of SMA but generally they retain some features of a standard one-to-one appointment such as physical examinations and personalised review of medical charts[2]. In addition, SMAs provide participants an opportunity to ask questions of clinicians and other patient and receive formal education and counselling during the group session. SMAs have been used to deliver care for a range of health conditions including diabetes, hypertension, and chronic pain; though there is potential for wider application, including multimorbidity[5].

A recent synthesis of qualitative literature found that most patients and primary care practitioners regarded SMAs positively[6]. Key benefits included improved patient self-confidence and motivation for self-management; whilst practitioners felt that SMAs had the potential to provide a more efficient and effective way of delivering care[6]. Previous reviews of effectiveness were inconclusive but evidence, largely from the United States (US) and Australia, reported a promising effect of group consultations for some biomedical measures. For example, improvements in glycated haemoglobin A1C (HbA1C) and systolic blood pressure (SBP) were greater in patients attending SMAs compared to usual care for diabetes[4,7]. However, previous reviews include studies that evaluate the use of SMAs as follow-up appointments after secondary care treatment[4]. It is unclear whether these types of group appointments are effective in supporting improved ongoing management of LTCs in primary care.

Responding to these evidence gaps, we aimed to examine the effects of SMAs delivered in primary care on health outcomes and healthcare service use in patients with LTCs. We sought to answer two overarching research questions:

1. **Are SMAs effective in improving health outcomes for patients with one or more long-term conditions?**

2. **Do SMAs reduce healthcare service use by patients with one or more long-term conditions?**

METHOD

This systematic review follows Cochrane Handbook Guidance[8] and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines[9].

Protocol and registration

This study was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42020173084). Regarding protocol changes, we proposed coding of Behaviour Change Techniques Taxonomy V1 (BCTTv1)[10] used in SMAs and associated with changes in outcomes. However, most included studies did not report the required detail and so instead we narratively described this information.

Inclusion/exclusion criteria

Studies were included if they met the criteria outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

PICOS Criterion	Description
Population	Adult patients (≥18 years of age) with one or more long-term conditions who have attended at least one shared medical appointment (SMA) in a primary care setting were eligible for inclusion. Patients in primary care settings who were seen by a secondary care specialist during the SMA were excluded. All countries were eligible for inclusion.
Intervention (Model of care)	SMAs/group consultations/group visits conducted in primary care setting, delivered by a primary care healthcare professional (e.g. nurse, doctor, pharmacist), were eligible for inclusion. The present review considered SMAs to be clinical encounters in which groups of patients with the same/similar long-term condition meet with a healthcare professional for routine care. The SMA must have included one-to-one time for every patient in attendance. Therefore, peer support groups were excluded.
Comparison/control	No restrictions – usual care, active control (e.g., another SMA model).
Outcomes	Behavioural outcomes – e.g., healthcare utilisation, physical activity, medication adherence. Disease-specific measures – e.g., Haemoglobin A1C (HbA1C). Biophysical health indicators – e.g., cholesterol, weight, BMI. Cost/resource use.
Study design	Only randomised controlled trials that were published in peer-reviewed journals were eligible for inclusion.

Search strategy

A comprehensive search strategy was developed, based on the approach described in Booth et al.[4], to search for trials published after their search, namely the period 2013-2020. Key changes included the removal of the terms “group outpatient”, “GMV” or “GMA”, “group processes” and “Group care” (see S1). The search strategy was first used to search MEDLINE (via OVID) and then translated for the following databases: EMBASE (via OVID), Science citation index (via Web of Knowledge) Social Science Citation Index (via Web of Knowledge), Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (via EBSCOhost), Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (Wiley), DARE, NHS EED, and HTA (Centre for Reviews and Dissemination). Any relevant pre-2013 trials identified by forward and backward citation searches of the included trials, including those in relevant systematic reviews[4,5,11,12], were also included in the review.

Screening

Screening and data extraction was facilitated using the systematic review management tool, Covidence[13]. Two reviewers independently screened all titles and abstracts against the inclusion criteria, and a third reviewer adjudicated any disagreements. This process was also applied to the screening of full-text papers.

Data extraction

Information relating to the study design, population, intervention, form of delivery[14] (e.g. experience/training of the providers and facilitators), outcomes, and results were extracted from all relevant papers using a data extraction form (see S2). All information was double-extracted by two researchers, with disagreements resolved through discussion or third-party moderation.

Where data were reported for several time-points, the data-point closest to the end of the SMA intervention was used to calculate the effect size as this would be when the largest effects attributable to the SMA is expected. If available, intention-to-treat data were used to calculate effect sizes.

Quality assessment

Two researchers independently assessed the quality of all included studies using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool[15]. Percentages of judgements (high, low, or unclear) for each domain was calculated across the studies.

Data analysis/synthesis

We mapped all reported outcomes into the following categories agreed by the wider research team to best reflect SMA effectiveness and efficiency: biomedical health indicators, psychological and well-being measures, behavioural outcomes, and cost and resource.

Meta-analyses were performed in StataIC 15. Given the heterogeneity between studies, a random-effects model was used[16]. Meta-analyses were conducted where there were at least two studies reporting a specific outcome[17]. Outcome effect sizes were calculated as Cohen's D (standardised mean difference). Heterogeneity was assessed using Higgins I-Square (I^2), whereby 50-90% was considered as representing substantial heterogeneity[18]. Authors were contacted for additional information if data needed to calculate effect sizes were not sufficiently reported in the published paper(s). Where this information could not be obtained from authors, *p*-values and confidence intervals were used to calculate effect sizes[8]. Only studies in which the comparator was usual care were pooled into the meta-analysis.

Using meta-regression, sensitivity analyses were conducted to explore whether results differed according to sources of bias identified from the risk of bias assessment and the omission of outliers.

