

Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention: Team-Based Care to Improve Blood Pressure Control (2012 Archived Review)

Table of Contents

Summary of Systematic Review and CPSTF Finding	3
Intervention Definition	3
Summary of CPSTF Finding	3
About The Systematic Review	3
Context	3
Summary of Results	4
Community Guide Review (search period July 2003- May 2012)	4
Summary of Economic Evidence	4
Applicability	5
Study Characteristics	5
Review References	5
Task Force Finding and Rationale Statement	7
Intervention Definition	7
Task Force Finding	7
Rationale	7
Basis of Finding	7
Applicability and Generalizability Issues	9
Data Quality Issues	9
Other Benefits and Harms	9
Economic Evidence	10
Considerations for Implementation	10
Evidence Gaps	11
References	11
Publications	12
Supporting Materials	13
Evidence Gaps	13
Included Studies	13
Effectiveness Review	13





Economic Review (search period January 1980-May 2	2012)21
Disclaimer	23



Summary of Systematic Review and CPSTF Finding

Intervention Definition

Team-based care to improve blood pressure control is a health systems-level, organizational intervention that relies on multidisciplinary teams to improve the quality of hypertension care for patients.

Team-based care is established by adding new staff or changing the roles of existing staff who work with a patient's primary care provider. Teams include the patient, the patient's primary care provider, and other professionals such as nurses, pharmacists, dietitians, social workers, and community health workers.

Team members provide process support and share responsibilities of hypertension care to complement the primary care provider's activities. These responsibilities include medication management; patient follow-up; and adherence and self-management support.

Team-based care typically aims to do the following:

- Facilitate communication and coordination of care among team members
- Enhance team members' use of evidence-based guidelines
- Establish regular, structured follow-up mechanisms to monitor patients' progress and schedule additional visits as needed
- Actively engage patients in their own care by providing them with education about hypertension medication, adherence support (for medication and other treatments), and tools and resources for self-management (including health behavior change)

Summary of CPSTF Finding

The Community Preventive Services Task Force (CPSTF) recommends team-based care to improve patients' blood pressure. Evidence shows team-based care increases the proportion of patients with controlled blood pressure and reduces systolic (SBP) and diastolic (DBP) blood pressure. Economic evidence indicates team-based care is cost-effective.

Studies included in the systematic review primarily used teams in which nurses and pharmacists collaborated with primary care providers, patients, and other professionals.

About The Systematic Review

The CPSTF finding is based on evidence from a systematic review published in 2006 (Walsh et al., 28 studies, search period January 1980-July 2003) combined with more recent evidence (52 studies, search period July 2003-May 2012).

The review was conducted on behalf of the CPSTF by a team of specialists in systematic review methods, and in research, practice, and policy related to cardiovascular disease prevention and control.

Context

- Team members who most often worked with patients and primary care providers were pharmacists and nurses.
- Medication management roles for team members were implemented in three different ways. Team members could
 - Change medications independent of the primary care provider



- Change medications with primary care provider approval or consultation
- Provide only adherence support and hypertension-related information, with no direct influence on prescribed medications

Summary of Results

Previous Review - Walsh et al. (search period January 1980- July 2003)

The systematic review included 28 studies.

- Overall, there was an increase in the proportion of patients with controlled blood pressure (less than or equal to 140/90 mmHg).
 - Controlled systolic blood pressure: median increase of 21.8 percentage points (9 studies)
 - o Controlled diastolic blood pressure: median increase of 17.0 percentage points (6 studies)
- Systolic blood pressure decreased by a median of 9.7 mmHg (17 studies).
- Diastolic blood pressure decreased by 4.2 mmHg (21 studies).

Community Guide Review (search period July 2003- May 2012)

The systematic review included 52 studies.

- The proportion of patients with controlled blood pressure (less than or equal to 140/90 mmHg) increased by a median of 12.0 percentage points (33 studies).
- Systolic blood pressure decreased by a median of 5.4 mmHg (44 studies).
- Diastolic blood pressure decreased by 1.8 mmHg (38 studies).
- In addition to improvements in blood pressure outcomes, team-based care was effective in improving other cardiovascular disease risk factors, including
 - Diabetes (HbA1c and blood glucose levels)
 - Cholesterol (total and LDL cholesterol)
- When teams included pharmacists, the median improvement in the proportion of patients with controlled blood pressure was considerably higher than the median increase reported overall.
- The effectiveness of team-based care was greater when team members could change hypertensive medications independent of the primary care provider, or with primary care provider approval or consultation.

Summary of Economic Evidence

The economic review included 31 studies (search period January 1980 – May 2012). Studies provided cost-effectiveness estimates (11 studies) or estimates for the cost of intervention and change in health care cost (20 studies). All monetary values reported are in 2010 U.S. dollars.

- The median intervention cost per patient per year was \$284 (29 estimates from 20 studies).
 - o Intervention cost was the cost of labor and resources needed to complement the activities of primary care providers. This typically included process support and shared responsibility for hypertension care.
- Compared to usual care, the median health care cost per patient per year was \$65 higher for team-based care (23 estimates from 20 studies).
 - Health care costs included outpatient visits, emergency department visits, hospital stays, and medications.



- Cost effectiveness is intervention cost per quality adjusted life year (QALY) saved.
 - One study directly estimated intervention cost per QALY saved to be \$4763.
 - The economic review team translated estimates from 10 additional studies to cost per QALY saved.
 - Median intervention cost per QALY saved was \$13,992 based on a formula from Mason et al. (2005).
 - Median intervention cost per QALY saved was \$9716 based on a formula from McEwan et al. (2006).

Of the 29 cost-effectiveness estimates (from 11 studies), 27 were below the conservative threshold of \$50,000 per QALY saved, which indicates that team-based care for blood pressure control is cost-effective.

Applicability

Based on the settings and populations from studies included in the Community Guide review, the CPSTF finding should be applicable to the following:

- Adults and older adults
- Women and men
- White and African-American populations
- Health care and community-based settings

Study Characteristics

- Thirty-eight studies were conducted in the United States; remaining studies were from Europe, Canada, and Japan.
- Studies were implemented solely within healthcare settings (41 studies), in community settings (9 studies), or in both a healthcare system and community setting (1 study).
- Team members who collaborated with patients and primary care providers were predominantly pharmacists (15 interventions), nurses (28 interventions), or both (5 interventions).
- The median duration of team-based care interventions was 12 months. Only six studies addressed team-based care interventions delivered to more than 500 patients.
- Study populations included adults and older adults and were balanced across gender. For most studies, the majority of patients were either white or African American.
- Eight studies focused predominantly on populations where more than 50% of participants identified as lowincome. In studies providing information on education level, the majority of participants identified as having a high school education or less.
- Limitations identified in the included studies showed significant differences in patient demographics between intervention and comparison groups at baseline, possible contamination within intervention and comparison groups, and issues related to inadequate description of populations and implemented interventions.

