

Manuscript Number: DIABET-D-16-00153R1

Title: Effectiveness of the multidisciplinary Risk Assessment and Management Program for patients with Diabetes Mellitus (RAMP-DM) on diabetic microvascular complications: a population-based cohort study

Article Type: Original Article

Keywords: diabetes mellitus, risk stratification, multidisciplinary, microvascular complications

Corresponding Author: Ms. Fangfang Jiao, MBBS

Corresponding Author's Institution: The University of Hong Kong

First Author: Fangfang Jiao, MBBS

Order of Authors: Fangfang Jiao, MBBS; Colman Siu Cheung Fung; Yuk Fai Wan; Sarah M McGhee; Carlos King Ho Wong; Daisy Dai; Ruby Kwok; Cindy Lo Kuen Lam

Manuscript Region of Origin: HONG KONG

Abstract: Aim: To evaluate the effectiveness of the multidisciplinary Risk Assessment and Management Program for Patients with Diabetes Mellitus (RAMP-DM) in reducing the risks of microvascular complications.

Methods: We conducted a prospective cohort study in 29,670 propensity score matched RAMP-DM participants and diabetic subjects under usual primary care (14,835 subjects in each group). The study endpoints were the first occurrence of any diabetic complications, nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy/pre-proliferative diabetic retinopathy (NPDR/pre-PDR), sight-threatening diabetic retinopathy (STDR) or blindness, nephropathy, end-stage renal disease (ESRD), neuropathy, and lower limb ulcer or amputation. Log rank-test and multivariable Cox proportional hazard regressions were employed to estimate the between-group differences in the incidences of study endpoints.

Results: After a median follow-up period of 36 months with >41,000 person-years, The RAMP-DM had lower incidence in any microvascular complications (760 versus 935, adjusted hazard ratio [HR], 0.73; 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.66 - 0.81; P<0.001). The RAMP-DM group had lower incidences in all the specific microvascular complications except neuropathy (adjusted HR, 0.94; 95%CI, 0.61 - 1.45; P=0.778). The adjusted HR of the RAMP-DM to control group for ESRD, STDR or blindness, and lower limb ulcer or amputation were 0.40 (95%CI, 0.24 - 0.69 ; P<0.001), 0.55 (95%CI, 0.39 - 0.78; P=0.001), and 0.49 (95%CI, 0.30 - 0.80; P=0.005), respectively.

Conclusion: The RAMP-DM intervention was associated with lower incidences of all microvascular complications except neuropathy over a three-year follow-up. The encouraging results provided evidence to support that

structured risk assessment and risk-stratified management provided by a multidisciplinary team is effective in reducing microvascular complications in diabetic patients.

1
2
3
4 **Effectiveness of the multidisciplinary Risk Assessment and Management Program for**
5
6 **patients with Diabetes Mellitus (RAMP-DM) on diabetic microvascular complications:**
7
8
9 **a population-based cohort study**

10
11
12
13
14 **Short title: Effects of RAMP-DM on microvascular complications**

15
16 Authors: Fangfang Jiao^a, Colman Siu Cheung Fung^a, Yuk Fai Wan^a, Sarah Morag McGhee^b,
17
18 Carlos King Ho Wong^a, Daisy Dai^c, Ruby Kwok^c, Cindy Lo Kuen Lam^a

19
20
21 **Corresponding author**

22
23
24 Fangfang Jiao

25
26 Email: francesj@connect.hku.hk

27
28 Telephone: 852-59382665

29
30 Fax: 852-28147475

31
32
33 Address: 3/F, Ap Lei Chau Clinic, 161 Ap Lei Chau Main Street, Ap Lei Chau, Hong Kong

34
35 **Email addresses:**

36
37 FJ: francesj@connect.hku.hk

38
39 CSCF: cfsc@hku.hk

40
41 YFW: yfwan@hku.hk

42
43 SMM: sarahmcghee7@gmail.com

44
45 CKHW: carlosho@hku.hk

46
47 DD: ddai@ha.org.hk

48
49 RK: kwoklp@ha.org.hk

50
51 CLKL: cklam@hku.hk

52
53
54 **Affiliations**

55
56 ^a 3/F Ap Lei Chau Clinic, 161 Main Street, Ap Lei Chau, Hong Kong, Department of Family
57
58 Medicine and Primary Care, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

^b School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong.5/F
William MW Mong Block, 21 Sassoon Road, Hong Kong.

^c Hospital Authority Building, 147B Argyle Street, Kowloon, Hong Kong, Primary and
Community Services, Hospital Authority Head Office, Hong Kong Hospital Authority.

Conflict of interest

No conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, are declared by the author(s).