Studies that were too heterogeneous to perform meta-analysis (where the comparator was not usual care) were synthesised narratively. For each outcome measure, evidence of an effect was determined by the *p*-values reported in the papers. To assess the certainty of the evidence, number of study participants, confidence intervals and the consistency of effects across studies, the risk of bias of the studies, how directly the included studies address the planned question (directness) were taken into consideration.

RESULTS

<Figure 1 – PRISMA diagram of study selection process here>

Characteristics of the included studies

Twenty-three unique trials (reported in thirty-four papers) were identified, for PRISMA details see Figure 1 and Table 2. See S3 for list of included papers.

Table 2: Characteristics of included studies grouped by health condition(s)

Study	Condition(s)	Country	Setting	Sample size (N)	Model	Comparator	Characteristics of sample
Scott (2004)[19] Coleman (2001)[20]	^Chronic conditions	USA	Large health maintenance organisation	295	CHCC model- 'group visits'	Usual care	SMA: Age*, 74.2 (7.6) UC: Age*, 74.1 (7.4) Female %, 58.8
Gardiner (2017)[21] Gardiner (2019)[22]	Chronic pain and depression	USA	Community Health Centres serving low-income, racially and ethnically diverse populations	159	Integrated medical group visit	Usual care	Age* 50.5 (12.3) Female %, 86.5 White%, 81.6
Berry (2016)[23]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	Community-based health center serving low-income population who are working	80	Group visits	Usual care	Age* 51.4 (8.5) Age range: 32-65 years Female %, 89.3 Ethnicity %: non-Hispanic Black 77.4, non-Hispanic White 17.9, Asian Pacific 1.2, American Indian, 1.2
Clancy 2003a[24] Clancy 2003b[25]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	University Primary Care Center serving uninsured or inadequately insured patients	120	CHCC model- 'group visits'	Usual care	Age, 54.0 (10.44) (range 22–83 years); Female, % 78.3 Ethnicity %: African American 77.5, Caucasian 21.7
Clancy (2007a)[26] Clancy (2007b)[27] Clancy 2008[28]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	University Primary Care Center serving mainly minority, inadequately insured patients	186	CHCC model- 'group visits'	Usual care	Age, 56.1 (range, 26.5-80.7), Female %, 72 African American %, 82.8
Cole (2013)[29]	Diabetes (Prediabetes)	USA	Military health system	65	SMA	Individual counselling	Age*, 58.3 (9.6) Female %, 46 Ethnicity, %: Caucasian 64, African American 17, Hispanic 19
Drake (2018)[30]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	Family medicine centre	33	SMA + personalised health planning	SMA	SMA: Age* 59.4 (10.5) UC: Age* 55.1 (14.5) Female %, 68.4 Ethnicity, %: White non-Hispanic 21.1, Black non-Hispanic 73.7, Hispanic 5.3

Ee (2020)[31]	Diabetes (Type 2)	Australia	University primary care center	18	SMA	Usual care	SMA: Age* 55.9 (11.6), UC: Age* 60.1 (7.7), Female %, 33 Ethnicity %: European 33.3, Oceanic 27.3, Asian 36.8
Liu (2012)[32]	Diabetes (Type 2)	The People's Republic of China	General practices	208	CHCC model- 'group visits'	Usual care	SMA: Age, 61.99 (9.8) UC: Age, 62.49 (9.97) Female %, 62.0 Ethnicity %: Han 96.2, Zhuang 2.9, Other 0.96
Naik (2011)[33]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	Veterans Affairs Medical Centres	87	Group clinic	**Enhanced usual care	SMA Age, 63.82 (7.9) UC: Age, 63.45 (7.8) African American %, 31.0
Schillinger (2008)[34] Schillinger (2009)[35] Wallace (2013)[36]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	University affiliated-Safety net settings-community health network	339	Group medical visit	Automated telephone self-management Usual care	Age* 56.1 (12) Female %, 59 Ethnicity, %: Asian 23.3, African American 20.6, While/Latino 46.9, White non-Latino 7.7, Other/unknown 1.5
Vaughan (2017)[37]	Diabetes (Prediabetes/ Type 2)	USA	Community health clinic serving low-income Hispanic adults	62	Group visit	After 6 months, the control group received the intervention	SMA: Age* 51.3(NR) UC: Age* 48 (NR) Female %, 86 Hispanic 98%
Vaughan (2020)[38]	Diabetes (Type 2)	USA	Community health clinic serving low-income Hispanic adults	89	Group visits	Usual care	SMA: Age* 55.99 (7.12) UC: Age* 53.86 (9.07) Female %, 71.9 Self-identified as Latino(a), and Spanish-speaking
Wagner (2001)[39]	Diabetes (Type 1 & 2)	USA	Primary care practices in health maintenance organisation	708	Chronic care clinic	Usual care	SMA: Age* 61.2(NR) UC: Age*, 60.4 (NR) Female% 47.1 Caucasian %, 68.9
Cohen (2011)[40]	Diabetes (Type 2) and cardiovascular risk	USA	Veterans Association Medical Center	99	SMA programme (2 phases)	Usual care	SMA: Age* 69.8 (10.7) UC: Age*: 67.2 (9.4) Female %, 2
Taveira (2014)[41]	Diabetes and cardiovascular risk	USA	Veterans Association Medical Center	200	Group medical visit	CRRC Individual clinic Usual care	CCRC: Age* 64.6 (10), SMA: Age* 64.5 (10), UC: Age*, 64.5 (10.2), Female% 2.8 African American %, 5.1