Review References

Mason JM, Freemantle N, Gibson JM, New JP. Specialist nurse-led clinics to improve control of hypertension and hyperlipidemia in diabetes: economic analysis of the SPLINT trial. *Diabetes Care* 2005;28(1):40-6.





McEwan P, Peters JR, Bergenheim K, Currie CJ. Evaluation of the costs and outcomes from changes in risk factors in type 2 diabetes using the Cardiff stochastic simulation cost-utility model (DiabForecaster). *Curr Med Res Opin* 2006;22(1):121-9.

Walsh J, McDonald K, Shojania K, et al. Quality improvement strategies for hypertension management: a systematic review. *Medical Care* 2006;44:646-57



Task Force Finding and Rationale Statement

Intervention Definition

Team-based care to improve blood pressure control is a health systems-level, organizational intervention that incorporates a multidisciplinary team to improve the quality of hypertension care for patients. Team-based care is established by adding new staff or changing the roles of existing staff to work with a primary care provider.

Each team includes the patient, the patient's primary care provider, and other professionals such as nurses, pharmacists, dietitians, social workers, and community health workers. Team members provide process support and share responsibilities of hypertension care to complement the activities of the primary care provider. These responsibilities include medication management; patient follow-up; and adherence and self-management support.

Team-based care interventions typically include activities to:

- Facilitate communication and coordination of care support among various team members
- Enhance use of evidence-based guidelines by team members
- Establish regular, structured follow-up mechanisms to monitor patients' progress and schedule additional visits as needed
- Actively engage patients in their own care by providing them with education about hypertension medication, adherence support (for medication and other treatments), and tools and resources for self-management (including health behavior change)

Task Force Finding (April 2012)

The Community Preventive Services Task Force recommends team-based care to improve blood pressure control on the basis of strong evidence of effectiveness in improving the proportion of patients with controlled blood pressure and in reducing systolic (SBP) and diastolic (DBP) blood pressure. Evidence was considered strong based on findings from 80 studies of team-based care organized primarily with nurses and pharmacists working in collaboration with primary care providers, patients, and other professionals. The economic evidence indicates that team-based care is cost-effective.

Rationale

Basis of Finding

The Task Force finding is based on evidence from a systematic review published in 2006 (Walsh et al., 28 studies, search period January 1980-July 2003) and a more recent Community Guide review (52 studies, search period July 2003-May 2012). Results from both reviews demonstrate the effectiveness of team-based care (TBC) in improving blood pressure outcomes. Magnitude of effect estimates, number of studies, and consistency of effects provide the basis for the strong evidence finding (Table).

7



Table 1: Team-Based Care for Improved Blood Pressure (BP) Control: Results

Outcome	Walsh 2006 (1980 - 2003)		Community Guide (2003 - 2012)	
	Number of Studies	Median Effect Estimate	Number of Studies	Median Effect Estimate
Improvement in proportion of patients with BP controlled*	9 (SBP) 6 (DBP)	21.8 pct pts (IQI: 9.0, 33.8) 17.0 pct pts (IQI: 5.7, 24.5)	33 (SBP+DBP)	12.0 pct pts (IQI: 3.2, 20.8)
Reduction in Systolic BP (SBP)	17	9.7 mm Hg (IQI: 4.2, 14)	44	5.4 mm Hg (IQI: 2.0, 7.2)
Reduction in Diastolic BP (DBP)	21	4.2 mm Hg (IQI: 0.2, 6.8)	38	1.8 mm Hg (IQI: 0.7, 3.2)

^{*}Absolute percentage point increase in proportion of patients achieving BP control

IQI = Interquartile Interval

pct pts = percentage points

The benefits of TBC in organizing around a system of care might apply to comprehensive cardiovascular disease risk reduction. The current Community Guide review found that in addition to improvements in blood pressure outcomes, TBC was effective in improving diabetes-related outcomes and lipid outcomes, especially total cholesterol and LDL-cholesterol.

From the current review, the predominant team members who worked with patients and primary care providers were nurses (28 studies), pharmacists (15 studies), or both (5 studies). When pharmacists were added to teams, the median improvement in the proportion of patients with controlled blood pressure was considerably higher than the overall median increase for this outcome. Median reductions in SBP and DBP were similar to overall estimates. When nurses or both nurses and pharmacists were added to teams, median estimates for all three outcomes were comparable to overall effect estimates. Only four studies examined the effectiveness of adding other team members, such as community health workers, social workers, or dietitians without nurses or pharmacists. In these few instances, median effect estimates were smaller in magnitude compared to overall effect estimates. Most studies added one team member; results were similar when compared to studies that added two or more team members, for all three outcomes.

Studies in the current review also examined effectiveness of TBC when team members could make changes to hypertensive medications independent of the primary care provider (16 studies); with primary care provider approval or consultation (15 studies); or not at all (22 studies). The first two levels of medication management achieved larger



improvements in blood pressure outcomes when compared to the third level, where team members provided adherence support and hypertension-related information but did not make medication changes or recommendations. Other important team member roles include support for health behavior change (e.g., counseling sessions) and systems support mainly via telephone follow-up.

Patients are an integral part of the team and work with primary care providers and other team members to improve involvement in self-management activities. Compared with patients treated by primary care providers only, a higher proportion of patients in TBC adhered to prescribed medication (>80%; 9 studies) and had greater satisfaction (3 studies). These improvements are likely attributable to greater emphasis in TBC on improving patient engagement and the quality of self-management support through health behavior change activities (37 studies) and pro-active follow-up, mainly via telephone (24 studies).

Applicability and Generalizability Issues

A majority of included studies in the current review were from the U.S. (38 studies), with other studies from Canada, Japan, and Western Europe. Although most studies were implemented in health care settings (42 studies), TBC was also evaluated in community settings (10 studies), indicating applicability of findings to both.

Evidence from the current review suggests TBC leads to larger improvements in populations where a majority has uncontrolled blood pressure (≥140/90 mmHg). However, median effect estimates from studies in populations whose hypertension was managed at enrolment (mean baseline SBP of 130-140 mmHg or mean DBP of 80-90 mmHg) were similar to the overall effect estimates, suggesting that benefits of TBC interventions apply to all populations with hypertension.