Disclosure statement

There is nothing need to be disclosed.

1
2
3
4 **Abstract**
5

6 **Aim:** To evaluate the effectiveness of the multidisciplinary Risk Assessment and Management
7 Program for Patients with Diabetes Mellitus (RAMP-DM) in reducing the risks of microvascular
8 complications.
9
10
11
12

13
14
15
16 **Methods:** We conducted a prospective cohort study in 29,670 propensity score matched RAMP-
17 DM participants and diabetic subjects under usual primary care (14,835 subjects in each group).
18 The study endpoints were the first occurrence of any diabetic complications, **nonproliferative**
19 **diabetic retinopathy/pre-proliferative diabetic retinopathy (NPDR/pre-PDR)**, sight-
20 threatening diabetic retinopathy (STDR) or blindness, nephropathy, end-stage renal disease
21 (ESRD), neuropathy, and lower limb ulcer or amputation. Log rank-test and multivariable Cox
22 proportional hazard regressions were employed to estimate the between-group differences in the
23 incidences of study endpoints.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36
37
38 **Results:** After a median follow-up period of 36 months with >41,000 person-years, The RAMP-
39 DM had lower incidence in any microvascular complications (**760 versus 935, adjusted hazard**
40 **ratio [HR],0.73; 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.66 – 0.81; P<0.001**). The RAMP-DM group
41 had lower incidences in all the specific microvascular complications except neuropathy (adjusted
42 **HR, 0.94; 95%CI, 0.61 - 1.45; P=0.778**). The adjusted HR of the RAMP-DM to control group
43 for ESRD, STDR or blindness, and lower limb ulcer or amputation were **0.40 (95%CI, 0.24 -**
44 **0.69 ; P<0.001)**, **0.55 (95%CI, 0.39 - 0.78; P=0.001)**, and **0.49 (95%CI, 0.30 - 0.80; P=0.005)**,
45 respectively.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Conclusion:** The RAMP-DM intervention was associated with lower incidences of all
5
6 microvascular complications except neuropathy over a three-year follow-up. The encouraging
7
8 results provided evidence to support that structured risk assessment and risk-stratified
9
10 management provided by a multidisciplinary team is effective in reducing microvascular
11
12 complications in diabetic patients.
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 **Clinical trial registry:** NCT02034695, www.ClinicalTrials.gov
20
21
22

23
24 **Keywords:** diabetes mellitus, risk stratification, multidisciplinary, microvascular complications
25
26
27

28 **List of Abbreviations**

29	DBP	Diastolic Blood Pressure
30	DM	Diabetes Mellitus
31	DR	Diabetic Retinopathy
32	eGFR	Estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate
33	ESRD	End Stage Renal Disease
34	HR	Hazard Ratio
35	ICD-9-CM	International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Edition
36	ICPC-2	International Classification of Primary Care
37	NNT	Number Needed to Treat
38	NPDR	Non-Proliferative Diabetic Retinopathy
39	RAMP-DM	Multidisciplinary Risk Assessment and Management Program for Patients with
40		diabetes mellitus
41	SBP	Systolic Blood Pressure
42	STDR	Sight-threatening Diabetic retinopathy
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		
61		
62		
63		
64		
65		

60 **Introduction**

1
2
3
4 Diabetes mellitus (DM) is one of the most common chronic diseases all over the world. The
5
6 prevalence of DM in the world is estimated to reach 592 million by 2035, with an increase of
7
8 54.2% in total case numbers compared to the year of 2013[1]. China has the largest number of
9
10 diabetic patients. The number of diabetic patients in China is estimated to exceed 129 million in
11
12 2030, accounting for more than one quarter of the total diabetic cases in the world [2]. In Hong
13
14 Kong, around 1 in 10 people has DM [3], and the prevalence of DM is increasing [4]. Diabetic
15
16 patients have an increased risk of developing microvascular complications, including retinopathy,
17
18 nephropathy and neuropathy. The prevalence of retinopathy and neuropathy is estimated to be 22%
19
20 and 13% respectively in newly diagnosed DM patients [5]. The prevalence of proliferative
21
22 retinopathy is 2% in diabetic patients with less than 5 years of duration of DM, and it increases
23
24 25% in patients with 25 or more years of DM [6]. Diabetic nephropathy develops in 25% Type 2
25
26 DM patients **after** 10 years after diagnosis [7] and end-stage renal disease (ESRD) develops in
27
28 14% Type 1 DM patients with 10 years duration of DM [8].
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 However, due to the insidious progress of microvascular complications, patients might be
39
40 undetected or left untreated in early disease stage, which can lead to devastating impact on
41
42 quality of life and life expectancy once the clinical significant complications are developed, such
43
44 as ESRD, sight-threatening diabetic retinopathy (STDR), and amputation. Several modifiable
45
46 risk factors, including HbA1c, blood pressure, eGFR are found to associate with development of
47
48 microvascular complications [9-11]. Early screening and intervention of early stage of
49
50 microvascular complications and modifiable risk factors are critical to prevent or delay the
51
52 progress of disease severity. In recent years, guidelines have recommended risk factor screening
53
54 and risk stratification management [12-14], setting personalized treatment goals based on
55
56 patients' individual complication risks. Personalized management is advocated as a means of
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 translating the evidence from randomized control trials to real-world settings [15]. However,
5
6 there is a lack of studies on the effectiveness of risk stratification-based personalized
7
8 management [15].
9