Wu (2018)[42]	Diabetes (Type 2) and cardiovascular risk	USA	Veterans Health Administration Hospital primary care services	250	Group medical visit	Usual care	SMA: Age* 65.8 (8.7) UC: Age* 65 (9.8) Female% 3.6 Ethnicity %: Caucasian 76.6, African American 10.8, Asian pacific islanders 9.45, Hispanic 1.4, Unknown 1.5
Taveira (2011)[43]	Diabetes (Type 2) and depression	USA	Veterans Affairs Medical Centres	88	SMA/ Group medical appointment	Usual care	SMA: Age* 60.2 (9.3) UC: Age* 61.4 (9.9), Female %, 2.3 White %, 98.9
Yancy (2020)[44] Crowley (2017)[45]	Diabetes (Type 2) and overweight	USA	Veterans Association Medical Center	263	Group medical visit with IWM	Group medical visit	Age*, 60.7 (8.2) Female %, 10.6 Ethnicity %: White 42.6, African American 54.4, Other 3
Edelman (2010)[46] Crowley (2013)[47] Crowley (2014)[48] Eisenberg (2019)[49]	Diabetes (Type 2) and hypertension	USA	Veterans Association Medical Center	239	Group clinic	Usual care	Age, 62.0 Male %, 96.9 African American %, 57.1
Gao (2015)[50]	Hypertension	The People's Republic of China	Community Health Care Centre	1346	CHCC model+ 'group visits'	Usual care	Age, 66.5 (9.8) Female %, 58.6
Simon (2015)[51]	Hypertension	Germany	Physician practices	48	CHCC model 'group medical visit'	Usual care	NR
Baqir (2020)[52]	Osteoporosis	UK	General practices	158	Group consultation	Usual care	SMA: Age*, 74 (11) UC: Age*, 74 (10) Female %, 83.5

Multiple papers for the same trial were found therefore we bolded the one used as the index paper throughout the rest of the paper. ^Chronic conditions (including asthma, COPD, heart failure, diabetes, arthritis, deafness, blindness), *Age in years mean (standard deviation), **enhanced usual care- patients required to attend 2 diabetes group education sessions. CRRC- Cardiovascular Risk Reduction Clinic, IWM- intensive weight management, SM- Self-management, SMA- Shared medical appointment, UC- usual care.

Sixteen trials (70%) were for a single LTC, of these: 13 were for diabetes[23,25,26,29–34,37–39,53], two for hypertension[50,51]; and one was for osteoporosis[52]. Eight trials considered multiple LTCs: three were diabetes and hypertension/cardiovascular risk[40–42,46]; one was diabetes and depression[43], one was for overweight patients with diabetes [44]; one was chronic pain and depression[22]: and one included multiple LTCs including: arthritis, hypertension, cancer, deafness and diabetes[19]. Overall, 20/23 (87%) of trials focused on patients with diabetes.

Nineteen trials (83%) were conducted in the US[19,22,23,25,26,29,30,33,34,37–44,46,53], two in China[32,50] and one each in Australia[31], Germany[51] and the United Kingdom[52]. Twelve trials were measured the effectiveness, impact or efficacy of SMAs compared to usual care[19,22,23,26,29,32,33,38,39,42,46,53], nine trials examined feasibility parameters[24,30,31,34,37,38,43,50], and two trials were non-inferiority/superiority trials[44,45,52].

In eight trials (35%) participants were veterans or military personnel[29,33,40–44,46]. Participants were from low-income communities in four trials[22,23,37,38], and uninsured communities in three US trials[25,26,34]. Three trials were tailored for non-English speaking participants, where written materials were available in Spanish[34,38,53]. The majority of participants were over 50 years old, the mean age of participants ranged between 50.5[21,22] to 74 years old[52]. Two trials were specifically for older patients over 55 or 60 years respectively[19,51], and two trials excluded patients over 75[44] and 80 years[32]. Twelve trials (52%) had a majority of female participants[19,23,24,32,37,38,50,52]. Ten trials had majority of male participants[29–31,33,40–44,46]. Two trials did not report the gender balance of participants[51,53]. Five studies had a majority White population[22,29,39,42,43], six trials had a majority Black population[23,25,26,30,44,46], three trials had a majority Hispanic population[37,38,53], two trials had a majority Asian population[31,32], and one trial had a majority White-Latino population [34]. Five studies did not report the ethnicity of participants[19,40,50–52].

Most trials (*n*=18, 78%) had a two-arm design that compared SMAs with usual care, typically a one-to-one (1:1) appointment with primary care physician[19,22,23,25,26,31,32,37–43,46,50,52,53]. In three other two-arm trials, the comparator was a 1:1 appointment plus two diabetes group education sessions[33], an SMA without an integrated weight management programme[44] or an SMA with a personal health planning component (PHP)[30]. Two trials had a delayed six-month waitlist control design[37,38]. Two trials had a three-arm design; one examined the effectiveness of a cardiovascular risk reduction clinic

compared with group medical visits and usual care[41], a second compared an automated telephone self-management service with SMAs and usual care[34].

Trial outcome measures varied across trials though most included behavioural measures, biomedical health indicators and psychological and well-being measures. Full details of all outcome measures reported by the studies are presented in S4.

Risk of bias

Risk of bias item across the studies was generally low across the items, except for 'Blinding of participants and personnel' (83% of trials) (See S5).

Sensitivity analyses

There were no differences for any of the outcomes according to the risk of bias assessment criteria relating to random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding, incomplete outcome data, and selected reporting (see S5).