Adults, older adults, and male and female patients were balanced across study populations. White and African-American populations were well-represented across studies, indicating applicability of findings to these populations. Three studies that targeted low-income populations showed mixed results. Five studies with greater than 50% of target populations considered low-income had improvements in all three blood pressure outcomes. Five studies with greater than 50% of target populations receiving public health insurance (Medicare or Medicaid) or being uninsured, and one study with 100% of the target population receiving public health insurance, observed improved blood pressure outcomes.

Information about patients' education levels was limited, and results from a small number of studies where a higher proportion of patients had less than a high school education were mixed. Information on socioeconomic status (SES) and analysis by these variables was generally sparse across the body of evidence.

Data Quality Issues

Forty-seven studies from the current review were randomized controlled trials; remaining studies were quasi-RCTs or used other study designs with concurrent comparison groups. The most common limitations affecting this body of evidence were significant differences between intervention and comparison groups at baseline and potential for contamination.

Other Benefits and Harms

Median effect estimates for lipid outcomes (reported in 17 studies) and diabetes outcomes (19 studies), from the current review, indicated improvement associated with TBC. Researchers assessing these outcomes usually organized teams to address multiple cardiovascular risk factors, such as hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and diabetes. Two studies



also reported a reduction in depressive symptoms from TBC interventions that incorporated services to address depression. Nine studies from the current review targeted blood pressure control among persons with diabetes and four other studies were conducted with populations in which the majority had diabetes. Improvements were found for all three blood pressure outcomes, suggesting applicability of findings to efforts targeting blood pressure control in populations with diabetes. No harms to patients were identified from TBC in studies from the current review or published in the broader literature. Potential adverse effects from medication for hypertension (and related risk factors) could be mitigated through TBC by facilitating efficient communication between patients and providers on the team.

Economic Evidence

Thirty-one studies were included in the economic review (search period January 1980 through May 2012). All monetary values reported are in 2010 U.S. dollars.

Intervention cost is the cost of setting up and running TBC. Twenty studies provided 29 estimates of intervention cost, and found the median cost per patient per year for TBC was \$284 (IQI: \$153 to \$670). The variation in intervention cost is partly explained by the number of cost components considered by the studies; the number of patients in the intervention group; and whether the intervention had objectives beyond blood pressure control.

Health care cost is the cost of products and services provided by the health care system, including outpatient, inpatient, emergency room visits, and medications. Twenty studies provided 23 estimates of health care cost. Compared to usual care, the median cost for TBC was \$65 higher per patient per year (IQI: -\$235 to \$318). The variation between estimates was notable, and ten estimates from ten studies showed health care cost for TBC was lower than cost for usual care indicating health care cost savings. The variations in health care cost is partly explained by the number of health care components considered by studies; existence of comorbidities; and time frame of the analysis. Estimates likely reflect the short-term impact on health care cost and not the potential savings from reduced blood pressure that would accrue over time.

Cost-effectiveness ratios assess intervention cost per quality-adjusted life year (QALY) saved. One study reported that TBC cost \$4763 per QALY saved. Ten additional studies provided 14 estimates of the cost associated with reductions in SBP due to TBC, and these estimates were translated to cost per QALY saved using two separate formulas. The median cost per QALY saved was \$13,992 (IQI: \$8339 to \$32,292) based on the first formula (Mason et al. 2005) and \$9716 (IQI: \$5971 to \$22,425) based on the second formula (McEwan et al. 2005). All but two estimates were below a conservative threshold for cost-effectiveness of \$50,000; indicating TBC for blood pressure control is a cost-effective intervention.

Two cost-benefit studies compared the economic benefits (averted health care cost) to the intervention cost, resulting in benefit-to-cost ratios of 12.2:1 and 10:1. However, each study had limitations likely to affect generalizability of results. The first study considered health care cost for conditions beyond hypertension, did not have a comparison group, and selected from a patient population of high utilizers of health care. The second study underestimated the cost of developing a decision-support system, and found blood pressure to be reduced only for high-income participants.

Considerations for Implementation

At the health system level, important considerations include resource allocation; effective reimbursement mechanisms for all team members; and return on investment. Additional strategies to maintain provider engagement such as feedback mechanisms and incentives are valuable. Health systems would need an effective method for identifying and prioritizing patients into these TBC arrangements and a clear understanding of the scope of the team's activities, mainly



in targeting multiple cardiovascular disease risk factors in addition to hypertension (e.g., hyperlipidemia, diabetes, smoking, poor nutrition).

At the intervention level, it is important to have clear decisions about team constitution and sufficient support to train providers, foster team-building, and communicate effectively. Various modalities for care delivery and communication need to be considered, including telephones and mobile phones, the Internet, and newer technologies.

Team member roles in medication management are also important for implementation. Medication management roles that allow team members to independently change medications or make recommendations to primary care providers may be more important for achieving blood pressure and lipid control, whereas roles in which team members provide support for adherence and information on hypertension and other cardiovascular risk factors might be more relevant for maintaining control of blood pressure and related cardiovascular disease risk factors. It is essential that self-management support for patients be integrated into TBC. Systems supports such as electronic medical records (EMRs) and home blood pressure monitors are also important in these efforts.

Evidence Gaps

More evidence is needed on larger-scale studies (n>500). Only four studies from the current review were considered large in scale and their effect estimates were smaller in magnitude compared with overall effect estimates. TBC interventions also should be implemented to serve minority and low-SES populations to gain a better understanding of effectiveness in various contexts. Though included studies had information on race, ethnicity, income, education level, and insurance status, results were seldom analyzed by these variables.

More evidence is needed also on the effectiveness of TBC with team members such as community health workers or dietitians. Few studies evaluated the type and frequency of interaction between primary care providers and other team members. More evidence is needed to evaluate the role communication plays in TBC. Future studies should provide information on patient and provider preferences for communication within teams. New technology has the potential to improve sharing of evidence-based recommendations between team members and the subsequent uptake of these suggested changes. Use of new and emerging technologies is especially important in developing better channels of communication among providers and between providers and patients.

Patient-centered outcomes of satisfaction with care and adherence to behavioral change activities were rarely reported. More evidence is needed on patient perspectives, including TBC's effects on uptake of self-management activities.

Additional evidence is needed on the long-term sustainability of TBC interventions. Most studies in the current review conducted TBC interventions that lasted between 6 and 12 months. More information is needed about costs and effective reimbursement mechanisms that might impact the intensity of TBC.

The data presented here are preliminary and are subject to change as the systematic review goes through the scientific peer review process.

References

Mason JM, Freemantle N, Gibson JM, New JP. Specialist nurse-led clinics to improve control of hypertension and hyperlipidemia in diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2005;28(1):40-6.