10
11
12
13
14 Previous studies on short-term effectiveness of risk-stratification based intervention were
15
16 conducted in the U.S. [16] and U.K. [17] . Both studies reported the increase in the percentages
17
18 of subjects reaching target HbA1c, blood pressure in the intervention group. However, long-term
19
20 effectiveness of the intervention was not reported. In Asia, attempt for the risk stratification
21
22 management was made by the Joint Asia Diabetes Evaluation Program [18]. Clinicians can
23
24 access a web-based comprehensive risk stratification model using an electronic portal. Between
25
26 2007-2009, 3687 people with diabetes across seven Asian countries, including Hong Kong, were
27
28 enrolled [19]. The implementation of the structured care and effectiveness of this care model
29
30 compared to usual care is not clear.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 To enhance the management of diabetic subjects in primary care setting in Hong Kong, a
39
40 multidisciplinary risk assessment and management program for patients with diabetes mellitus
41
42 (RAMP-DM) has been operating in public general out-patient clinics since August 2009. The
43
44 details of the intervention have been reported [20]. Compared to diabetic subjects under usual
45
46 care, RAMP-DM group was found to have significant improvement in HbA1c, blood pressure
47
48 control and reduction in cardiovascular events incidences at both 12-month [21] and 36-month
49
50 [22] of follow-up.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The RAMP-DM intervention included systematically comprehensive screening of risk factors
5 and early stage of diabetic microvascular complications at enrollment, including retinal photo
6
7 examination, foot assessment, renal function test and urine albumin to creatinine ratio
8
9 measurement. It was unclear yet, whether the RAMP-DM intervention was associated with
10
11 reduction in microvascular complications. Therefore, this study aimed at investigating the effects
12
13 of RAMP-DM intervention on the microvascular complications compared to usual primary care
14
15 over 3-year follow-up. It was hypothesized that RAMP-DM participants would have significant
16
17 lower incidences in microvascular complications, especially in the advanced stage diseases.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Methods**

27 *Study design*

28
29 A prospective cohort study was conducted to compare the risks of developing different stages of
30
31 three subtypes of diabetic microvascular complications over three years between diabetic
32
33 subjects managed under RAMP-DM and those receiving usual primary care.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 *RAMP-DM intervention*

41
42 The RAMP-DM was a territory-wide primary care service component for patients with DM in
43
44 public primary care clinics in Hong Kong. It was launched since August 2009 by Hong Kong
45
46 Hospital Authority, the sole public healthcare provider in Hong Kong. The details of the RAMP-
47
48 DM program have been reported previously [20]. In brief, all the enrolled subjects would
49
50 undergo a comprehensive risk assessment examinations including measurement of basic
51
52 parameters, laboratory test, eye and foot assessment. The case manager, taken by an advanced
53
54 practice nurse would review the examinations results, assessed the cardiovascular risks and
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 stratified patients into ‘very high’, ‘high’, ‘medium’ and ‘low’ risk groups according to the
5
6 modified Joint Asia Diabetes Evaluation cardiovascular risk stratification flow chart [19]. The
7
8 patients were then assigned to receive appropriate interventions and education provided by a
9
10 team of multi-disciplinary healthcare professionals, including Associate Consultants in family
11
12 medicine, Registered Nurses, Advanced Practice Nurses and allied health professionals
13
14 (optometrist, dietitian, podiatrist, physiotherapist, etc) according to their stratified risk level and
15
16 HbA1c level. According to patients’ risk levels, some RAMP-DM subjects have annual full risk
17
18 factors screening and Nurse Intake Assessment, and others have the full assessment every 2-3
19
20 years with annual blood test and followed-up by their primary care doctors.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Diabetic patients under usual primary care continued to be managed by their primary care
29
30 doctors without risk assessment and stratification. They were also eligible for referral to allied
31
32 health professionals at their doctors’ discretion.
33
34
35
36
37