Effectiveness of SMAs

Biomedical measures

Glycated haemoglobin A1C (HbA1c) (%)

Of the 16 trials measuring HbA1c (%), nine trials[23,26,31,34,38,41–43] which compared SMA to usual care were included in a meta-analysis. No statistically significant difference between SMAs and usual care was found for HbA1c (%) at follow-up (d=-0.098, *95%CI* = -0.34, 0.14, k=9) (p=0.420) (see Figure 2a). Substantial heterogeneity was observed (I^2 = 70.9%). Of five other SMA trials reporting HbA1c (%) but not in the meta-analysis[25,39,40,46], only one reported significant group differences, whereby the SMA group had significantly higher odds of attaining HbA1c goals (< 7%) compared to usual care[23]. However, this was a high risk of bias study, scoring 'unclear' across the six domains. However, this was a high risk of bias study, scoring 'unclear' across the six domains. The pooled effect remained similar when Ee et al. (2020)[31] was removed as an outlier in the sensitivity analysis due to wide *95%CIs*, (d=-0.120, *95%CI* = -0.37, 0.13, k=8)

Diastolic blood pressure

Of 12 studies which reported diastolic blood pressure (DBP)[23,26,29–32,34,37,38,41,46,50], eight were included in meta-analysis[23,29,31,34,37,38,41,50]. A very small statistically significant pooled effect was found at follow-up (d=-0.123, *95%CI* = -

0.22, -0.03, *k*=8) (p=0.008), whereby participants in the SMA group had lower DBP than those in usual care (see Figure 2b). The pooled effect remained similar (*d*=-0.194, *95%CI* = -0.35, -0.04, *k*=7) (p=0.016) when Gao et al. (2015)[50], the study with the largest sample size (1204), was omitted in the sensitivity analysis.

Of the three studies not included in the meta-analysis[26,32,46], one trial of SMAs for diabetes and hypertension reported that mean DBP was lower in the SMA group (78.3 mmHg) than in the usual care group (82.1 mmHg) at 12 months[46].

Systolic blood pressure

Of 13 trials reporting SBP[23,26,29,31,32,34,37,38,40–42,46,50], nine could be meta-analysed[23,29,31,34,37,38,41,42,50]. No statistically significant difference between SMAs and usual care was found for SBP at follow-up (*d*=-0.018, *95%CI* = -0.11, 0.08, *k*=9) (*p*=0.709), with lows level of heterogeneity observed (I^2 = 3.8%) (see Figure 2c). Of the four trials not in the meta-analysis[26,32,40,46], two moderately robust studies reported statistically significant group differences in SBP at follow-up[32,46], whereby the SMA group showed greater decreases in SBP compared to usual care.

No statistically significant effect of SMAs compared to usual care was found for other biomedical health outcomes including: total cholesterol, high density lipoprotein cholesterol, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, triglycerides, weight, and BMI (see S6).

Trials with non-usual care comparators

Three trials had enhanced SMAs as their comparator[30,33,44]. Drake et al., (2018) reported that participants in the PHP SMA group had lower DBP (*M*=86 mmHg) at 8 months follow-up compared to participants in the standard SMA group (*M*=79.8 mmHg)[30]. Naik et al. (2011) also reported significant group differences at follow-up, whereby participants (US veterans) in the SMA arm demonstrated significantly greater improvements in HbA1c (%) than those in the control group receiving usual care and group education[33]. Yancy et al. (2020) reported patient weight loss in the SMAs with intensive weight management was comparable to weight loss amongst patients attending SMAs but statistical significance was unclear[44]. It is possible that other studies could not detect statistically significant differences between arms due to small sample sizes.

<Insert Figure 2 a,b,c, here>

Psychological and well-being measures

Quality of life

Six trials reported quality of life (QoL) outcomes[19,22,31,34,40,42] of which two trials reported significant group differences[19,34]. One trial of SMAs for chronically ill patients with multiple LTCs found that participants in the SMA group (*M*=7.2, *SD*=1.8) reported significantly better QoL than the usual care group (*M*=6.3, *SD*=2.0) (*p*=.002) at 24 months[19]. Schillinger et al., (2008) measured QoL using the short form (SF)-12 instrument which comprised of mental health and physical health subscales. Improvements in SF-12 mental health was observed for SMA group compared to SMA (effect size=0.31, *p*=0.03) and usual care (effect size=0.18, *p*=0.2)[34]. However, this was considered as a high risk of bias study, with high/unclear judgements across four out of six domains.

Patient satisfaction

Four trials measured patient satisfaction[19,30,39,52]. Scott et al. (2004) reported significant differences at follow-up with SMA patients reporting higher satisfaction with practitioner discussions compared to controls[19]. The other three studies found no differences.

Patient self-efficacy

Self-efficacy was measured in nine trials[19, 22, 23,32,34,40,43,46,50] , of which five studies were included in meta-analysis[19,22,23,34,50]. No statistically significant effect was found (*d*=0.167, *95%CI* = -0.08, 0.41, *k*=5) (p=0.182) (See S7). High levels of heterogeneity were observed (I^2=78.9%). Of the four other studies not included in meta-analysis[32,40,43,46], two reported that SMA patients had significant improvements in self-efficacy to manage diabetes compared to usual care[32,46].

No statistically significant effect of SMAs compared to usual care was found for other depression (see S7).

Trials with non-usual care comparator

Drake et al. (2018) reported significant improvements in self-efficacy, as measured using the Diabetes Empowerment Scale, for the PHP SMA group compared to the standard SMA group[30]. Naik et al. (2011) did not find any differences in diabetes self-efficacy scores between the SMA group and the traditional diabetes group education group[33].

Behavioural outcomes

Hospital admissions

Seven trials reported hospital admissions within six to 24 months[19,23,25,39,41,43,46] and three were included in a meta-analysis[19,23,41]. There was no difference between SMAs and usual care in terms of hospital admissions at follow-up (*d*=-0.016, *95%CI* = -0.38, 0.35, *k*=3; (*p*=0.931) (see Figure 3a). Substantial heterogeneity was observed (I^2 = 71.1%).

None of the other four trials[25,39,43,46] reported significant group differences for hospital admissions at follow-up.

