Impact of a diabetes disease management program on quality of care and costs: propensity score-matched real-world data from Switzerland.

Maria Carlander¹, Marc Höglinger¹, Maria Trottmann², Birgitta Rhomberg², Cornelia Caviglia³, Adrian Rohrbasser³, Christian Frei², Klaus Eichler¹

¹ Winterthur Institute of Health Economics, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Gertrudstrasse 15, CH-8401 Winterthur, Switzerland

² Swica Health Care Organisation, Switzerland

³ Medbase, health care provider, Switzerland

Corresponding author:

Maria Carlander, MPH
Health Services Research
Winterthur Institute of Health Economics
Zurich University of Applied Sciences
Gertrudstrasse 15
CH-8401 Winterthur, Switzerland
Tel.: +41 58 934 46 31
Fax.: +41 58 935 46 31
e-mail: cara@zhaw.ch

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Objectives

Structured treatment programs have been recommended for management of patients with chronic conditions to overcome ill-coordinated care. We aimed to evaluate a disease management program (DMP) for diabetes mellitus patients in Switzerland.

Methods

We performed a prospective observational study with a propensity score-matched usual care control group from a claims database. We included type-1 and type-2 diabetes patients from a primary care setting. The DMP (intervention) comprised a structured treatment approach with an individual treatment plan, treatment goals and an interprofessional team approach. Our outcome comprehensive measures included quality of life (QOL: EQ-5D-5L), pre-defined indicators for diabetes guideline adherence, number of used services and direct medical costs. We applied a difference-in-difference (DID) approach to compare DMP with usual care (follow-up 1 year). Costs were calculated with non-parametric bootstrapping (2017 Swiss Francs, CHF; conversion rate to Euros: 0.85) from a third-party payer perspective (Swiss health care insurance).

Results

QOL in a sub-sample of 80 patients did not change during follow-up (mean utility 0.89 at baseline and follow-up; $p=0.94$). Guideline adherence showed slight improvements for DMP. For example, “non-adherence” (baseline DMP: 19%) decreased in the DMP group by -3 %-points (DID; 95%-CI: -0.07 to 0.01) but not in the control group. A general trend emerged, though mostly not statistically significant, with less used services in the DMP group compared to the control group. Costs increased in both groups during follow-up, but the increase was higher in the control group (DID, mean total costs per patient per year: CHF -950.00 [95%-CI: -1959.53 to 59.56]). Such a negative difference-in-difference estimate in favor of DMP also emerged for cost sub-categories (e.g. costs for inpatient and outpatient care).

Conclusions

The structured treatment program under evaluation is a promising approach to improve diabetes care in a Swiss primary care setting but more follow-up data are needed.

Key words: diabetes mellitus; disease management; structured treatment program; quality of care; quality of life; health care; costs

Background

Structured treatment programs have been recommended for management of patients with chronic conditions, such as diabetes mellitus, to overcome ill-coordinated services across involved providers, strengthen guideline adherence and improve patient outcome.¹ Ill-coordinated care can lead to duplication of services and possibly overuse. On the other hand, there is a risk of undertreatment, for example if doctors have too little time for consultations or do not follow evidence-based guidelines.^{2,3} To meet the high demands for efficient and coordinated care, more and more insurance companies and physician networks are offering structured treatment programs (also known as disease management programs; DMPs) for certain chronic diseases. These evidence-based concepts of care are intended to increase both quality and efficiency of treatment.⁴

Structured treatment programs for diabetes mellitus have shown mixed results in health care systems similar to Switzerland. A systematic review compiling evidence from 9 evaluations of German DMPs for diabetes patients found that DMPs can improve quality of care. However, some changes in outcome parameters may only be observable over a longer period of time.⁵ For example, a propensity-score matched controlled study from this review found that the DMP did not reveal any clear medical benefit at even somewhat higher costs.⁴

In Switzerland, little is known about the impact of structured treatment programs for diabetes mellitus on quality of care and, simultaneously, costs in real world settings. Evaluations are either based on Markov models with data from international literature⁶, or have separately assessed the impact of diabetes guideline adherence⁷, financial incentives² or telemedicine.⁸ One study with claims data assessed the impact of integrated care (i.e. managed care) for diabetes and found less disease-related hospitalisations and lower costs.⁹ Recently, an evaluation of diabetes care in a Swiss real-world setting has been published¹⁰ and a Swiss cohort study has been set up in the Canton of Valais, but no intermediate results have been communicated yet.¹¹ In summary, the evidence base for diabetes DMPs in Switzerland is scarce. Thus, we evaluated a disease management program with a structured treatment approach for diabetes mellitus patients in Switzerland compared to usual care exploring quality of care, quality of life and costs simultaneously.

Methods

Study design

We performed a prospective observational study with a propensity score-matched control group from a claims database.

Study setting

The study was performed in a Swiss primary care setting (Medbase health care provider). Medbase provides a structured diabetes treatment program within its network of primary care practices since 2017. The first seven practices in the north-eastern part of Switzerland participated in the study and included the diabetes patients. Data were collected on patient and GP group practice level in the years 2017 to 2019. This article presents the mid-term results of the evaluation (1-year follow-up).

In Switzerland, insurees are free to choose their GP in primary care. Structured treatment programs, as described above for the intervention group, may sometimes be applied, but are not implemented on a broader scale in Switzerland. In some contracted insurance models (may be with capitation) physician networks collaborate with insurers and patients joining such networks get rebates on their insurance premiums. The participating practices in our study are serving patients with and without such contracted insurance models.

Inclusion criteria of patients

We included type-1 and type-2 diabetes patients and all age groups with no gender restriction. Exclusion criteria for the structured treatment program were substantial comorbidities (e.g. dementia), relevant language barriers, living in a nursing home and substantial barriers due to personal living situation or relevant job strains. For all reported outcomes, diabetes patients also had to be insured with SWICA Health Care Organisation, a large Swiss health care insurance (about 1.5 million insurees in 2019).

Structured treatment program (intervention)

Patients in the intervention group took part in a structured diabetes treatment program. For ease of comparison with other similar programs we use the term DMP within this report.