38 *Subjects*

39
40 The RAMP-DM aims at covering all diabetic patients in Hong Kong. All patients with DM who
41
42 are followed up regularly at public primary care clinics are eligible to be enrolled in RAMP-DM.
43
44 **Patients were invited to join RAMP-DM opportunistically when they saw their primary**
45
46 **care doctors. The enrollment was on a voluntary basis.** Up to 31st December 2013, the end
47
48 date of our study data collection period, there were 147,097 enrolled into RAMP-DM (out of a
49
50 total of 206,238 patients receiving diabetic care under the primary care service of HA from
51
52 August 2008 to July 2013). The remaining people with diabetes were continued to be enrolled
53
54 into RAMP-DM after 31st July 2013, and they served as potential control subjects in this study.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 We identified study subjects from the Clinical Management System database of the Hospital
8 Authority. Inclusion criteria for this study are, 1) Age \geq 18; 2) Patients with documented
9 International Classification of Primary Care (ICPC-2) codes T89/T90 before baseline; 3) Patients
10 with at least one public primary clinics attendance before baseline. To evaluate the effectiveness
11 of RAMP-DM in reducing primary microvascular complications, subjects with any pre-existing
12 microvascular complications were excluded from the analysis. For the control group, patients
13 who were enrolled in RAMP-DM on or before 31st July 2013 were also excluded in the analysis.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 The baseline for each RAMP-DM participant was the first date of risk assessment of RAMP-DM
27 between 1st August 2009 and 31st July 2010. **The subjects in control group were DM patients**
28 **continuously managed in usual primary care. We set 31st January 2010, the middle date of**
29 **the baseline among RAMP-DM subjects, as the baseline for the control group.** All subjects
30 were observed until a study endpoint or three years since their baseline using the date of their last
31 follow-up as a censor date.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Ethical approval of this study was granted by the Institutional Review Board of the University of
44 Hong Kong/Hospital Authority: Hong Kong West Cluster (UW 10-369), New Territories East
45 Cluster (CRE-2010.543), New Territories West Cluster (NTWC/CREC/1091/12), Kowloon East
46 and Kowloon Central Cluster (KC/KE-10-0210/ER-3), Kowloon West Cluster (KW/EX/10-317
47 (34-04)), and Hong Kong East Cluster (HKEC-2010-093).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 *Propensity score matching*
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 To reduce selection bias, the subjects in the RAMP-DM and control groups were matched using
5 propensity score matching. Study subjects were paired based on observable characteristics which
6 indicate a similar probability of receiving treatment (similar propensity score), but one of them
7 received the intervention and the other did not. The propensity score is the conditional
8 probability of receiving the intervention given the observed baseline covariates and it is
9 independent of the outcomes. Propensity score matching is appropriate for studies with a large
10 sample size and many covariates [23]. A propensity score was generated for each patient, and the
11 RAMP-DM intervention was modelled as the dependent variable and the baseline covariates
12 were the independent variables. The propensity score matching was conducted using the
13 “psmatch2” STATA package by one-to-one matching without replacement and with a caliper of
14 0.001, which means the differences of propensity scores for each matched pair was within 0.001.
15 The unmatched control subjects were discarded.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The baseline covariates for developing the propensity score were 1) demographic characteristics,
37 including age, sex, whether on comprehensive social security assistance; 2) clinical parameters,
38 including smoking status, duration of diabetes, HbA1c, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol
39 (LDL-C), total cholesterol (TC), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), triglyceride
40 systolic blood pressure (SBP), diastolic blood pressure (DBP) and estimated glomerular filtration
41 rate (eGFR); 3) treatment modality, including oral glucose-lowering drugs, insulin, anti-
42 hypertensive drugs and lipid-lowering drugs; and 4) comorbidities, measured by the Charlson
43 comorbidity score[24].
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 *Study endpoints*

59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The endpoint for this study was the time to first occurrence of a diabetic microvascular
5 complication, which was identified by the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Edition,
6
7 Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) and ICPC-2 codes from the Clinical Management System of
8
9 the Hospital Authority (**Supplementary Table**).
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 *Data analysis*