Emergency department use

Of eight relevant trials[19,22,23,25,39,41,43,46], four were included in a meta-analysis[19,23,39,41]. No difference between SMAs and usual care was found for admissions to emergency departments at follow-up (*d*=-0.083, *95%CI* = -0.30, 0.13, *k*=4, *p*=0.453 (Figure 3b). Considerable heterogeneity was observed (I^2 = 61.7%).

Of four trials not in the meta-analysis [22,25,43,46], only Edelman et al. (2010) reported significant group differences in emergency department use favouring SMAs with 0.4 (*95%CI* = 0.20, 0.70) fewer emergency care visits than the usual care group over the 12-month study period [46].

Primary care visits

Four trials reported the number of primary care visits participants made during the study period[19,39,43,46]. Three were pooled in a meta-analysis[19,39,43] showing no statistically significant difference (*d*=0.034, *95%CI* = -0.09, 0.16, *k*=3, *p*=0.575) (see Figure 3c).

Edelman et al. (2010), which could not be included into the meta-analysis, reported that SMA participants had significantly fewer primary care visits than controls (5.3 vs. 6.2 per patient-year) at 12 months[46].

No statistically significant effect of SMAs compared to usual care were found for other behavioural outcomes including medication adherence and physical activity (see S8)

<Insert Figure 3a,b,c here>

Cost and resource use

Few studies reported the costs involved in the delivery of the SMA and those that did were unclear about cost parameters (i.e whether scheduling and preparation time was included or not) or how the costs were attributed. One trial of diabetes SMAs reported that overall costs

per patient were higher in SMAs than those in usual care group for the study period of six months[25]. However, another trial found no significant difference between SMA and usual care in terms of total costs incurred during the 24 months study period, but showed a positive effect of the SMA at 13 months post-study where cost decreased by 6% for the SMA but increased by 13% for usual care $p<0.01$[39]. The SMA trial for osteoporosis reported that the costs incurred during the study period were lower for the SMA group compared to control groups[52]. A trial of chronic condition SMAs (reported that total costs incurred by the SMA group were lower than the usual care group[19].

SMA components and mode of delivery

There was much variation in the SMAs models reported by studies (see S9 for detailed description). Key features of SMA models were: the opportunity for each patient to have individual 1:1 time with a clinician (23 trials), facilitated group discussion or group question and answer session (15 trials)[19,22,25,26,29,30,32–34,37–39,40,43,46,50], 'group education' (14 trials)[19,23,25,31–33,37,38,41,42,43,44,46,50], and the opportunity to socialise (11 trials)[19,22,25,26,29,32,34,37,38,46,50].

SMAs were delivered face-to-face in all trials, although three SMA models included digital technologies, namely website and telephone support[22] and phone calls or text message support and/or reminders[37,38]. In three trials[33,41,52] SMAs were delivered by a single healthcare professional though mostly they were delivered by multidisciplinary teams. Professionals most commonly involved were family physicians[19,23,24,30–34,39,44,46,50,51,53], nurse practitioners[23,26–29,32,44,45] or nurses[19,20,39,40,42,46–50,53]. It was not always possible to tell what role each member of staff had in the delivery of the SMA. Provider characteristics other than profession or role were rarely reported, though two trials involving a majority Hispanic/Latino participants reported that the community health worker and or physician were bilingual[34,38]. Four trials reported that the same interventionists attended all visits for a particular group[40,44,46,51]. One trial of diabetes SMAs reported that group assignments were maintained for all SMAs to facilitate peer interactions and relationships within groups[33]. The consistency in group composition in terms of patient and interventionists attending each session was not reported by most studies.

DISCUSSION

Our systematic review identified 23 unique RCTs comparing SMAs for one or more LTCs to usual care or an enhanced SMA. We found that SMAs significantly improved diastolic blood pressure for diabetes patients and there were non-significant trends favouring SMAs for

QoL, patient satisfaction and patient self-efficacy. Improved self-efficacy may help boost self-care. In line with the findings of previous reviews[12], no harm was observed for the use of SMAs across these outcomes and there was no effect on healthcare service use compared to usual care. This indicates that whilst SMAs may not be superior to usual care in terms of most health outcomes or reducing demand on services, they do not appear to increase demand at least in the short-term. Evidence reporting costs is too heterogeneous to draw firm conclusions.

Comparison with previous literature

Like previous reviews of SMAs for LTCs[4,12,54], more than half of the included RCTs included patients with diabetes, and as such the most commonly reported outcome measure was HbA1C. However, unlike previous reviews[7,55], we did not observe any significant improvements in HbA1c. This may be because previous reviews included trials in secondary care. Our meta-analysis showed that SMA participants had lower DBP compared to patients who received usual care. This effect remained even when a large study[50] with 1204 participants was omitted in the sensitivity analyses. Whilst significant differences were not found for the other biomedical outcomes between the SMA and usual care groups, individual trials reporting a significant difference suggest trends favouring SMA for outcomes including SBP and cholesterol.

Previous systematic reviews have been inconclusive with regards to the impact of SMAs on healthcare utilisation. Edelman et al.'s (2012) review[7] of SMAs for patients with chronic medical conditions in older adults found a lower pattern of healthcare utilisation, whilst Booth et al. (2015)[4] reported a mixed pattern of changes. Our meta-analyses show that SMAs do not differ from usual care in terms of healthcare utilisation. There is no evidence in the present data to suggest that patients compensate for a lack of privacy by returning to primary care again or that they risk hospitalisation because issues are not adequately addressed during the SMA session(s). However, it should be noted that the key source of bias across the included studies was the lack of blinding of participants and personnel. Therefore, possible selection bias may result in recruitment of SMA participants with less concern about sharing their personal/medical information.