McEwan P, Peters JR, Bergenheim K, Currie CJ. Evaluation of the costs and outcomes from changes in risk factors in type 2 diabetes using the Cardiff stochastic simulation cost-utility model (DiabForecaster). *Current Medical Research and Opinion* 2006;22(1):121-9.

Walsh J, McDonald KM, Shojania KG, Sundaram V, Nayak S., et al. Quality improvement strategies for hypertension management: a systematic review. *Medical Care* 2006;44:646-57.

Publications

Proia KK, Thota AB, Njie GJ, Finnie RKC, Hopkins DP, et al. Team-Based Care and Improved Blood Pressure Control: A Community Guide Systematic Review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2014;47(1):86–99.

Community Preventive Services Task Force. Team-Based Care to Improve Blood Pressure Control. Recommendation of the Community Preventive Services Task Force. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 2014;47(1):100–2.



Supporting Materials

Evidence Gaps

The CPSTF identified several areas that have limited information. Additional research and evaluation could help answer the following questions and fill remaining gaps in the evidence base.

- Only a few of the included studies used large sample sizes. What is the effectiveness of team-based care when used for large populations?
- How effective are team-based care interventions among patients from low socioeconomic status (SES) groups and racial and ethnic groups other than Whites and African-Americans?
- How does effectiveness vary by patients' race, ethnicity, income, education level, or insurance status?
- Most of the included studies evaluated teams with primary care providers, nurses and pharmacists; very few
 included other providers, such as community health workers or dietitians. How does intervention effectiveness
 vary by the type of professional included on a team?
- How do communication channels used within teams (e.g., face-to-face, telephone, e-mail, text message) and communication frequency between patients and providers (e.g., weekly, monthly) effect outcomes?
- What is the role of technology in facilitating team-based care?
- What are patient-centered outcomes associated with team-based care, such as satisfaction with care and adherence to healthy behaviors (e.g. increased physical activity)?
- How sustainable are the benefits from team-based care over time?
- How are reimbursement mechanisms, including incentives, used to support team-based care? How do these mechanisms effect outcomes?
- What are the primary components and drivers of intervention cost and economic benefits of team-based care?
- What are the economic benefits and costs of intervention?
- What are intervention effects on worker productivity?
- There is no standard translation of QALY saved from reduction in blood pressure at the population level. How
 can a translation be developed as an approximation to long term benefits that are impractical and expensive to
 measure in research studies?

Included Studies

The number of studies and publications do not always correspond (e.g., a publication may include several studies or one study may be explained in several publications).

Effectiveness Review

Studies from The Community Guide Updated Review (52 studies, search period 2003-2012)

Allen JK, Dennison-Himmelfarb CR, Szanton SL, Bone L, Hill MN, Levine DM, et al. Community Outreach and Cardiovascular Health (COACH) Trial: a randomized, controlled trial of nurse practitioner/community health worker cardiovascular disease risk reduction in urban community health centers. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes 2011;4(6):595-602.





Artinian NT, Flack JM, Nordstrom CK, Hockman EM, Washington OG, Jen KL, et al. Effects of nurse-managed telemonitoring on blood pressure at 12-month follow-up among urban African Americans. Nurs Res 2007;56(5):312-22.

Becker DM, Yanek LR, Johnson WR, Jr., Garrett D, Moy TF, Reynolds SS, et al. Impact of a community-based multiple risk factor intervention on cardiovascular risk in black families with a history of premature coronary disease. Circulation 2005;111(10):1298-304.

Bogner HR, de Vries HF. Integration of depression and hypertension treatment: a pilot, randomized controlled trial. Ann Fam Med 2008;6(4):295-301.

Bosworth HB, Olsen MK, Dudley T, Orr M, Goldstein MK, Datta SK, et al. Patient education and provider decision support to control blood pressure in primary care: a cluster randomized trial. Am Heart J 2009;157(3):450-6.

Bosworth HB, Olsen MK, Grubber JM, Neary AM, Orr MM, Powers BJ, et al. Two self-management interventions to improve hypertension control: a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2009;151(10):687-95.

Bosworth HB, Powers BJ, Olsen MK, McCant F, Grubber J, Smith V, et al. Home blood pressure management and improved blood pressure control: results from a randomized controlled trial. Arch Intern Med 2011;171(13):1173-80.

Brennan T, Spettell C, Villagra V, Ofili E, McMahill-Walraven C, Lowy EJ, et al. Disease management to promote blood pressure control among African Americans. Popul Health Manag 2010;13(2):65-72.

Bunting BA, Smith BH, Sutherland SE. The Asheville Project: clinical and economic outcomes of a community-based long-term medication therapy management program for hypertension and dyslipidemia. J Am Pharm Assoc 2008;48(1):23-31.

Carter BL, Ardery G, Dawson JD, James PA, Bergus GR, Doucette WR, et al. Physician and pharmacist collaboration to improve blood pressure control. Arch Intern Med 2009;169(21):1996-2002.

Carter BL, Bergus GR, Dawson JD, Farris KB, Doucette WR, Chrischilles EA, et al. A cluster randomized trial to evaluate physician/pharmacist collaboration to improve blood pressure control. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich) 2008;10(4):260-71.

Chabot I, Moisan J, Gregoire JP, Milot A. Pharmacist intervention program for control of hypertension. Ann Pharmacother 2003;37(9):1186-93.

Chen EH, Thom DH, Hessler DM, Phengrasamy L, Hammer H, Saba G, et al. Using the Teamlet Model to improve chronic care in an academic primary care practice. J Gen Intern Med 2010;25 Suppl 4:S610-4.

Cohen LB, Taveira TH, Khatana SA, Dooley AG, Pirraglia PA, Wu WC. Pharmacist-led shared medical appointments for multiple cardiovascular risk reduction in patients with type 2 diabetes. Diabetes Educ 2011;37(6):801-12.

Edelman D, Fredrickson SK, Melnyk SD, Coffman CJ, Jeffreys AS, Datta S, et al. Medical clinics versus usual care for patients with both diabetes and hypertension: a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2010;152(11):689-96.

El Fakiri F, Bruijnzeels MA, Uitewaal PJ, Frenken RA, Berg M, Hoes AW. Intensified preventive care to reduce cardiovascular risk in healthcare centres located in deprived neighbourhoods: a randomized controlled trial. Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil 2008;15(4):488-93.



Fiscella K, Volpe E, Winters P, Brown M, Idris A, Harren T. A novel approach to quality improvement in a safety-net practice: concurrent peer review visits. J Natl Med Assoc 2010;102(12):1231-6.

Green BB, Cook AJ, Ralston JD, Fishman PA, Catz SL, Carlson J, et al. Effectiveness of home blood pressure monitoring, Web communication, and pharmacist care on hypertension control: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2008;299(24):2857-67.