17
18 The independent t-test or chi-squared test, as appropriate, was employed to compare the
19 demographic and clinical parameters between the RAMP-DM and control groups at baseline
20 and the end of follow-up. The cumulative incidence rates for each subtype of microvascular
21 complications were reported. We constructed the 95% confidence intervals of the incidence
22 rates based on the assumption that the observed incident events followed a Poisson
23 distribution. **We calculated the number needed to treat (NNT) to reduce one diabetes-**
24 **related complication by RAMP-DM. The NNT was calculated as the inverse of the**
25 **absolute risk reduction [25]. The NNT is interpreted as the average number of patients**
26 **needed to treat in order to reduce one unwanted outcomes. The lower the NNT, the more**
27 **effective is the intervention.**
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 For each of the study endpoints, the Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate the survival
46 curves and the log-rank test was used to compare the between group differences. To estimate
47 the magnitude of differences in endpoints, multivariable Cox proportional hazards regression
48 models were employed to explore the effects of RAMP-DM on the dependent variables of
49 each endpoint, adjusting for all the baseline covariates. The hazard ratio (HR) with 95%
50 confidence interval of RAMP-DM were reported for each endpoint. The predictive accuracy
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 of each regression model was evaluated using Harrell’s discrimination C-index, ranging from
5
6 0 to 1. A value of 0.5 indicates the model does not have predictive discrimination ability, and
7
8 values of 1 indicate perfect ability to discriminate subjects [26]. Intention to treat analysis was
9
10 adopted.
11
12
13
14
15

16 We performed all the statistical analyses using STATA Version 13.0 (StataCorp LP, College
17
18 Station, Texas, US), and *P*-value less than 0.05 was considered as statistically significant.
19
20
21
22

23 **Results**

24 *Baseline characteristics*

25
26 From 1st Aug 2009 to 31st July 2010, a total of 18,459 diabetic subjects under primary care were
27
28 enrolled in RAMP-DM. We identified 47,148 potential control subjects who met the inclusion
29
30 criteria for the study. Subjects with any pre-existing microvascular complications were excluded
31
32 in each group, giving 17,804 and 44,809 subjects in RAMP-DM and control groups, respectively.
33
34 Limiting the eligibility to subjects with complete baseline data reduced the sample to 17,528 and
35
36 16,180 in RAMP-DM and control groups, respectively. To reduce selection bias, we further
37
38 refined the study sample using propensity score matching. The final matched sample for this
39
40 study comprised 14,835 RAMP-DM subjects and 14,835 control subjects.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The comparison of baseline characteristics between the two groups is shown in Table 1. At
51
52 baseline, the RAMP-DM and control group had similar values in all the demographic, clinical
53
54 parameters and treatment modality. The average age of the two cohorts was 65, and around 87%
55
56 subjects were on oral glucose-lowering drugs. At the end of follow-up, the RAMP-DM subjects
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 showed significantly lower HbA1c (7.10% vs 7.21%, $P<0.001$) and SBP (130 mmHg vs 132
5
6 mmHg, $P<0.001$). The RAMP-DM group showed higher percentages of patients on all the four
7
8 types of drugs (glucose-lowering drugs, anti-hypertensive drugs, lipid-lowering drugs and insulin)
9
10 than the control group at the end of follow-up.
11
12
13
14
15

16 *Observed incidence of microvascular complications*

17
18 Table 2 shows the observed number of the first diagnoses of each subtype of diabetic
19
20 microvascular complication and the incidence rates over a median follow-up period of 36 months
21
22 among 14,835 subjects in each group. More than 43,000 and 41,000 person-years of observation
23
24 were available for each of the study endpoints in the RAMP-DM and control group, respectively.
25
26 The RAMP-DM group showed lower incidence rates for all the endpoints. **NPDR/non-PDR** was
27
28 the most prevalent microvascular complication in both groups (**535** and **594** retinopathy events in
29
30 RAMP-DM and control group, respectively). Over the observation period, **51** cases of STDR or
31
32 blind occurred in the RAMP-DM group, which was around half that in the control group (**90**
33
34 cases). The number needed to treat by RAMP-DM to reduce one microvascular complication
35
36 was **85**.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Multivariable Cox Regression Models*

47
48 The Kaplan-Meier survival curves for each study end point are shown in Figure 1. For all severer
49
50 microvascular complications, including STDR or blindness ($P<0.001$), ESRD ($P<0.001$), ulcer
51
52 or amputation ($P=0.009$), significant lower incidence rates were observed in RAMP-DM group,
53
54 and the differences became larger over the follow-up period. The incidences of neuropathy were
55
56 almost identical between the two groups ($P=0.778$).
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The HR between RAMP-DM and control groups for each study endpoint was estimated by
8
9 multivariable Cox regression models, adjusting for all the baseline covariates. As shown in Table
10
11 3, compared to the control group, the RAMP-DM group significantly reduced the incidence of
12
13 both NPDR/pre-PDR (**HR: 0.85, 95% CI: 0.76-0.96, P=0.007**) and nephropathy (**HR: 0.54, 95%**
14
15 **CI: 0.45-0.66, P<0.001**). The reduction was more evident in severer stages of disease. The HR
16
17 for STDR or blind and ESRD were **0.55 (95%CI: 0.39-0.78, P=0.001)** and **0.40(95%CI: 0.24-**
18
19 **0.69, P<0.001)**, respectively. The two groups did not show difference in the incidence of
20
21 neuropathy (**HR: 0.94, 95% CI: 0.61-1.45, P=0.78**), but the RAMP-DM group had substantial
22
23 lower incidence in ulcer or amputation (**HR: 0.49, 95% CI: 0.30-0.80, P=0.005**).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Discussion**