In comparison to biomedical outcomes and psychological outcomes, behavioural outcomes were less frequently reported by studies. This echoes the findings of Edelman et al. (2015)[46] which found there to be limited data on key patient-centred outcomes such as patient satisfaction. Behavioural outcomes such as medication adherence are important across many LTCs and are key to understanding how patients are self-managing their

conditions. In line with Kelly et al.'s (2017)[12] recommendation, future studies should report outcome effectiveness measures that are common or comparable across different LTCs such as physical activity, self-efficacy, medication adherence, and quality of life. It would be advantageous to agree a Core Outcome Set (COS), consisting of a standardised group of outcomes, to be reported by all SMA trials. This can help with future evaluations of SMAs through reducing heterogeneity and facilitating meta-analysis and ensuring that outcome measures are relevant to key stakeholders[56].

Strengths and limitations

Although previous reviews have explored the effectiveness of SMAs in improving health outcomes, this review provides a focus on primary care which is key to managing LTCs. We found ten additional trials with 1160 participants since the comprehensive work by Booth et al. (2015)[4] indicating a rapidly growing field. We used robust methods whereby our search strategy was developed with input from Information Specialists through an iterative process and key stages of the review (including screening, data extraction, and quality appraisal) were undertaken independently by two reviewers. We included studies regardless of type of LTC so that we were able to summarise all the available evidence on effectiveness of SMAs for LTCs in primary care in one analysis. However, evidence of an effect was determined by p=<.0.5 in the papers. This assumes that studies were adequately powered, which may not be the case, particularly for some of the secondary outcomes of the included studies.

Limitations of evidence base and implications for future research

Our narrative synthesis is limited by what is reported thus important contextual factors may be missing from authors' descriptions of the SMAs. Similar components may be described differently by different authors or, conversely, similar descriptions are used to describe different components. Standardised taxonomies for describing mode of delivery and intervention content would help to identify important behavioural components and key implementation processes that contribute to intervention effectiveness. However, for this to be possible, it is also important that interventionists clearly specify which target behaviours (e.g. to increase physical activity) the SMAs aim to change and also measure fidelity to ensure that the session(s) are delivered as intended to achieve optimum effects[57]. Further, theoretical underpinnings were lacking in the included SMA interventions, making it difficult to identify 'mechanisms of action' through which interventions bring about change[58]. Future SMAs interventions should be theory-based and be explicit in reporting its theoretical underpinnings.

Where multiple healthcare professionals are involved in the SMA, their key role and purpose in the SMA were rarely clearly defined. There was also limited reporting on the composition of the SMA groups across some of the included studies (i.e. how patients were selected for recruitment and size). Therefore, it is unclear which groups of patients might benefit from attending the same SMAs together and what implications SMAs may have for intervention-generated health inequalities. One third of the included studies were conducted on US veterans and one third of studies have involved participants from low-income/uninsured population groups. Generalisability of these groups to other healthcare settings in other countries is unclear. Further investigations into SMAs for patients with one or more LTCs is required, including a wider variety of LTCs (such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) and with more diverse population groups. For example, including low-income and disadvantaged groups in other countries, including the UK.

Conclusions

This review is the first to examine the effects of SMAs delivered in primary care on health outcomes and healthcare service use in patients with one or more LTCs. Our review suggests that SMAs are unlikely to result in less favourable outcomes to patients with LTCs compared to usual care. To identify key intervention components that contribute to effectiveness, future studies will benefit from using standardised taxonomies to report intervention content. The use of an evaluation framework, with a core outcome set, is recommended to improve evidence in this field.

REFERENCES

1 Clay H, Stern R. Making time in general practice: freeing GP capacity by reducing bureaucracy and avoidable consultations, managing the interface with hospitals and exploring new ways of working. 2015.

2 Hayhoe B, Verma A, Kumar S. Shared medical appointments. *BMJ* 2017;**358**:10–1. doi:10.1136/bmj.j4034

3 Jones T, Darzi A, Egger G, *et al.* Process and Systems: A systems approach to embedding group consultations in the NHS. *Futur Healthc J* 2019;**6**:8–16. doi:10.7861/futurehosp.6-1-8

4 Booth A, Cantrell A, Preston L, *et al.* What is the evidence for the effectiveness, appropriateness and feasibility of group clinics for patients with chronic conditions? A systematic review. *Heal Serv Deliv Res* 2015;**3**:1–194. doi:10.3310/hsdr03460

5 Wadsworth KH, Archibald TG, Payne AE, *et al.* Shared medical appointments and patient-centered experience: A mixed-methods systematic review. *BMC Fam Pract* 2019;**20**:1–13. doi:10.1186/s12875-019-0972-1

6 Graham F, Tang MY, Jackson K, *et al.* Barriers and facilitators to implementation of shared medical appointments in primary care for the management of long-term conditions: a systematic review and synthesis of qualitative studies. *BMJ Open* 2021;**11**:e046842. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046842

7 Edelman D, Gierisch JM, McDuffie JR, *et al.* Shared Medical Appointments for Patients with Diabetes Mellitus: A Systematic Review. *J Gen Intern Med* 2015;**30**:99–106. doi:10.1007/s11606-014-2978-7

8 Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al.* Systematic Reviews of Interventions. In: Deeks J, Higgins J, Altman D, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2 (updated February 2021)*. 2021. www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.