The DMP under assessment is a structured, evidence-based and patient-centered concept for care of diabetes patients. It comprises an individual treatment plan with treatment goals and an interprofessional team approach. Within the practice network GPs, other physician specialists, physiotherapists, pharmacists and additional health professional are employed. Within the individual treatment plan, specific measures to hit the treatment goals can be adjustment of medication, tailored patient education, periodical control measures and physical training sessions performed by physiotherapists. Current treatment and results of examinations are documented and regularly evaluated together with the patient for achievement of treatment goals and adjustments, if needed. Due to the interdisciplinary team composition, patients are offered a more comprehensive management of their chronic disease compared to a mono-disciplinary approach by physicians. To enhance professional exchange and team competence, regular meetings within professions and within practice teams take place. In addition, quality assurance meetings are held within the physician network, i.e. between practices, to improve and further develop the structured treatment concept.

Usual diabetes care (control group)

We used a propensity score-matched control group of diabetes patients from the SWICA claims data base (SWICA: about 1.5 million insurees in 2019 in Switzerland; diabetes prevalence in Switzerland: 5% ¹) to compare the impact of the DMP with secular trends in real-world usual care of diabetes patients. The control patients are treated under the real-world conditions of primary care in Switzerland.

Propensity score matching was performed using the SWICA claims data. We used a propensity score kernel matching approach with "entropy balancing". ¹² Kernel matching is superior to pairwise matching, because it makes use of all cases in the control group and weights them according to their similarity to the treatment cases. The entropy balancing approach produces a (weighted) control group with means and variances of the matching variables identical to those of the treatment group. Our matching variables were gender, five age-groups; three regions of residence, five categories of urban/rural residence locations; three insurance variables (e.g. high or

low deductibles as a reliable indicator for health state); and nine pharmaceutical cost groups (PCG; an indicator for co-morbidities). The matching variables (e.g. PCGs) were extracted for the baseline year 2017 before entering the DMP to exclude contamination by any management decision taken during the DMP itself.

Outcome measures and data sources

Four main outcome domains of the structured treatment program were evaluated, either on the patient or on the practice level. The outcomes were collected at different points of time (see Figure S1).

Quality of Life (patient level)

Self-reported health-related quality of life (QOL) was only assessed in the DMP group with the validated instrument EQ-5D-5L.^{13 14} The questions include five dimensions of QOL and an evaluation of the overall health status. QOL was collected in a cross-sectional manner in 2018 and 2019. We used several validated translations of the EQ-5D-5L according to the local patient mix (Swiss-German; Italian; French; Spanish; Turkish; Portuguese; Albanian; Serbo-Croatian).

A subsample of patients was selected for assessment of QOL. In each of the seven participating practices, the first 20 consecutive diabetes patients after start of the index period (from March to May, in each year) were asked to fill out the EQ-5D-5L instrument in the group practice prior to consultation. Thus, the information collected via the EQ-5D-5L instrument could be used during the same consultation as monitoring information. After consultation, the QOL data was pseudo-anonymised, linked via an ID number and forwarded to the analysis center.

“SGED-Score” (GP group practice level)

We used the SGED-score of the Swiss Society of Diabetology and Endocrinology (SGED). This score was derived to measure good diabetes management in primary healthcare based on international guidelines.¹⁵ The criteria of the SGED-score include eight main activities, which should be performed regularly during specific time intervals: controls of clinical and metabolic state, lifestyle advice for overweight and smoking patients, HbA1c measurements, blood pressure measurements, LDL-cholesterol measurements for <75-year-olds, nephropathy test, eye examination and

examination of the feet (see Figure S3 for details). For each criterion, a minimum fraction of patients in whom the criteria are to be performed is defined. The SGED score is calculated as a composite indicator (0-100 points) at the practice level for the quality of care of a group of diabetic patients. For example, if the indicator “blood pressure of <140/85 mmHg for at least 65% of diabetes patients” is fulfilled, 15 of 100 points are added to the composite score of the practice. The SGED-score was assessed only in the DMP group.

The data needed for the SGED-score were collected by clinicians in the relevant group practices in an Excel-sheet. Data was provided at the practice level, thus no information about blood samples or treatment frequencies in single patients could be drawn from the data sheets.

4 Simple performance measures (4SPM, patient level)

The four simple performance measures (4SPM) indicator provides information about diabetes guideline adherence. This quality of care indicator can be calculated based on patients’ health insurance claims data.¹⁶ It comprises information about frequency of 4 performance measures within 1 year (assessments of HbA1c, lipids, nephropathy status and examination at ophthalmologist). Four hierarchical levels of diabetes guideline adherence are defined with the 4SPM:

- Level 0: “non adherent” (no or only one HbA1c-measurements per year)
- Level 1: at least 2 HbA1c-measurements per year
- Level 2: L1 **and** at least 1 measurement of lipids per year
- Level 3: L1, L2 **and** at least 1 control of nephropathy status per year
- Level 4: L1, L2, L3 **and** at least 1 control at ophthalmologist per year

For analysis, each patient can qualify for each level only once, i.e. the share of patients from the 5 levels is summing up to 100%. For two levels, we also applied a modified version:

- Level 3-modified: L1, L2 **and** at least 1 control of nephropathy status per year *or current ACE-inhibitor therapy* (i.e. the drug consequence in case of pathologic nephropathy status)
- Level 4-modified: L1, L2, L3 **and** at least 1 control at ophthalmologist *per 2 years* (extended time interval according to updated Swiss guidelines)

Health care services and costs (patient level)

We compared direct medical treatment costs in the structured treatment program (DMP; intervention) with costs of propensity score-matched diabetes patients not participating in the programme (usual care; control).

4SPM, applied services and costs were extracted from the SWICA claims database where diabetes patients who are treated with antidiabetic medication can be identified via diabetes specific PCG-groups. Type 2 diabetes patients without oral drug treatment or insulin cannot be identified and are excluded for these outcome variables. Data were extracted, for example, for demographic attributes (e.g. age, gender, death [yes/no]), health insurance attributes (e.g. managed care coverage [yes/no]), PCG (pharmaceutical cost groups; for diabetes and other morbidity categories), number of services (per person per year), direct medical costs (per person per calendar year, as paid by the health insurance), etc.

Health economic analysis

Health economic analysis was done from the perspective of a third-party payer (SWICA Health Care Insurance).¹⁷ Number of services and direct medical inpatient and outpatient cost data were extracted from the SWICA claims database. Costs included all-diagnosis direct medical costs of all diagnostic procedures, treatments, drugs, complications and consultations covered by the mandatory health insurance company. Data cover the inpatient and outpatient sector for each diabetes patient across all hospitals and all providers.