32
33 To the best of our knowledge, this was the first study investigating the long-term effects of a
34
35 multidisciplinary risk-stratification based DM management on microvascular complications in
36
37 Chinese population. With more than 41,000 person-years follow-up, this population-based cohort
38
39 study found that RAMP-DM intervention was associated with reduction in the incidences of all
40
41 the studied diabetic microvascular complications, except neuropathy. The RAMP-DM **was more**
42
43 **effective in reducing the incidences of severe microvascular complications**, prompting that
44
45 the HR for developing STDR or blindness, ESRD and ulcer or amputation were **0.55, 0.40 and**
46
47 **0.49**, respectively. These findings provided evidence of the effectiveness of multidisciplinary
48
49 risk-stratification based management in a real world primary setting.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Significant lower incidences of retinopathy, nephropathy and amputation were observed in the
5
6 RAMP-DM group, which might be partly attributed to the significant decreases in HbA1c and
7
8 blood pressure observed in the RAMP-DM group. Also, the RAMP-DM group had higher
9
10 percentage of subjects on glucose-lowering drugs, insulin, anti-hypertensive drugs and lipid-
11
12 lowering drugs, indicating the RAMP-DM participants were under more intensive treatment.
13
14 HbA1c and blood pressure were found to be associated with the risks of developing diabetic
15
16 retinopathy [9], nephropathy [10] and neuropathy [27] . Previous studies found that intensive
17
18 glucose control were associated with lower incidences of microvascular complications. The
19
20 United Kingdom Prospective Diabetes Study found that, over 10 years follow-up, the intensive
21
22 glucose control reduced the risk of aggregated microvascular complications (RR: 0.75, $P=0.0099$)
23
24 and retina photocoagulation (RR: 0.71, $P=0.0031$), but no effects were found in reducing renal
25
26 failure (RR: 0.73, $P=0.45$) and amputation (RR: 0.61, $P=0.099$) [28]. The Preterax and
27
28 Diamicon Modified Release Controlled Evaluation trial showed that over 5 years of follow-up,
29
30 the intensive control group showed decrease in the incidence of nephropathy (HR 0.79, $P=0.006$),
31
32 but not significant effect on retinopathy (HR 0.95, $P=0.50$) [29]. Compared to interventions that
33
34 only emphasized on medical intervention, multidisciplinary interventions were found to be more
35
36 effective to reduce renal and ophthalmological complications. The Steno-2 study implemented a
37
38 multifactorial intervention including a combination of medications and focused behavior
39
40 modification [30]. It was reported that the intervention group had lower risks for nephropathy
41
42 (relative risk 0.44, $P=0.004$), retinopathy (relative risk 0.57, $P=0.01$) and autonomic neuropathy
43
44 (relative risk 0.53, $P=0.004$) over 13.3 years follow-up compared to the conventional care group .
45
46 A physician-led structured diabetes management program in Germany also showed lower
47
48 incidence of chronic renal insufficiency (relative risk 0.49) and amputation (relative risk 0.63)
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 among the intervention group over 4 years' follow-up. This program involved education and
5
6 structured evidence-based care by physicians [31].
7
8
9