9 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al.* The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;**372**. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71

10 Michie S, Richardson M, Johnston M, *et al.* The behavior change technique taxonomy (v1) of 93 hierarchically clustered techniques: Building an international consensus for the reporting of behavior change interventions. *Ann Behav Med* 2013;**46**:81–95. doi:10.1007/s12160-013-9486-6

11 Kirsh SR, Aron DC, Johnson KD, *et al.* A realist review of shared medical appointments: How, for whom, and under what circumstances do they work? *BMC Health Serv Res* 2017;**17**:1–13. doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2064-z

12 Kelly F, Liska C, Morash R, *et al.* Shared medical appointments for patients with a nondiabetic physical chronic illness: A systematic review. *Chronic Illn* 2019;**15**:3–26. doi:10.1177/1742395317731608

13 Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software. 2021.www.covidence.org

14 Dombrowski SU, O'Carroll RE, Williams B. Form of delivery as a key 'active ingredient' in behaviour change interventions. *Br J Health Psychol* 2016;**21**:733–40. doi:10.1111/bjhp.12203

15 Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, *et al.* The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011;**343**:1–9. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928

16 Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in health care. York: 2009.

17 Valentine JC, Pigott TD, Rothstein HR. How many studies do you need? A primer on

statistical power for meta-analysis. *J Educ Behav Stat* 2010;**35**:215–47. doi:10.3102/1076998609346961
18 Deeks J, Higgins J, Altman D. Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In: Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al.*, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. Cochrane 2021. www.training.cochrane.org/handbook
19 Scott JC, Conner DA, Venohr I, *et al.* Effectiveness of a group outpatient visit model for chronically ill older health maintenance organization members: A 2-year randomized trial of the Cooperative Health Care Clinic. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2004;**52**:1463–70. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2004.52408.x
20 Coleman EA, Eilertsen TB, Kramer AM, *et al.* Reducing emergency visits in older adults with chronic illness. A randomized, controlled trial of group visits. *Eff Clin Pract* 2001;**4**:49–57.
21 Gardiner P, Lestoquoy AS, Gergen-Barnett K, *et al.* Design of the integrative medical group visits randomized control trial for underserved patients with chronic pain and depression. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2017;**54**:25–35. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2016.12.013
22 Gardiner P, Luo M, D'Amico S, *et al.* Effectiveness of integrative medicine group visits in chronic pain and depressive symptoms: A randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One* 2019;**14**:1–20. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0225540
23 Berry DC, Williams W, Hall EG, *et al.* Imbedding Interdisciplinary Diabetes Group Visits Into a Community-Based Medical Setting. *Diabetes Educ* 2016;**42**:96–107. doi:10.1177/0145721715620022
24 Clancy DE, Cope DW, Magruder K, *et al.* Evaluating group visits in an uninsured or inadequately insured patient population with uncontrolled type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Educ* 2003;**29**:292–203. doi:10.1177/0145721707299266
25 Clancy DE, Cope DW, Magruder KM, *et al.* Evaluating concordance to American Diabetes Association standards of care for type 2 diabetes through group visits in an uninsured or inadequately insured patient population. *Diabetes Care* 2003;**26**:2032–6. doi:10.2337/diacare.26.7.2032
26 Clancy DE, Huang P, Okonofua E, *et al.* Group visits: Promoting adherence to diabetes guidelines. *J Gen Intern Med* 2007;**22**:620–4. doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0150-3
27 Clancy DE, Yeager DE, Huang P, *et al.* Further evaluating the acceptability of group visits in an uninsured or inadequately insured patient population with uncontrolled type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Educ* 2007;**33**:309–14. doi:10.1177/0145721707299266
28 Clancy DE, Dismuke CE, Magruder KM, *et al.* Do Diabetes Group Visits Lead to Lower Medical Care Charges? *Am J Manag Care* 2008;**14**:39–44.http://www.ajmc.com/journals/issue/2008/2008-01-vol14-n1/Jan08-2784p39-44/
29 Cole RE, Boyer KM, Spanbauer SM, *et al.* Effectiveness of Prediabetes Nutrition Shared Medical Appointments: Prevention of Diabetes. *Diabetes Educ* 2013;**39**:344–53. doi:10.1177/0145721713484812
30 Drake C, Meade C, Hull SK, *et al.* Integration of Personalized Health Planning and Shared Medical Appointments for Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *South Med J* 2018;**111**:674–82. doi:10.14423/SMJ.0000000000000892
31 Ee C, de Courten B, Avard N, *et al.* Shared Medical Appointments and Mindfulness for Type 2 Diabetes—A Mixed-Methods Feasibility Study. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)* 2020;**11**:1–16. doi:10.3389/fendo.2020.570777
32 Liu S, Bi A, Fu D, *et al.* Effectiveness of using group visit model to support diabetes patient self-management in rural communities of Shanghai: A randomized controlled trial. *BMC Public Health* 2012;**12**:1. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-1043
33 Naik AD, Palmer N, Petersen NJ, *et al.* Comparative effectiveness of goal setting in diabetes mellitus group clinics: Randomized clinical trial. *Arch Intern Med* 2011;**171**:453–9. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2011.70
34 Schillinger D, Hammer H, Wang F, *et al.* Seeing in 3-D: Examining the reach of diabetes self-management support strategies in a public health care system. *Heal Educ Behav* 2008;**35**:664–82. doi:10.1177/1090198106296772