Inpatient costs in our study represent 45% of the total inpatient costs in Switzerland (a lump sum based on Swiss-DRG tariffs). The remaining 65% of inpatient costs are covered by public authorities in Switzerland and not covered in our analysis. In the outpatient sector, where costs are solely covered by health insurers, each service unit is paid on a fee-for-service base. Thus, direct medical costs in the outpatient sector were calculated via number of reimbursed units (e.g. prescribed medication packages) multiplied with current Swiss basic health insurance tariffs (OKP) per unit. Costs are presented as 2017 Swiss Francs (CHF; official 2017 conversion rate to Euros: 0.85; to US\$: 1.02; to British £: 0.76). Out-of-pocket payments and deductibles of the patients were not accounted for. In addition, we did not apply a discount rate for costs due to the short observation period.

Statistical analysis

For our descriptive analysis, we used means (standard deviation) or medians (interquartile range [IQR]) for continuous variables and proportions for categorical data. For inferential analysis, we applied parametric and non-parametric tests and confidence intervals; p-values <0.05 were considered significant. Confidence intervals of cost data were calculated with non-parametric bootstrapping due to the skew distribution of cost data.¹⁸ Analyses were performed using the STATA SE 15 software package (StataCorp. 2015. Stata Statistical Software, College Station, Texas, USA).

Results

Patient population

Recruitment of intervention and control group is shown in the study flow (Figure 1) and baseline values are shown in Table 1 (before and after matching). Both groups were well matched with respect to known variables that affect outcomes

Quality of life

Health-related quality of life (EQ-5D) was assessed in a sub-sample of the DMP-DM group in the baseline year 2018 (n=148; thereof 138 patients with valid data) and in 2019 (n=105; thereof 93 patients with valid data). QOL follow-up data was available for 80 patients.

Health-related quality of life (EQ-5D) of the surveyed sub-sample of 80 patients did not change between 2018 and 2019. This was the case for the individual EQ-5D dimensions (Figure 2), the derived utility values (mean utility 0.89 in 2018 and 2019; $p=0.94$; Figure 3) and for the self-reported health status on the visual analogue scale EQ-5D-VAS (VAS mean in 2018: 77.6; VAS mean in 2019: 79.6; $p=0.92$; Figure S2). The “pain/discomfort” domain showed the highest share of patients with problems (“slight”, “moderate” “severe”, or “extreme problems”: 2018: 55%; 2019: 57%).

SGED-Score

The SGED score population comprised n=627 diabetes patients insured with SWICA who were treated within the diabetes DMP with and without diabetes drugs. The SGED-Score slightly improved on the practice level from the baseline year 2017 to the follow-up year 2018 (Table 2).

In 2017, before implementing the DMP, three of 11 SGED criteria were fulfilled in at least one of the 7 participating group practices. In 2018, after 1 year of follow-up, six of 11 SGED criteria were fulfilled in at least one of the 7 participating group practices. The most often fulfilled criterion (in 5 of 7 practices) was “at least 2 HbA1c measurements per year in $\geq 60\%$ of diabetes patients with a HbA1c level of $< 8\%$ ”. The number of SGED criteria that was not fulfilled in any practice decreased from 8 of 11 criteria in 2017 to 5 of 11 criteria in 2018.

4 simple performance measures (4SPM)

The 4SPM population comprised the matched study population (n=538 diabetes patients in the DMP group; n=5127 diabetes patients in the control group). We found slight improvements in the 4SPM indicators in the DMP group compared to the control group in our difference-in-difference analysis (Baseline: 2017; follow-up: 2018).

At baseline, management of 19%-20% of patients was classified as “non-adherence” according to the pre-defined criteria. 25% of patients qualified for Level 1, 37%-40% for Level 2, 3% to 5% for Level 3 and 11% to 13% for Level 4 (Table 3). During follow-up, the share of patients in two lower adherence levels decreased in the DMP group compared to usual care (DID: for “non-adherence” Level 0: -3%-points; Level 2: -4%-points). For Level 4 (adapted criteria: Level 3 plus one ophthalmologic assessment per 2 years), a significant difference-in-difference improvement for DMP emerged with an increase of 7%-points (95%-CI: 3% to 12%).

Analysis of single performance measures (i.e. not the Level view) showed, that improvements in the DMP group were seen for the adherence to nephropathy related guidance (plus 8% of patients [95%-CI: 3% to 13%]) and guidance related to ophthalmologic examinations (plus 6% of patients [95%-CI: 1% to 11%]).

Health care services and costs

The population for analysis of health care services and costs comprised the matched study population (n=538 diabetes patients in the DMP group; n=5127 diabetes patients in the control group).

In our difference-in-difference analysis (Baseline: 2017; follow-up: 2018), a general trend emerged, though mostly not statistically significant, with less applied services and lower costs in the DMP group compared to the control group. For example, baseline total direct medical costs (comprising inpatient and outpatient sector treatment) in our matched sample were high in both groups with between CHF 8520 (DMP group) and CHF 9336 (control group) per year. These costs increased in both groups during follow-up, but the increase was about six times higher in the control group. This led to a mean cost difference-in-difference (DID) of CHF -950.00 (95%-CI: -1959.53 to 59.56) per patient per year in the DMP group compared to the control group (Table 4). Such a negative difference-in-difference estimate in favor of DMP also showed up with cost sub-categories, such as cost for inpatient and outpatient

treatment separately. Furthermore, the fraction of diabetes patients with at least one inpatient treatment per year during follow-up decreased significantly by -6% (95%-CI: -11% to -1%) in the DMP group (baseline rates in 2017: intervention group 20%; control group 19%).

Discussion

After one year of follow-up, the diabetes disease management program under investigation was associated with improvements in quality of care, stable QOL and lower costs compared to the propensity score matched control group in our difference-in-difference analysis.