Haskell WL, Berra K, Arias E, Christopherson D, Clark A, George J, et al. Multifactor cardiovascular disease risk reduction in medically underserved, high-risk patients. Am J Cardiol 2006;98(11):1472-9.

Hennessy S, Leonard CE, Yang W, Kimmel SE, Townsend RR, Wasserstein AG, et al. Effectiveness of a two-part educational intervention to improve hypertension control: a cluster-randomized trial. Pharmacotherapy 2006;26(9):1342-7.

Hicks LS, Sequist TD, Ayanian JZ, Shaykevich S, Fairchild DG, Orav EJ, et al. Impact of computerized decision support on blood pressure management and control: a randomized controlled trial. J Gen Intern Med 2008;23(4):429-41.

Hill MN, Han HR, Dennison CR, Kim MT, Roary MC, Blumenthal RS, et al. Hypertension care and control in underserved urban African American men: behavioral and physiologic outcomes at 36 months. Am J Hypertens 2003;16(11 Pt 1):906-13.

Hunt JS, Siemienczuk J, Pape G, Rozenfeld Y, MacKay J, LeBlanc BH, et al. A randomized controlled trial of team-based care: impact of physician-pharmacist collaboration on uncontrolled hypertension. J Gen Intern Med 2008;23(12):1966-72.

Ishani A, Greer N, Taylor BC, Kubes L, Cole P, Atwood M, et al. Effect of nurse case management compared with usual care on controlling cardiovascular risk factors in patients with diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. Diabetes Care 2011;34(8):1689-94.

Johnson W, Shaya FT, Khanna N, Warrington VO, Rose VA, Yan X, et al. The Baltimore Partnership to Educate and Achieve Control of Hypertension (The BPTEACH Trial): a randomized trial of the effect of education on improving blood pressure control in a largely African American population. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich) 2011;13(8):563-70.

Katon WJ, Lin EH, Von Korff M, Ciechanowski P, Ludman EJ, Young B, et al. Collaborative care for patients with depression and chronic illnesses. N Engl J Med 2010;363(27):2611-20.

Lee JK, Grace KA, Taylor AJ. Effect of a pharmacy care program on medication adherence and persistence, blood pressure, and low-density lipoprotein cholesterol: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2006;296(21):2563-71.

Levine DM, Bone LR, Hill MN, Stallings R, Gelber AC, Barker A, et al. The effectiveness of a community/academic health center partnership in decreasing the level of blood pressure in an urban African-American population. Ethn Dis 2003;13(3):354-61.

Litaker D, Mion L, Planavsky L, Kippes C, Mehta N, Frolkis J. Physician - nurse practitioner teams in chronic disease management: the impact on costs, clinical effectiveness, and patients' perception of care. J Interprof Care 2003;17(3):223-37.

Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention: Team-Based Care to Improve Blood Pressure Control (2012 Archived Review)





Ma J, Berra K, Haskell WL, Klieman L, Hyde S, Smith MW, et al. Case management to reduce risk of cardiovascular disease in a county health care system. Arch Intern Med 2009;169(21):1988-95.

Magid DJ, Ho PM, Olson KL, Brand DW, Welch LK, Snow KE, et al. A multimodal blood pressure control intervention in 3 healthcare systems. Am J Manag Care 2011;17(4):e96-103.

Marquez Contreras E, Vegazo Garcia O, Claros NM, Gil Guillen V, de la Figuera von Wichmann M, Casado Martinez JJ, et al. Efficacy of telephone and mail intervention in patient compliance with antihypertensive drugs in hypertension. ETECUM-HTA study.Blood Press 2005;14(3):151-8.

McLean DL, McAlister FA, Johnson JA, King KM, Makowsky MJ, Jones CA, et al. A randomized trial of the effect of community pharmacist and nurse care on improving blood pressure management in patients with diabetes mellitus: study of cardiovascular risk intervention by pharmacists-hypertension (SCRIP-HTN). Arch Intern Med 2008;168(21):2355-61.

Morgado M, Rolo S, Castelo-Branco M. Pharmacist intervention program to enhance hypertension control: a randomised controlled trial. Int J Clin Pharm 2011;33(1):132-40.

Murray MD, Harris LE, Overhage JM, Zhou XH, Eckert GJ, Smith FE, et al. Failure of computerized treatment suggestions to improve health outcomes of outpatients with uncomplicated hypertension: results of a randomized controlled trial. Pharmacotherapy 2004;24(3):324-37.

New JP, Mason JM, Freemantle N, Teasdale S, Wong L, Bruce NJ, et al. Educational outreach in diabetes to encourage practice nurses to use primary care hypertension and hyperlipidaemia guidelines (EDEN): a randomized controlled trial. Diabet Med 2004;21(6):599-603.

New JP, Mason JM, Freemantle N, Teasdale S, Wong LM, Bruce NJ, et al. Specialist nurse-led intervention to treat and control hypertension and hyperlipidemia in diabetes (SPLINT): a randomized controlled trial. Diabetes Care 2003;26(8):2250-5.

Ogedegbe G, Chaplin W, Schoenthaler A, Statman D, Berger D, Richardson T, et al. A practice-based trial of motivational interviewing and adherence in hypertensive African Americans. Am J Hypertens 2008;21(10):1137-43.

Pezzin LE, Feldman PH, Mongoven JM, McDonald MV, Gerber LM, Peng TR. Improving blood pressure control: results of home-based post-acute care interventions. J Gen Intern Med 2011;26(3):280-6.

Reid F, Murray P, Storrie M. Implementation of a pharmacist-led clinic for hypertensive patients in primary care--a pilot study. Pharm World Sci 2005;27(3):202-7.

Rinfret S, Lussier MT, Peirce A, Duhamel F, Cossette S, Lalonde L, et al. The impact of a multidisciplinary information technology-supported program on blood pressure control in primary care. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes 2009;2(3):170-7.

Rocco N, Scher K, Basberg B, Yalamanchi S, Baker-Genaw K. Patient-centered plan-of-care tool for improving clinical outcomes. Qual Manag Health Care 2011;20(2):89-97.



Rudd P, Miller NH, Kaufman J, Kraemer HC, Bandura A, Greenwald G, et al. Nurse management for hypertension. A systems approach. Am J Hypertens 2004;17(10):921-7.

Ruppar TM. Randomized pilot study of a behavioral feedback intervention to improve medication adherence in older adults with hypertension. J Cardiovasc Nurs 2010;25(6):470-9.

Simpson SH, Majumdar SR, Tsuyuki RT, Lewanczuk RZ, Spooner R, Johnson JA. Effect of adding pharmacists to primary care teams on blood pressure control in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. Diabetes Care 2011;34(1):20-6.