35 Schillinger D, Handley M, Wang F, *et al.* Effects of self-management support on structure, process, and outcomes among vulnerable patients with diabetes: a 3-arm randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2009;**32**. doi:10.2337/dc08-0787.Clinical
36 Wallace A, Perkhounkova Y, Tseng H, *et al.* Influence of patient characteristics on assessment of diabetes self-management support. *Nurs Res* 2013;**62**:106–14. doi:10.1097/NNR.0b013e3182843b77
37 Vaughan EM, Johnston CA, Cardenas VJ, *et al.* Integrating CHWs as Part of the Team Leading Diabetes Group Visits: A Randomized Controlled Feasibility Study. *Diabetes Educ* 2017;**43**:589–99. doi:10.1177/0145721717737742
38 Vaughan EM, Hyman DJ, Naik AD, *et al.* A Telehealth-supported, Integrated care with CHWs, and MEdication-access (TIME) Program for Diabetes Improves HbA1c: a Randomized Clinical Trial. *J Gen Intern Med* Published Online First: 2020. doi:10.1007/s11606-020-06017-4
39 Wagner EH, Grothaus LC, Sandhu N, *et al.* Chronic care clinics for diabetes in primary care: A system-wide randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2001;**24**:695–700. doi:10.2337/diacare.24.4.695
40 Cohen LB, Taveira TH, Khatana SAM, *et al.* Pharmacist-Led Shared Medical Appointments for Multiple Cardiovascular Risk Reduction in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes. *Diabetes Educ* 2011;**37**:801–12. doi:10.1177/0145721711423980
41 Taveira TH, Wu WC. Interventions to maintain cardiac risk control after discharge from a cardiovascular risk reduction clinic: A randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2014;**105**:327–35. doi:10.1016/j.diabres.2014.05.013
42 Wu WC, Taveira TH, Jeffery S, *et al.* Costs and effectiveness of pharmacist-led group medical visits for type-2 diabetes: A multi-center randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One* 2018;**13**:1–14. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0195898
43 Taveira TH, Dooley AG, Cohen LB, *et al.* Pharmacist-Led Group Medical Appointments for the Management of Type 2 Diabetes with Comorbid Depression in Older Adults. *Ann Pharmacother* 2011;**45**:1346–55. doi:10.1345/aph.1Q212
44 Yancy WS, Crowley MJ, Dar MS, *et al.* Comparison of Group Medical Visits Combined with Intensive Weight Management vs Group Medical Visits Alone for Glycemia in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes: A Noninferiority Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020;**180**:70–9. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.4802
45 Crowley MJ, Edelman D, Voils CI, *et al.* Jump starting shared medical appointments for diabetes with weight management: Rationale and design of a randomized controlled trial. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2017;**58**:1–12. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2017.04.004
46 Edelman D, Fredrickson SK, Melnyk SD, *et al.* Medical Clinics Versus Usual Care for Patients With Both Diabetes. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;**152**:689–96.
47 Crowley MJ, Melnyk SD, Coffman CJ, *et al.* Impact of baseline insulin regimen on glycemic response to a group medical clinic intervention. *Diabetes Care* 2013;**36**:1954–60. doi:10.2337/dc12-1905
48 Crowley MJ, Melnyk SD, Ostroff JL, *et al.* Can group medical clinics improve lipid management in diabetes? *Am J Med* 2014;**127**:145–51. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2013.09.027
49 Eisenberg A, Crowley MJ, Coffman C, *et al.* Effect of a group medical clinic for veterans with diabetes on body mass index. *Chronic Illn* 2019;**15**:187–96. doi:10.1177/1742395317753885
50 Gao J, Yang L, Junming D, *et al.* Evaluation of group visits for Chinese hypertensives based on primary health care center. *Asia-Pacific J Public Heal* 2015;**27**:NP350–60. doi:10.1177/1010539512442566
51 Simon B, Sawicki PT. Quality improvement in chronic care delivery for patients with arterial hypertension through Group Medical Visits: Patient acceptance and attendance in the German pilot project. *Qual Prim Care* 2015;**23**:106-112 7p.http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=114567511&amp%5Cnlang=ja&site=ehost-live
52 Baqir W, Gray WK, Blair A, *et al.* Osteoporosis group consultations are as effective as

usual care: Results from a non-inferiority randomized trial. *Lifestyle Med* 2020;**1**:1–9. doi:10.1002/lim2.3
53 Gutierrez N, Gimpel NE, Dallo FJ, *et al.* Shared medical appointments in a residency clinic: An exploratory study among hispanics with diabetes. *Am J Manag Care* 2011;**17**:212–4.
54 Edelman D, McDuffie JR, Oddone E, *et al.* Shared Medical Appointments for Chronic Medical Conditions□: A Systematic Review. *VA Evidence-based Synth Progr Reports* Published Online First: 2012.http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK99785/
55 Housden L, Wong ST, Dawes M. Effectiveness of group medical visits for improving diabetes care: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Can Med Assoc J* 2013;**185**:E635–44. doi:10.1503/cmaj.130053
56 Webbe J, Sinha I, Gale C. Core Outcome Sets. *Arch Dis Child Educ Pract Ed* 2018;**103**:163–6. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2016-312117
57 Bellg AJ, Resnick B, Minicucci DS, *et al.* Enhancing treatment fidelity in health behavior change studies: Best practices and recommendations from the NIH Behavior Change Consortium. *Heal Psychol* 2004;**23**:443–51. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.23.5.443
58 Carey RN, Connell LE, Johnston M, *et al.* Behavior Change Techniques and Their Mechanisms of Action: A Synthesis of Links Described in Published Intervention Literature. *Ann Behav Med* 2018;**53**:693–707. doi:10.1093/abm/kay078

Figure legends

Figure 1: PRISMA diagram of study selection process

Figure 2: Forest plot for a) HbA1C(%), b) diastolic blood pressure, c) systolic blood pressure

Figure 3: Forest plot for a) hospital admissions, b) emergency department use, c) primary care visits


Identification
Screening
Eligibility
Included
11,220 studies identified from database searches
5,497 duplicates removed
5,723 studies screened
5,607 discarded as irrelevant
116 studies assessed for eligibility via full-text article review
106 excluded as ineligible
52 – Not RCT
25 – Not primary care
10 – Paediatric population
10 – Not SMA
7 – Duplicates
1 – Wrong patient population
1 – Pre-2013
14 papers (9 trials) identified from HSDR report
1 paper (1 trials) from forward and backward citation searching
34 papers (23 unique trials)

a)



NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

b)



NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

c)



NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

a)



NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

b)



NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model

c)



NOTE: Weights are from random-effects model