Strengths and limitations

Our study has several strengths. We report real-world data of a big Swiss health insurance organisation which adds evidence about the impact of a structured diabetes care approach in primary care of a social health insurance system. Assessing patient benefit and costs simultaneously is an important health services research issue. With this approach, the value of health care for specific chronic conditions can be better understood.¹⁹

Our study has, however, several limitations. First, this is an observational study and causal inference can, strictly speaking, not be drawn. However, we addressed the problem of confounding with a thorough propensity score matching approach generating a control group from a big Swiss claims data base. Second, we have no detailed clinical data on the patient level to further describe our diabetes population (e.g. type of diabetes; drug therapy). However, we report validated indicators for morbidity as represented via PCGs.^{20 21} Third, diabetes patients without specific diabetes medication are not included for the outcomes 4SPM, costs and services because, in Switzerland, health care insurances are not allowed to hold specific diagnoses of their patients within the claims data base. Fourth, the follow-up of our study is short. A longer follow-up is needed to confirm or refute our results. Variability in costs is high, even in patients with chronic conditions with multiple service use. Thus, “regression to the mean” may lead to non-significant cost differences in the opposite direction during longer follow-up. Fifth, QOL was measured only in a small sub-sample of patients and we do not have specific clinical data to describe this population in detail. However, even though a random sample was not possible due to logistic problems in the practices, we believe that our sampling process of consecutive patients within the defined sampling period has led to a reasonably representative selection from our total diabetes population. Nevertheless, results should to be interpreted cautiously and strong conclusions may be drawn from our QOL results. Finally, the data quality for the SGED score items may have limitations, as practices have first initiated routine data collection for these indicators recently.

Peer discussion and quality rounds are installed now to further increase learning from study results.

Comparison with other studies

QOL was unchanged in our study which is in line with other trials. A cluster randomized trial from Austria tested a DMP for type 2 diabetes patients and found no significant differences in EQ-5D-3L VAS compared to usual care after one-year follow-up.^{22 23} Baseline QOL was similar to our sample (EQ-Index 0.88; VAS: 71.1), as also confirmed in a cross-sectional study of diabetes patients from Canada with an EQ-5D index of 0.85.²⁴ A German cross-sectional study found slight improvements of QOL in patients joining a diabetes DMP (reported range of EQ-index in seven classes of co-morbidities: DMP 0.83-0.54; usual care: 0.70-0.40)²⁵ In summary, these comparisons provide indirect evidence that our sampling procedure for QOL measurement may have led to no substantial selection bias.

For the SGED score only one published assessment was found. In a sample of Swiss urban group practices (Sanacare) the SGED score was assessed in 235 diabetes patients who were treated according to the chronic care management model.¹⁰ The authors report high guideline adherence fulfilling all but one SGED criteria in their sample (not fulfilled: “≥ 65% of patients with a blood pressure of < 140/90 mmHg”). Observed differences to our results with seemingly lower adherence may be due to poor documentation of clinical procedures and testing, low data quality or, indeed, different compliance with current guidelines.

A reasonably high concordance of our 4SPM results with data from another Swiss claims database⁷ supports reliability of this indicator. Non-adherence (i.e. Level 0) is somewhat less frequent in our sample (20% vs. 30%), while Level 1 (25% vs. 24%), Level 2 (37% vs. 37%) and Level 3 (4% vs. 4%) show nearly identical frequency. Applying the new Swiss guidance for one ophthalmologic control within *two* years translates into higher adherence in our sample compared to the older published data (13% vs. 5%).

Comparison of cost and service data across health care systems are problematic due to different service structures and incentives.¹⁷ Another big health care insurance in Switzerland reports mean annual direct medical costs of diabetes patients being in a range between CHF 2'910 and CHF 12'930 (costing year 2011), depending on the number of co-morbidities²⁰, and between CHF 9'466 and CHF 10'530 (costing years 2012-2013), depending on the integration of services.⁹ Thus, mean annual costs in

our sample between CHF 8'830 and CHF 11'557 (costing year 2017; raw data) are in a similar range.

Implications for clinicians and public health decision makers

Our study indicates that implementing a structured treatment program for diabetes patients in primary care is a promising option. This has implications for clinicians and managers of health care organisations alike.

Monitoring of quality of care for chronic conditions is of high importance to judge if patients are treated according to current standards. The SGED score, as used in our study, is a promising tool but needs further testing in the field. For example, more data collection is needed from diverse providers to arrive at a representative benchmarking data pool. In addition, minimal important differences for change should be defined. Further measurement cycles are needed to better understand the data.

Measuring QOL during practice consultations offers a unique opportunity to involve patients in the treatment process and get a better understanding of disease progression from the patients' viewpoint.^{19 26} Furthermore, comparing patient benefit with treatment costs is a cornerstone in judging the value of health care.¹⁹ Leading international hospitals have recently engaged in implementing QOL measurements in their clinical routine procedures in the inpatient and outpatient sector to show excellence.²⁷ Also, some Swiss public authorities have made the assessment of patient-reported outcomes a pre-requisite for public funding in orthopedic surgery.²⁸ The assessment of PROMs may soon be a standard of care for patients with chronic conditions and diabetes care would be a worthwhile testing field as shown in our physician practice network.

The current magnitude of savings of about 10% of annual costs of diabetes patients is relevant from the payers' perspective. However, cost differences are not statistically significant and follow-up is short. If these results can be confirmed after longer follow-up, such structured treatment programs are an example of value-based health care, as similar or better quality of care can be provided at lower cost.

Conclusions

The structured treatment program under evaluation is a promising approach to improve diabetes care in a Swiss primary care setting, but more follow-up data are needed.

Glossary

CG	Control group
CHF	Swiss francs
CI	Confidence intervall
DM	Diabetes mellitus
DMP	Disease Management Program
IG	Intervention group
OKP	Obligatorische Kranken- und Pflegeversicherung (Basic health insurance in Switzerland)
PCG	Pharmaceutical cost groups
PROM	Patient-reported outcome measure
QOL	Quality of life
SD	Standard deviation
SGED	Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Endokrinologie und Diabetes (Swiss Society for Endocrinology and Diabetes)
VAS	Visual analogue scale
4SPM	4 simple performance measures (HbA1c; lipid profile; nephropathy examination; ophthalmologic examination)

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable. According to the local Ethics committee (BASEC-Nr. Req-2017-00416), patient consent was not necessary as our evaluation using an anonymised database does not fall under the Human Research Act in Switzerland.

Competing interests: KE, MC, MH report grants from SWICA Health Care Organisation, Switzerland, during the conduct of the study; KE and MH also report grants from Swiss Accident Insurance (SUVA), grants from AO Foundation, grants from Swiss Federal Office of Public Health, outside the submitted work; KE also reports grants from Astellas, grants from AstraZeneca, grants from Celgene, grants from Janssen-Cilag, grants from Novartis, grants from Amgen, outside the submitted work; BR, MT, CF are employed by SWICA Health Care Organisation, Switzerland; CC and AR are employed by Medbase health care provider, Switzerland; AR is also employed by Institute of Primary Health Care (BIHAM), University of Bern, Switzerland; SWICA Health Care Organization holds shares of Medbase health care provider.