Svetkey LP, Pollak KI, Yancy WS, Jr., Dolor RJ, Batch BC, Samsa G, et al. Hypertension improvement project: randomized trial of quality improvement for physicians and lifestyle modification for patients. Hypertension 2009;54(6):1226-33.

Tobari H, Arimoto T, Shimojo N, Yuhara K, Noda H, Yamagishi K, et al. Physician-pharmacist cooperation program for blood pressure control in patients with hypertension: a randomized-controlled trial. Am J Hypertens 2010;23(10):1144-52.

Tobe SW, Pylypchuk G, Wentworth J, Kiss A, Szalai JP, Perkins N, et al. Effect of nurse-directed hypertension treatment among First Nations people with existing hypertension and diabetes mellitus: the Diabetes Risk Evaluation and Microalbuminuria (DREAM 3) randomized controlled trial. CMAJ 2006;174(9):1267-71.

Ulm K, Huntgeburth U, Gnahn H, Briesenick C, Purner K, Middeke M. Effect of an intensive nurse-managed medical care programme on ambulatory blood pressure in hypertensive patients. Arch Cardiovasc Dis 2010;103(3):142-9.

Wakefield BJ, Holman JE, Ray A, Scherubel M, Adams MR, Hillis SL, et al. Effectiveness of home telehealth in comorbid diabetes and hypertension: a randomized, controlled trial. Telemed J E Health 2011;17(4):254-61.

Wood DA, Kotseva K, Connolly S, Jennings C, Mead A, Jones J, et al. Nurse-coordinated multidisciplinary, family-based cardiovascular disease prevention programme (EUROACTION) for patients with coronary heart disease and asymptomatic individuals at high risk of cardiovascular disease: a paired, cluster-randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2008;371(9629):1999-2012.

Zillich AJ. Hypertension outcomes through blood pressure monitoring and evaluation by pharmacists (HOME study). J Gen Intern Med 2005;20(12):1091.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES LINKED TO INCLUDED STUDIES FROM THE COMMUNITY GUIDE UPDATED REVIEW (SEARCH PERIOD 2003-2012)

These additional references provide important supporting information to supplement the content available from the included studies listed above.

Bosworth HB, Olsen MK, Dudley T, Orr M, Neary A, Harrelson M, et al. The Take Control of Your Blood pressure (TCYB) study: study design and methodology. Contemp Clin Trials 2007;28(1):33-47.

Bosworth HB, Olsen MK, Gentry P, Orr M, Dudley T, McCant F, et al. Nurse administered telephone intervention for blood pressure control: a patient-tailored multifactorial intervention. Patient Educ Couns 2005;57(1):5-14.





Bosworth HB, Olsen MK, McCant F, Harrelson M, Gentry P, Rose C, et al. Hypertension Intervention Nurse Telemedicine Study (HINTS): testing a multifactorial tailored behavioral/educational and a medication management intervention for blood pressure control. Am Heart J 2007;153(6):918-24.

Cene CW, Yanek LR, Moy TF, Levine DM, Becker LC, Becker DM. Sustainability of a multiple risk factor intervention on cardiovascular disease in high-risk African American families. Ethn Dis 2008;18(2):169-75.

Datta SK, Oddone EZ, Olsen MK, Orr M, McCant F, Gentry P, et al. Economic analysis of a tailored behavioral intervention to improve blood pressure control for primary care patients. Am Heart J 2010;160(2):257-63.

Dennison CR, Post WS, Kim MT, Bone LR, Cohen D, Blumenthal RS, et al. Underserved urban African American men: hypertension trial outcomes and mortality during 5 years. Am J Hypertens 2007;20(2):164-71.

Dolor RJ, Yancy WS, Jr., Owen WF, Matchar DB, Samsa GP, Pollak KI, et al. Hypertension Improvement Project (HIP): study protocol and implementation challenges. Trials 2009;10:13.

Goessens BM, Visseren FL, Sol BG, de Man-van Ginkel JM, van der Graaf Y, Group SS. A randomized, controlled trial for risk factor reduction in patients with symptomatic vascular disease: the multidisciplinary Vascular Prevention by Nurses Study (VENUS).Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil 2006;13(6):996-1003.

Green BB, Anderson ML, Ralston JD, Catz S, Fishman PA, Cook AJ. Patient ability and willingness to participate in a web-based intervention to improve hypertension control. J Med Internet Res 2011;13(1):e1.

Green BB, Ralston JD, Fishman PA, Catz SL, Cook A, Carlson J, et al. Electronic communications and home blood pressure monitoring (e-BP) study: design, delivery, and evaluation framework. Contemp Clin Trials 2008;29(3):376-95.

Ma J, Lee KV, Berra K, Stafford RS. Implementation of case management to reduce cardiovascular disease risk in the Stanford and San Mateo Heart to Heart randomized controlled trial: study protocol and baseline characteristics. Implement Sci 2006;1:21.

McLean DL, McAlister FA, Johnson JA, King DM, Jones CA, Tsuyuki RT. Improving blood pressure management in patients with diabetes: the design of the SCRIP-HTN study. Can Pharm J 2006;139(4):36-39.

Ogedegbe G, Schoenthaler A, Richardson T, Lewis L, Belue R, Espinosa E, et al. An RCT of the effect of motivational interviewing on medication adherence in hypertensive African Americans: rationale and design. Contemp Clin Trials 2007;28(2):169-81.

Powers BJ, Olsen MK, Oddone EZ, Bosworth HB. The effect of a hypertension self-management intervention on diabetes and cholesterol control. Am J Med 2009;122(7):639-46.

Rozenfeld Y, Hunt JS. Effect of patient withdrawal on a study evaluating pharmacist management of hypertension. Pharmacotherapy 2006;26(11):1565-71.

Von Muenster SJ, Carter BL, Weber CA, Ernst ME, Milchak JL, Steffensmeier JJ, et al. Description of pharmacist interventions during physician-pharmacist co-management of hypertension. Pharm World Sci 2008;30(1):128-35.



Weber CA, Ernst ME, Sezate GS, Zheng S, Carter BL. Pharmacist-physician comanagement of hypertension and reduction in 24-hour ambulatory blood pressures. Arch Intern Med 2010;170(18):1634-9.

Wentzlaff DM, Carter BL, Ardery G, Franciscus CL, Doucette WR, Chrischilles EA, et al. Sustained blood pressure control following discontinuation of a pharmacist intervention. J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich) 2011;13(6):431-7.