10
11 For each subtype of microvascular complication, we investigated both early stage and advanced
12
13 stage of disease. Interestingly, we found RAMP-DM was more effective in reducing more severe
14
15 stage of disease. RAMP-DM group showed substantial decrease in the incidence of STDR or
16
17 blindness (HR: 0.55, P=0.001), while for the incidence of mild diabetic retinopathy (NPDR/pre-
18
19 PDR), the difference between two groups was not evident until 24 months (Figure 1). A possible
20
21 explanation might be that diabetic subjects under RAMP-DM had systematic diabetic
22
23 retinopathy screening, leading to a higher detection rate of diabetic retinopathy. Early detection
24
25 allows more timely management for subjects diagnosed with mild, non-clinical significant
26
27 diabetic retinopathy which might result in a lower incidence of STDR. As diabetic retinopathy
28
29 can be totally asymptomatic until it develops into STDR, early screening for diabetic retinopathy
30
31 is critical in preventing further deterioration by giving timely intensive treatment. A previous
32
33 study showed that a systematic screening program could effectively reduce the prevalence of
34
35 blindness [32]. **We should note that even the RAMP-DM group might have higher detect**
36
37 **rate for NPDR/non-PDR due to the systemic screening, the RAMP-DM management was**
38
39 **still associated with significant lower incidences of NPDR/non-PDR, which might due to**
40
41 **better control of blood glucose and blood pressure.**
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The similar findings were observed for neuropathy. The incidence of mild neuropathy (lower
53
54 limb ulcer or amputation not included) was similar between RAMP-DM and control groups (HR:
55
56 0.940, P=0.778), and the survival curves were almost overlapped (Figure 1). However, RAMP-
57
58
59
60
61
62

1
2
3
4 DM group had **significantly lower** incidence of lower limb ulcer or amputation (HR: 0.493,
5
6 P=0.005), and the difference became more evident after 12 months. Patients enrolled in RAMP-
7
8 DM undertook comprehensive foot examination, including physical examination for callosity,
9
10 corn, ulcer, skin infection, deformities, nail pathology, temperature, ischaemic changes and
11
12 peripheral pulses, monofilament test and vibration perception threshold by biothesiometer. Early
13
14 screening was **likely** to detect more cases asymptomatic neuropathy, leading to relatively “higher”
15
16 incidence of early stage neuropathy in the RAMP-DM group. While the incidence of lower limb
17
18 ulcer or amputation was remarkably lower in the RAMP-DM group. Tight glycaemic control [27,
19
20 33], structured education program [34] and multidisciplinary management [30, 31] **have been**
21
22 **found in other studies to decrease the incidence of neuropathy effectively.** As a
23
24 multidisciplinary intervention, RAMP-DM included disease education on knowledge, self-care
25
26 and lifestyle during nurse intervention. The risk-stratification management might also raise the
27
28 doctors’ awareness to offer more intensive management of high risk patients. All these efforts
29
30 might contribute to the lower incidences of severer neuropathy in the RAMP-DM group.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 We found RAMP-DM was associated with lower incidences of both nephropathy (ESRD not
42
43 included) and ESRD. The presence of asymptomatic nephropathy was mainly through
44
45 albuminuria and eGFR. Diabetic patients under usual primary care also undertook annual blood
46
47 test in Hong Kong. However, patients enrolled in RAMP-DM might receive more intensive
48
49 management in preventing future deterioration of disease, resulting in lower incidences of
50
51 nephropathy and ESRD.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **RAMP-DM is the program to stratify diabetic patients with different risk levels so that**
5 **they can receive regular assessment and screening and can be provided early with**
6 **additional interventions or management. RAMP-DM is a way of increasing the focus on**
7 **patients that need a more intensive treatment.** The RAMP-DM is organizational investment
8 from the Hospital Authority and Food & Health Bureau, that administrative support, central
9 information technology system and screening facilities were well provided. In addition, the Food
10 & Health Bureau of government commissioned **annual audit and evaluation of quality of care**
11 **in three consecutive years**, which facilitate quality improvement of diabetes care and adherence
12 to the structured risk-stratification based protocol among RAMP-DM patients. Therefore, this
13 program could effectively translate the systematic management protocol into the real-world
14 setting.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 *Strength and limitations of this study*

34 This propensity score matched prospective comparative effectiveness study had several strengths.
35 First, the study sample was extracted from the Clinical Management System of the Hospital
36 Authority, which recorded data on all the people with diabetes managed in the public healthcare
37 sector. This population-based sample was highly representative of the Hong Kong population
38 with diabetes. Second, large sample size and three-year follow-up presented sufficient subjects to
39 examine different stage of diabetic microvascular complications. Third, comprehensive
40 covariates were included to develop propensity score matching for the two groups. The observed
41 risk factors that might affect the incidence of diabetic complications were included. We further
42 adjusted all the covariates during multivariable Cox regression to minimize any possible bias.
43 Fourth, this comparative effectiveness study was based on data obtained from real patients under

1
2
3
4 primary care, and thus applicable to a real-world setting. Fifth, we used an intention-to-treat
5
6 analysis, giving a more conservative estimate of the effectiveness of RAMP-DM.
7
8
9