Funding: The study was in part financially supported by SWICA Health Care Organization, Switzerland. Funding was paid to the Winterthur Institute of Health Economics Institute at Zurich University of Applied Sciences. The funding body commented on the final draft of the manuscript but did not make final decisions regarding the design of the study, the data collection, the analysis and the interpretation of results.

Authors' Contributions: KE is the guarantor and drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to the development of the selection criteria and data extraction criteria. MT managed the claims database and extracted data. AR and CC managed the Medbase database. MH, MC, AR and MT provided statistical expertise and performed the analysis. All authors contributed to interpretation of results. All authors read, provided feedback and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements:

The authors are grateful for the valuable support of all diabetes patients joining the structured treatment program and providing QOL data; furthermore, our thank goes to all involved staff from all health professions within the participating Medbase group practices. Without their engagement this study would not have been possible in the present form.

Participating Medbase practices (in alphabetical order of location):

- Medbase Basel
- Medbase Eglisau, Zurich
- Medbase Oerlikon, Zurich
- Medbase St.Gallen
- Medbase Wiedikon, Zurich
- Medbase Wil, St.Gallen
- Medbase Winterthur, Zurich

References

1. Huber CA, Schwenkglenks M, Rapold R, Reich O. Epidemiology and costs of diabetes mellitus in Switzerland: an analysis of health care claims data, 2006 and 2011. *BMC Endocr Disord* 2014;14:44. doi: 10.1186/1472-6823-14-44
2. Meier R, Muheim L, Senn O, Rosemann T, Chmiel C. The impact of financial incentives to improve quality indicators in patients with diabetes in Swiss primary care: a protocol for a cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ open* 2018;8(6):e023788. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023788 [published Online First: 2018/07/02]
3. Bovier PA, Sebo P, Abetel G, George F, Stalder H. Adherence to recommended standards of diabetes care by Swiss primary care physicians. *Swiss Med Wkly* 2007(11-12):173-81. doi: 2007/11/smw-11592 [published Online First: 2007/04/26]
4. Linder R, Ahrens S, Koppel D, Heilmann T, Verheyen F. The benefit and efficiency of the disease management program for type 2 diabetes. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2011;108(10):155-62. doi: 10.3238/arztebl.2011.0155
5. Fuchs S, Henschke C, Blumel M, Busse R. Disease management programs for type 2 diabetes in Germany: a systematic literature review evaluating effectiveness. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2014;111(26):453-63. doi: 10.3238/arztebl.2014.0453
6. Gozzoli V, Palmer AJ, Brandt A, Spinas GA. Economic and clinical impact of alternative disease management strategies for secondary prevention in type 2 diabetes in the Swiss setting. *Swiss Med Wkly* 2001;131(21-22):303-10. doi: 2001/21/smw-09716
7. Huber CA, Brandle M, Rapold R, Reich O, Rosemann T. A set of four simple performance measures reflecting adherence to guidelines predicts

- hospitalization: a claims-based cohort study of patients with diabetes. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2016;10:223-31. doi: 10.2147/PPA.S99895
8. Blozik E, von Overbeck J, Bethke M. Telemedizinische Betreuung bei Patienten mit Diabetes mellitus Typ 2. *Z Allg Med* 2013;89(5):221-26.
 9. Huber CA, Reich O, Fruh M, Rosemann T. Effects of Integrated Care on Disease-Related Hospitalisation and Healthcare Costs in Patients with Diabetes, Cardiovascular Diseases and Respiratory Illnesses: A Propensity-Matched Cohort Study in Switzerland. *Int J Integr Care* 2016;16(1):11. doi: 10.5334/ijic.2455
 10. Sahli R, Jungi M, Christ E, Goeldlin A. «Chronic Care Management»-Programm in der hausärztlichen Praxis. *Swiss Medical Forum* 2019;19(7-8):113-16.
 11. Observatoire Valaisan de la Santé. Cohorte "Qualité Diabète Valais" Sion2020 [Available from: <https://www.ovs.ch/fr/entete-de-page/l-ovs/registres-medicaux/qualite-diabete-valais/je-participe/> accessed 15-JUNE 2020.
 12. Hainmueller J. Entropy Balancing for Causal Effects: A Multivariate Reweighting Method to Produce Balanced Samples in Observational Studies. *Political Analysis* 2012;20(1):25-46. doi: 10.1093/pan/mpr025 [published Online First: 2017/01/04]
 13. Szende A, Janssen B, Cabases J. Self-Reported Population Health: An International Perspective based on EQ-5D. Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London: Springer Open 2014.
 14. Ludwig K, von der Schulenburg J-MG, Greiner W. German Value Set for the EQ-5D-5L. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2018;36(6):663-74.
 15. Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Endokrinologie und Diabetologie. Anwendungshilfe zu den Kriterien für "gutes" Disease Management Diabetes in der Grundversorgung 2014 [Available from: <http://sgedssed.ch/informationen-fuer-fachpersonen/ressourcen-fuer->

[hausarztmedizin-und-medizinische-grundversorgung/](#) accessed 17-JUNE 2020.

16. Huber CA, Brändle M, Rapold R, Reich O, Rosemann T. A set of four simple performance measures reflecting adherence to guidelines predicts hospitalization: a claims-based cohort study of patients with diabetes. *Patient preference and adherence* 2016;10:223-31. doi: 10.2147/PPA.S99895
17. Drummond M, Sculpher M, Torrance G, O'Brien B, Stoddart G. Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2005.
18. Barber J, Thompson S. Analysis of cost data in randomized trials: an application of the non-parametric bootstrap. *Stat Med* 2000;19(23):3219-36. doi: 10.1002/1097-0258(20001215)19:23<3219::AID-SIM623>3.0.CO;2-P [pii] [published Online First: 2000/12/13]
19. Porter M, Teisberg E. Redefining Health Care. Creating Value-Based Competition on Results. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press 2006.
20. Huber CA, Diem P, Schwenkglenks M, Rapold R, Reich O. Estimating the prevalence of comorbid conditions and their effect on health care costs in patients with diabetes mellitus in Switzerland. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes* 2014;7:455-65. doi: 10.2147/DMSO.S69520
21. Huber CA, Schneeweiss S, Signorell A, Reich O. Improved prediction of medical expenditures and health care utilization using an updated chronic disease score and claims data. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66(10):1118-27. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.04.011 [published Online First: 2013/07/13]
22. Panisch S, Johansson T, Flamm M, Winkler H, Weitgasser R, Sönnichsen AC. The impact of a disease management programme for type 2 diabetes on health-related quality of life: multilevel analysis of a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Diabetology & metabolic syndrome* 2018;10(1):28.