Studies from Walsh et al. (28 studies, search period 1980-2003)

Five-year findings of the hypertension detection and follow-up program. II. Mortality by race-sex and age. Hypertension Detection and Follow-up Program Cooperative Group. JAMA 1979;242(23):2572-7.

Mortality after 10 1/2 years for hypertensive participants in the Multiple Risk Factor Intervention Trial. Circulation 1990;82(5):1616-28.

Artinian NT, Washington OG, Templin TN. Effects of home telemonitoring and community-based monitoring on blood pressure control in urban African Americans: a pilot study. Heart Lung 2001;30(3):191-9.

Blenkinsopp A, Blenkinsopp. Extended adherence support by community pharmacists for patients with hypertension: a randomised controlled trial. Int J Pharma Pract 2011;8(3):165.

Bogden PE, Abbott RD, Williamson P, Onopa JK, Koontz LM. Comparing standard care with a physician and pharmacist team approach for uncontrolled hypertension. J Gen Intern Med 1998;13(11):740-5.

Borenstein JE, Graber G, Saltiel E, Wallace J, Ryu S, Archi J, et al. Physician-pharmacist comanagement of hypertension: a randomized, comparative trial. Pharmacotherapy 2003;23(2):209-16.

Campbell NC, Ritchie LD, Thain J, Deans HG, Rawles JM, Squair JL. Secondary prevention in coronary heart disease: a randomised trial of nurse led clinics in primary care. Heart 1998;80(5):447-52.

Carter BL, Barnette DJ, Chrischilles E, Mazzotti GJ, Asali ZJ. Evaluation of hypertensive patients after care provided by community pharmacists in a rural setting. Pharmacotherapy 1997;17(6):1274-85.

Curzio JL, Rubin PC, Kennedy SS, Reid JL. A comparison of the management of hypertensive patients by nurse practitioners compared with conventional hospital care. J Hum Hypertens 1990;4(6):665-70.

Earp JA, Ory MG, Strogatz DS. The effects of family involvement and practitioner home visits on the control of hypertension. Am J Public Health 1982;72(10):1146-54.

Erfurt JC, Foote A, Heirich MA. Worksite wellness programs: incremental comparison of screening and referral alone, health education, follow-up counseling, and plant organization. Am J Health Promot 1991;5(6):438-48.

Erickson SR, Slaughter R, Halapy H. Pharmacists' ability to influence outcomes of hypertension therapy. Pharmacotherapy 1997;17(1):140-7.

Foote A, Erfurt JC. Hypertension control at the work site. Comparison of screening and referral alone, referral and follow-up, and on-site treatment. N Engl J Med 1983;308(14):809-13.





Garcao JA, Cabrita J. Evaluation of a pharmaceutical care program for hypertensive patients in rural Portugal. J Am Pharm Assoc (Wash) 2002;42(6):858-64.

Garcia-Pena C, Thorogood M, Armstrong B, Reyes-Frausto S, Munoz O. Pragmatic randomized trial of home visits by a nurse to elderly people with hypertension in Mexico. Int J Epidemiol 2001;30(6):1485-91.

Goldberg HI, Wagner EH, Fihn SD, Martin DP, Horowitz CR, Christensen DB, et al. A randomized controlled trial of CQI teams and academic detailing: can they alter compliance with guidelines? Jt Comm J Qual Improv 1998;24(3):130-42.

Hill MN, Bone LR, Hilton SC, Roary MC, Kelen GD, Levine DM. A clinical trial to improve high blood pressure care in young urban black men: recruitment, follow-up, and outcomes. Am J Hypertens 1999;12(6):548-54.

Hla KM, Feussner JR, Blessing-Feussner CL, Neelon FA, Linfors EW, Starmer CF, et al. BP control. Improvement in a university medical clinic by use of a physician's associate. Arch Intern Med 1983;143(5):920-3.

Krishan I, Davis CS, Nobrega FT, Smoldt RK. The Mayo three-community hypertension control program. IV. Five-year outcomes of intervention in entire communities. Mayo Clin Proc 1981;56(1):3-10.

Logan AG, Milne BJ, Achber C, Campbell WP, Haynes RB. Cost-effectiveness of a worksite hypertension treatment program. Hypertension 1981;3(2):211-8.

Logan AG, Milne BJ, Flanagan PT, Haynes RB. Clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of monitoring blood pressure of hypertensive employees at work. Hypertension 1983;5(6):828-36.

McClellan WM, Craxton LC. Improved follow-up care of hypertensive patients by a nurse practitioner in a rural clinic. J Rural Health 1985;1(2):34-41.

McGhee SM, McInnes GT, Hedley AJ, Murray TS, Reid JL. Coordinating and standardizing long-term care: evaluation of the west of Scotland shared-care scheme for hypertension. Br J Gen Pract 1994;44(387):441-5.

Mehos BM, Saseen JJ, MacLaughlin EJ. Effect of pharmacist intervention and initiation of home blood pressure monitoring in patients with uncontrolled hypertension. Pharmacotherapy 2000;20(11):1384-9.

Park JJ, Kelly P, Carter BL, Burgess PP. Comprehensive pharmaceutical care in the chain setting. J Am Pharm Assoc (Wash) 1996;NS36(7):443-51.

Schneider PJ, Larrimer JN, Visconti JA, Miller WA. Role effectiveness of a pharmacist in the maintenance of patients with hypertension and congestive heart failure. Contemp Pharm Pract 1982;5(2):74-9.

Solomon DK, Portner TS, Bass GE, Gourley DR, Gourley GA, Holt JM, et al. Clinical and economic outcomes in the hypertension and COPD arms of a multicenter outcomes study. J Am Pharm Assoc (Wash) 1998;38(5):574-85.

Vivian EM. Improving blood pressure control in a pharmacist-managed hypertension clinic. Pharmacotherapy 2002;22(12):1533-40.



Economic Review (search period January 1980-May 2012)

Artinian NT, Washington OG, Templin TN. Effects of home telemonitoring and community-based monitoring on blood pressure control in urban African Americans: a pilot study. Heart Lung 2001;30(3):191-9.

Bertera EM, Bertera RL. The cost-effectiveness of telephone vs clinic counseling for hypertensive patients: a pilot study. Am J Public Health 1981;71(6):626-9.

Bogden PE, Abbott RD, Williamson P, Onopa JK, Koontz LM. Comparing standard care with a physician and pharmacist team approach for uncontrolled hypertension. J Gen Intern Med 1998;13(11):740-5.

Borenstein JE, Graber G, Saltiel E, et al. Physician-pharmacist comanagement of hypertension: a randomized, comparative trial. Pharmacotherapy 2003;23(2):209-16.