23. Sonnichsen AC, Winkler H, Flamm M, Panisch S, Kowatsch P, Klima G, Furthauer B, Weitgasser R. The effectiveness of the Austrian disease management programme for type 2 diabetes: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *BMC Fam Pract* 2010;11:86. doi: 10.1186/1471-2296-11-86 [published Online First: 2010/11/09]
24. Sayah FA, Qiu W, Xie F, Johnson JA. Comparative performance of the EQ-5D-5L and SF-6D index scores in adults with type 2 diabetes. *Qual Life Res* 2017 doi: 10.1007/s11136-017-1559-8
25. Ose D, Wensing M, Szecsenyi J, Joos S, Hermann K, Miksch A. Impact of primary care-based disease management on the health-related quality of life in patients with type 2 diabetes and comorbidity. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32(9):1594-6. doi: 10.2337/dc08-2223
26. Gerteis M, Edgman-Levitan S, Daley J, Delbanco TL, editors. *Through the patient's eyes. Understanding and promoting patient-centered care*. San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1993.
27. International Consortium for Health Outcomes Measurement. Start measuring and comparing outcomes that matter 2020 [Available from: <https://www.ichom.org/> accessed 24-JUNE 2020.
28. Gesundheitsdirektion Zürich, Swiss Orthopaedics, SIRIS. Obligatorische Messung der Indikations- und Ergebnisqualität bei Patienten mit primären Hüft- und Knieprothesenoperationen in den Listenspitälern des Kantons Zürich Zürich2019 [Available from: https://gd.zh.ch/internet/gesundheitsdirektion/de/themen/behoerden/spitalplanung_spitallisten/akutsomatik.html accessed 13-MAY 2020.

Table 1. Baseline parameters. Baseline values (2017) of socio-demographic variables, indicators for morbidity, costs and hospitalisations for intervention group and control group (before and after matching).

	Raw data			Matching 1		
	DMP-DM (treatment)	Usual care (control)	difference treat-contr.	DMP-DM (treatment)	Usual care (control)	difference treat-contr.
Sample size	N=542	N=5'127		N=538 [†]	N=5'127	
Socio-demographic variables						
Age (mean)	57.28	67.08	-9.80***	57.34	58.68	-1.33
Age group below 20 (fraction)	0.03	0.01	0.02***	0.03	0.03	-0.00
Age group 20-39 (fraction)	0.09	0.02	0.07***	0.09	0.09	-0.00
Age group 40-59 (fraction)	0.40	0.21	0.19***	0.40	0.40	0.00
Age group 60-79 (fraction)	0.42	0.59	-0.17***	0.42	0.42	0.00
Age group 80 plus (fraction)	0.06	0.17	-0.11***	0.06	0.06	0.00
Gender male (fraction)	0.65	0.58	0.07**	0.65	0.65	0.00
Area of residence						
Switzerland Zurich (fraction)	0.40	0.41	-0.02	0.40	0.40	0.00
Switzerland North-West (fraction)	0.13	0.21	-0.08***	0.12	0.12	-0.00
Switzerland East (fraction)	0.47	0.37	0.10***	0.47	0.47	-0.00
Type of residence area						
Urban (big agglomeration) (fraction)	0.32	0.34	-0.02	0.33	0.33	-0.00
Urban (middle-size agglom.) (fraction)	0.47	0.24	0.22***	0.47	0.47	0.00
Urban (small agglomeration) (fraction)	0.02	0.11	-0.08***	0.02	0.02	0.00
Peri-urban (fraction)	0.14	0.20	-0.06***	0.13	0.13	0.00
Rural (fraction)	0.05	0.11	-0.06***	0.05	0.05	-0.00
Health insurance features						
Deductible high (fraction)	0.12	0.05	0.07***	0.12	0.12	-0.00
Basic insurance (OKP) only (fraction)	0.71	0.77	-0.06**	0.71	0.71	0.00
Suppl. insurance inpatient sector (fraction)	0.11	0.20	-0.09***	0.11	0.11	-0.00
PCG indicators for morbidity						
PCG: Diabetes type-1 (fraction)	0.37	0.34	0.03	0.37	0.37	-0.00
PCG: Diabetes type-2 (fraction)	0.27	0.19	0.07***	0.27	0.27	-0.00
PCG: Diab. type-2 & hypertension (fraction)	0.36	0.46	-0.10***	0.37	0.37	0.00
PCG: Asthma bronchiale/COPD (fraction)	0.04	0.05	-0.01	0.04	0.04	0.00
PCG: Mental disorder (fraction)	0.07	0.12	-0.05***	0.07	0.07	-0.00
PCG: Chronic pain (fraction)	0.03	0.05	-0.02*	0.03	0.03	0.00
PCG: Heart disease (fraction)	0.01	0.03	-0.02**	0.01	0.01	0.00
PCG: Glaucoma (fraction)	0.04	0.05	-0.01	0.04	0.04	0.00
PCG: other diseases (fraction)	0.05	0.10	-0.05***	0.05	0.05	-0.00
Costs and services						
Direct medical costs, total 2017 (CHF)	8830.93	11557.14	-2726.20***	8518.45	9335.95	-817.50
Direct medical costs, outpatient (CHF)	6852.39	8238.18	-1385.79***	6678.55	7079.36	-400.81
Direct medical costs, inpatient (CHF)	1607.62	2310.97	-703.34*	1480.26	1658.75	-178.49
Direct medical costs, inpatient acute (CHF)	1349.35	1852.03	-502.68	1279.44	1348.77	-69.33
≥ 1 inpatient stay in 2017 (fraction)	0.20	0.24	-0.04*	0.20	0.19	0.01
Number of inpatient stays in 2017 (mean)	0.32	0.47	-0.15**	0.31	0.35	-0.03

[†]4 treatment cases were not matched

*, **, *** statistically significant differences on the 0.1%, 1% und 5% level

Abbreviations: CHF: Swiss Francs; DMP-DM: disease management program for diabetes mellitus; PCG: pharmaceutical cost groups; an indicator for co-morbidity

Table 2. SGED score overtime (from 2017 to 2018). The SGED score population in 2018 comprised n=627 diabetes patients insured with SWICA who were treated within the structured diabetes treatment program (DMP) with and without diabetes drugs.