Bosworth HB, Olsen MK, Grubber JM, et al. Two self-management interventions to improve hypertension control: a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2009;151(10):687-95.

Bosworth HB, Powers BJ, Olsen MK, et al. Home blood pressure management and improved blood pressure control: results from a randomized controlled trial. Arch Intern Med 2011;171(13):1173-80.

Bunting BA, Smith BH, Sutherland SE. The Asheville Project: clinical and economic outcomes of a community-based long-term medication therapy management program for hypertension and dyslipidemia. J Am Pharm Assoc (2003) 2008;48(1):23-31.

Carter BL, Barnette DJ, Chrischilles E, Mazzotti GJ, Asali ZJ. Evaluation of hypertensive patients after care provided by community pharmacists in a rural setting. Pharmacotherapy 1997;17(6):1274-85.

Cote I, Gregoire JP, Moisan J, Chabot I, Lacroix G. A pharmacy-based health promotion programme in hypertension: cost-benefit analysis. Pharmaco Economics 2003;21(6):415-28.

Datta SK, Oddone EZ, Olsen MK, et al. Economic analysis of a tailored behavioral intervention to improve blood pressure control for primary care patients. Am Heart J 2010;160(2):257-63.

Devine EB, Hoang S, Fisk AW, Wilson-Norton JL, Lawless NM, Louie C. Strategies to optimize medication use in the physician group practice: the role of the clinical pharmacist. J Am Pharm Assoc (2003) 2009;49(2):181-91.

Eckerlund I, Jonsson E, Ryden L, Rastam L, Berglund G, Isacsson SO. Economic evaluation of a Swedish medical care program for hypertension. Health Policy 1985;5(4):299-306.

Edelman D, Fredrickson SK, Melnyk SD, et al. Medical clinics versus usual care for patients with both diabetes and hypertension: a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med 2010;152(11):689-96.

Fedder DO, Chang RJ, Curry S, Nichols G. For the patient. The effectiveness of a community health worker outreach program on healthcare utilization of west Baltimore City Medicaid patients with diabetes, with or without hypertension. Ethn Dis 2003;13(1):146.

Forstrom MJ, Ried LD, Stergachis AS, Corliss DA. Effect of a clinical pharmacist program on the cost of hypertension treatment in an HMO family practice clinic. DICP 1990;24(3):304-9.

Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention: Team-Based Care to Improve Blood Pressure Control (2012 Archived Review)



Isetts BJ, Schondelmeyer SW, Artz MB, et al. Clinical and economic outcomes of medication therapy management services: the Minnesota experience. J Am Pharm Assoc (2003) 2008;48(2):203-11; 3 p following 11.

Katon WJ, Lin EH, Von Korff M, et al. Collaborative care for patients with depression and chronic illnesses. N Engl J Med 2010;363(27):2611-20.

Kulchaitanaroaj P, Brooks JM, Ardery G, Newman D, Carter BL. Incremental costs associated with physician and pharmacist collaboration to improve blood pressure control. Pharmacotherapy 2012;32(8):772-80.

Litaker D, Mion L, Planavsky L, Kippes C, Mehta N, Frolkis J. Physician - nurse practitioner teams in chronic disease management: the impact on costs, clinical effectiveness, and patients' perception of care. J Interprof Care 2003;17(3):223-37.

Logan AG, Milne BJ, Achber C, Campbell WP, Haynes RB. Cost-effectiveness of a worksite hypertension treatment program. Hypertension 1981;3(2):211-8.

Logan AG, Milne BJ, Flanagan PT, Haynes RB. Clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of monitoring blood pressure of hypertensive employees at work. Hypertension 1983;5(6):828-36.

Lowey A, Moore S, Norris C, Wright D, Silcock J, Hammond P. The cost-effectiveness of pharmacist-led treatment of cardiac risk in patients with type 2 diabetes. Pharm World Sci 2007;29(5):541-5.

Ma J, Berra K, Haskell WL, et al. Case management to reduce risk of cardiovascular disease in a county health care system. Arch Intern Med 2009;169(21):1988-95.

Mason JM, Freemantle N, Gibson JM, New JP. Specialist nurse-led clinics to improve control of hypertension and hyperlipidemia in diabetes: economic analysis of the SPLINT trial. Diabetes Care 2005;28(1):40-6.

McGhee SM, McInnes GT, Hedley AJ, Murray TS, Reid JL. Coordinating and standardizing long-term care: evaluation of the west of Scotland shared-care scheme for hypertension. Br J Gen Pract 1994;44(387):441-5.

Munroe WP, Kunz K, Dalmady-Israel C, Potter L, Schonfeld WH. Economic evaluation of pharmacist involvement in disease management in a community pharmacy setting. Clin Ther 1997;19(1):113-23.

Murray MD, Harris LE, Overhage JM, et al. Failure of computerized treatment suggestions to improve health outcomes of outpatients with uncomplicated hypertension: results of a randomized controlled trial. Pharmacotherapy 2004;24(3):324-37.

Okamoto MP, Nakahiro RK. Pharmacoeconomic evaluation of a pharmacist-managed hypertension clinic. Pharmacotherapy 2001;21(11):1337-44.

Pezzin LE, Feldman PH, Mongoven JM, McDonald MV, Gerber LM, Peng TR. Improving blood pressure control: results of home-based post-acute care interventions. J Gen Intern Med 2011;26(3):280-6.





Reed SD, Li Y, Oddone EZ, et al. Economic evaluation of home blood pressure monitoring with or without telephonic behavioral self-management in patients with hypertension. Am J Hypertens 2010;23(2):142-8.

Wertz D, Hou L, DeVries A, et al. Clinical and economic outcomes of the Cincinnati Pharmacy Coaching Program for diabetes and hypertension. Manag Care 2012;21(3):44-54.

Studies Used for Economics Methods

Mason JM, Freemantle N, Gibson JM, New JP. Specialist nurse-led clinics to improve control of hypertension and hyperlipidemia in diabetes: economic analysis of the SPLINT trial. Diabetes Care 2005;28(1):40-6.

McEwan P, Peters JR, Bergenheim K, Currie CJ. Evaluation of the costs and outcomes from changes in risk factors in type 2 diabetes using the Cardiff stochastic simulation cost-utility model (DiabForecaster). Curr Med Res Opin 2006;22(1):121-9.

Disclaimer

The findings and conclusions on this page are those of the Community Preventive Services Task Force and do not necessarily represent those of CDC. CPSTF evidence-based recommendations are not mandates for compliance or spending. Instead, they provide information and options for decision makers and stakeholders to consider when determining which programs, services, and policies best meet the needs, preferences, available resources, and constraints of their constituents.

Document last updated December 1, 2021