Nr.	Quality criteria	Frequency	Quality indicator	Aim	Maximum points	Number of practices reaching aim 2017	Number of practices reaching aim 2018	Range of results across practices (Baseline 2017) N=725	Range of results across practices (Follow-up 2018) N=627
1	Regular clinical controls	min. 3	Diabetes control (single events)	at ≥ 80% of patients	10	0	1*	45.24% – 76.62%	37.9% – 81.18%
2	Lifestyle measures	min. 1	Advice for healthy body weight and physical activity (if BMI ≥ 25) Therapy or advice to stop smoking (for smokers)	at ≥ 80% of patients at ≥ 80% of patients	5 5	0 2	1* 2	20% – 64.79% 28.57% – 85.40%	20.97% – 83.87% 50.0% – 95.54%
3	HbA1c	min. 2	HbA1c (DCCT-traceable)	Annual mean: <7% at ≥40% of patients <8% at ≥60% of patients <9% at ≥85% of patients	5 8 12	1 1 0	3* 5* 1*	28.86% – 44.16% 42.86% – 62.34% 50% – 69.13%	28.57% – 49.41% 51.61% – 72.0% 57.26% – 85.6%
4	Blood pressure	min. 2	Blood pressure (in sitting position after 5 min. rest)	Annual mean: <140/85 mmHg at ≥65%	15	0	0	8.03% – 33.77%	5.36% – 33.06%
5	LDL cholesterol (in patients ≤75 years)	min. 1	LDL cholesterol in patients ≤75 years (if more than 1 measurement: annual mean)	Annual mean: <2.6 mmol/l at ≥63%	10	0	0	8.62% – 38.66%	20.88% – 52.87%
6	Nephropathy assessments	min. 1	Assessment of serum creatinine + microalbuminuria	at ≥ 80% of patients	10	0	0	18.75% – 42.86%	8.06% – 61.18%
7	Ophtalmologic assessments	min. 1	Every 2 years ophtalmologic examination by ophtalmologist	at ≥ 80% of patients	10	0	0	12.99% – 34.13%	15.29% – 66.07%
8	Food examinations	min. 1	(Pulse test + monofilament) OR (pulse test + vibration sense)	at ≥ 80% of patients	10	0	0	3.75% – 35.71%	9.68% – 64.8%

*Improvement in number of practices reaching aim in 2018;

Abbreviations: DMP: disease management program (for diabetes mellitus);

Table 3. Four Simple Performance Measures (4SPM) over time. Baseline values (2017), change from 2017 to 2018 and difference-in-difference (DID) estimates are depicted.

	Baseline 2017		Change from 2017 to 2018		Difference-in difference (DID: treatment - control)	
	DMP-DM (treatm.)	Usual care (control)	DMP-DM (treatm.)	Usual care (control)	DID estimate	95%-CI
Sample size	N=538	N=5'127	N=538	N=5'127	N=538	N=5'127
4SPM: Levels (original[†])						
4SPM L0: Nonadherent (fraction)	0.19	0.20	-0.03	-0.00	-0.03	[-0.07,0.01]
4SPM L1: ≥ 2 HbA1c tests (fraction)	0.25	0.25	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	[-0.05,0.05]
4SPM L2: L1 plus lipid profile (fraction)	0.37	0.40	-0.03	0.01	-0.04	[-0.09,0.02]
4SPM L3: L2 plus nephropathy test (fraction)	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	[-0.03,0.03]
4SPM L4: L3 plus ophthalmologic assessment per 24 mth. (fraction)	0.13	0.11	0.07	0.01	0.06**	[0.02,0.10]
4SPM: Levels (adapted)						
4SPM L0: Nonadherent (fraction)	0.19	0.20	-0.03	-0.00	-0.03	[-0.07,0.01]
4SPM L1: ≥ 2 HbA1c tests (fraction)	0.25	0.25	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	[-0.05,0.05]
4SPM L2: L1 plus lipid profile (fraction)	0.27	0.30	-0.03	0.01	-0.04	[-0.09,0.01]
4SPM L3: L2 plus nephropathy test or current ACE inhibitor (fraction)	0.09	0.07	-0.00	0.01	-0.01	[-0.04,0.03]
4SPM L4: L3 plus ophthalmologic assessment per 24 mth. (fraction)	0.20	0.17	0.08	0.00	0.07***	[0.03,0.12]
4SPM: Single measures						
Current ACE inhibitor (fraction)	0.29	0.23	-0.01	-0.00	-0.01	[-0.03,0.02]
≥ 2 HbA1c tests (fraction)	0.81	0.80	0.03	0.00	0.03	[-0.01,0.07]
Continuous glucose monitoring (fraction)	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.00	[-0.01,0.01]
Lipid profile (fraction)	0.64	0.62	0.01	0.01	-0.00	[-0.06,0.05]
Nephropathy test (fraction)	0.25	0.18	0.09	0.01	0.08**	[0.03,0.13]
Nephropathy test or current ACE inhibitor (fraction)	0.47	0.37	0.06	0.00	0.06*	[0.01,0.10]
Ophthalmologic assessment (per 12 mth) (fraction)	0.47	0.48	0.07	0.00	0.06*	[0.01,0.11]
Ophthalmologic assessment (per 24 mth) (fraction)	0.62	0.62	0.04	0.00	0.03	[-0.01,0.07]

[†]According to Huber et. al. 2008 ⁷

*, **, *** statistically significant differences on the 0.1%, 1% und 5% level

Abbreviations: ACE: angiotensin converting enzyme; CI: confidence interval; DID: difference-in-difference;

Table 4. Costs and medical services over time. Baseline values (2017), change from 2017 to 2018 and difference-in-difference (DID) estimates are depicted. Costs are direct medical costs, applied services are from the inpatient or outpatient sector.

	Baseline 2017		Change from 2017 to 2018		Difference-in difference (DID: treatment - control)	
	DMP-DM (treatment)	Usual care (control)	DMP-DM (treatment)	Usual care (control)	DID estimate	95%-CI
Sample size	N=538	N=5127	N=538	N=5127	N=538	N=5127
Costs (main categories): CHF						
Treatment costs (total)	8518.45	9335.95	170.65	1120.64	-949.98	[-1959.53,59.56]
Treatment costs, outpatient [†]	6678.55	7079.36	-12.04	276.84	-288.87	[-770.88,193.13]
Treatment costs, all inpatient	1480.26	1658.75	137.50	485.31	-347.81	[-1117.32,421.70]
Treatment costs, acute care inpatient	1279.44	1348.77	173.80	556.98	-383.18	[-998.19,231.84]
Costs (outpatient sector[†]): CHF						
Physician consultations	1212.39	1173.17	-36.29	-6.38	-29.91	[-171.48,111.66]
Physiotherapy	243.44	227.49	-7.80	26.29	-34.09	[-86.41,18.24]
Occupational therapy	18.38	22.96	4.96	0.16	4.80	[-21.56,31.15]
Psychiatric care	148.00	163.21	-3.49	18.76	-22.25	[-73.19,28.69]
Therapy at psychologist	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	[0.00,0.00]
Medication KVG	2262.39	2564.13	-96.77	44.42	-141.19	[-402.53,120.15]
Hospital care, outpatient	745.08	741.14	36.50	-12.92	49.42	[-158.58,257.42]
Blood tests and other analyses	452.38	488.48	39.77	40.25	-0.49	[-51.62,50.64]
X-ray examinations	317.60	337.32	-12.78	3.97	-16.75	[-84.28,50.78]
Nutrition advice KVG	26.57	15.80	2.62	1.49	1.13	[-8.41,10.66]
Diabetes nurse KVG	28.66	19.20	-2.68	-3.32	0.64	[-8.75,10.03]
Medical Services						
≥ 1 inpatient stay (fraction)	0.20	0.19	-0.04	0.02	-0.06 [*]	[-0.11,-0.01]
Number of inpatient stays (mean)	0.31	0.35	-0.03	0.05	-0.08	[-0.19,0.03]
Number of outpatient consultations (mean)	9.69	10.34	-0.11	0.60	-0.71 [*]	[-1.41,-0.01]
Consultation at diabetes specialist (fraction)	0.25	0.25	0.04	0.03	0.02	[-0.02,0.05]
>1 consultation at diabetes specialist (fraction)	0.20	0.21	0.04	0.03	0.01	[-0.02,0.05]
Hospital care, outpatient (CHF 500+) (fraction)	0.31	0.32	0.02	0.02	-0.00	[-0.05,0.05]

[†] Outpatient costs do not add up to total outpatient costs as only main outpatient cost categories are shown;

*, **, *** statistically significant differences on the 0.1%, 1% und 5% level

Abbreviations: CHF: Swiss Francs; CI: confidence interval; DID: difference-in-difference; KVG: (Swiss) Krankenversicherungs-Gesetz (Swiss Basic Health Insurance Act);

Legends for figures:

Figure 1: Study flow

Figure 2: Quality of life (5 dimensions). Share of problems within the 5 QOL dimensions as measured with the EQ-5D-5L descriptive system between 2018 and 2019 (n=80 patients with follow-up data).

Figure 3: Quality of life (utilities). Health-related quality of life (EQ-5D-5L) as expressed with utility values (range: 0.0-1.0) in 2018 (mean 0.89) and in 2019 (mean 0.89; p=0.94; n=80 patients with follow-up data). The German value set was applied.¹⁴

Figure 1: Study flow.

Figure 2: Quality of life (5 dimensions). Share of problems within the 5 QOL dimensions as measured with the EQ-5D-5L descriptive system between 2018 and 2019 (n=80 patients with follow-up data).

Figure 3: Quality of life (utilities). Health-related quality of life (EQ-5D-5L) as expressed with utility values (range: 0.0-1.0) in 2018 (mean 0.89) and in 2019 (mean 0.89; $p=0.94$; $n=80$ patients with follow-up data). The German value set was applied.

14

Supplement:

Figure S1: Data collection over time. Time windows of data collection are shown for the intervention group (DMP-Diabetes) and the control group (usual care) for each of the outcome measures. Projected data analysis for SGED, 4SPM and OKP measures for time window 2019 is also shown but will not be available before end of 2020.

Abbreviations: DMP: disease management program; FU: follow-up; QOL: quality of life; SGED: Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Endokrinologie und Diabetes; 4SPM: Four simple performance measures; OKP: obligatorische Kranken- und Pflegeversicherung (Swiss basic health insurance);

Figure S2: Health state (VAS). Self-estimated health state (EQ-5D-5L) as expressed with visual analogue scale (VAS: range: 0-100) in 2018 (mean 77.6) and in 2019 (mean 79.6; $p=0.92$).

Figure S3: SGED Score criteria. ¹⁵

Kriterien (Maximal erzielbare Punkte)	Häufigkeit (p.a.)	Messgrösse	Zielwerte (bezogen auf Patientenpopulation)	Punkte
Regelmässige Kontrollen (10 Punkte)	min. 3	Diabetes-Kontrolle (Episode)	bei $\geq 80\%$ d. Patienten	10
Lifestyle-Massnahmen (10 Punkte)	min. 1	a) BMI < 25 oder Beratung bzgl. Gewicht und Bewegung → Gewicht, Grösse	BMI < 25 v Beratung bei $\geq 80\%$	5
		b) Nichtraucher oder Therapie/ Beratung bzgl. Rauchstopp → Raucherstatus (Packs)	Nichtraucher v Therapie bzw. Beratung bei $\geq 80\%$	5
HbA _{1c} (25 Punkte)	min. 2	HbA _{1c} (DCCT-traceable)	Jahresdurchschnitt: < 9.0% bei $\geq 85\%$	12
			< 8.0% bei $\geq 60\%$	+8
			< 7.0% bei $\geq 40\%$	+5
Blutdruck (15 Punkte)	min. 2	Blutdruck, <i>sitzend nach 5 Min. Ruhe</i>	Jahresdurchschnitt: < 140/90 mmHg bei $\geq 65\%$	15
LDL-Cholesterin bei Patienten unter 75 J. (20 Punkte)	min. 1	LDL-Cholesterin, bei Patienten unter 75 J. (bei mehr als einer Messung: Jahresdurchschnitt)	< 3.37 mmol/l bei $\geq 63\%$	10
			< 2.60 mmol/l bei $\geq 36\%$	+10
Nephropathiesuche (5 Punkte)	min. 1	Bestimmung Serumkreatinin + Mikroalbuminurie	bei $\geq 80\%$ d. Patienten	5
Augenuntersuchung (10 Punkte)	min. 1	Jährliche Augenuntersuchung beim Augenarzt	bei $\geq 60\%$ d. Patienten	10
Fussuntersuchung (5 Punkte)	min. 1	Puls + Monofilament v Puls + Vibrations-sinn	bei $\geq 80\%$ d. Patienten	5