10
11 Several limitations should be aware when interpreting the results. The important limitation of
12
13 this study was that we could not carry out a randomized study therefore unobserved potential
14
15 confounders might affect the results, although we have minimised this by including as many
16
17 possible covariates as we can in propensity score matching. Second, not all the RAMP-DM
18
19 subjects were included in the analysis due to missing data at baseline and some subjects were
20
21 further excluded due to unavailable matched control pairs. **Third, the RAMP-DM patients and**
22
23 **usual care patients might come from the same or different public primary care clinics.**
24
25 **Unfortunately, we did not have the clinic information since all the patients were free to**
26
27 **choose different public primary care clinics for their follow-up.** Fourth, three years are not
28
29 long enough to project the long term benefits of RAMP-DM. **We need longer follow-up to**
30
31 **evaluate the longer term effects of RAMP-DM. It would be interesting to see whether the**
32
33 **effects of RAMP-DM would maintain over a longer term.**
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Conclusions**

44
45 This prospective comparative effectiveness study in a pragmatic primary care setting found that
46
47 RAMP-DM was associated with decreased risks of first occurrence of retinopathy, STDR,
48
49 nephropathy, ESRD, and lower limb ulcer or amputation over a three-year follow-up. These
50
51 findings supplemented the effectiveness of RAMP-DM and provided imperative translational
52
53 evidence of the effectiveness of multidisciplinary risk-stratification based management for
54
55 people with diabetes.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Acknowledgements**
5

6 This Study on Enhanced Primary Care was funded by the Food and Health Bureau, the
7
8 Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (Project No.EPC-HKU-2). The
9
10 authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of the RAMP-DM program teams (including Ms.
11
12 Dorothy Lam, Mr. Jackey Chan) and Statistics and Workforce Planning Department (including
13
14 Ms. Eva Tsui, Mr. Peggo Lam, Mr. Choi-Fan Yiu) at the Hong Kong Hospital Authority. Also,
15
16 we would like to thank all hospital authority cluster coordinators and clinical staff in the Chronic
17
18 Disease Management Programs for working with our team in this evaluation study.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **References**
33

- 34 [1] Guariguata L, Whiting D, Hambleton I, Beagley J, Linnenkamp U, Shaw J. Global
35 estimates of diabetes prevalence for 2013 and projections for 2035. *Diabetes Res Clin Pr.*
36 2014;103(2):137-49.
37
38 [2] International Diabetes Federation. *Diabetes Atlas*. sixth edition. 2013.
39
40 [3] Janus E, Wat N, Lam K, Cockram C, Siu S, Liu L, et al. The prevalence of diabetes,
41 association with cardiovascular risk factors and implications of diagnostic criteria (ADA 1997
42 and WHO 1998) in a 1996 community - based population study in Hong Kong Chinese. *Diabetic*
43 *Med.* 2000;17(10):741-5.
44
45 [4] Wong KC, Wang Z. Prevalence of type 2 diabetes mellitus of Chinese populations in
46 Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. *Diabetes Res Clin Pr.* 2006;73(2):126-34.
47
48 [5] Leung G, Lam K. Diabetic complications and their implications on health care in Asia.
49 *Hong Kong medical journal= Xianggang yi xue za zhi/Hong Kong Academy of Medicine.*
50 2000;6(1):61-8.
51
52 [6] Klein R, Klein BE, Moss SE, Davis MD, DeMets DL. The Wisconsin Epidemiologic
53 Study of Diabetic Retinopathy: II. Prevalence and risk of diabetic retinopathy when age at
54 diagnosis is less than 30 years. *Arch Ophthalmol-chic.* 1984;102(4):520-6.
55
56 [7] Adler AI, Stevens RJ, Manley SE, Bilous RW, Cull CA, Holman RR. Development and
57 progression of nephropathy in type 2 diabetes: the United Kingdom Prospective Diabetes Study
58 (UKPDS 64). *Kidney Int.* 2003;63(1):225-32.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 [8] Brancati FL, Whelton PK, Randall BL, Neaton JD, Stamler J, Klag MJ. Risk of end-stage
5 renal disease in diabetes mellitus: a prospective cohort study of men screened for MRFIT. *JAMA*.
6 1997;278(23):2069-74.
7
8 [9] Aspelund T, Þórisdóttir Ó, Olafsdóttir E, Gudmundsdóttir A, Einarsdóttir A, Mehlsen J,
9 et al. Individual risk assessment and information technology to optimise screening frequency for
10 diabetic retinopathy. *Diabetologia*. 2011;54(10):2525-32.
11 [10] Jardine MJ, Hata J, Woodward M, Perkovic V, Ninomiya T, Arima H, et al. Prediction of
12 kidney-related outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2012;60(5):770-8.
13 [11] Girach A, Manner D, Porta M. Diabetic microvascular complications: can patients at risk
14 be identified? A review. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2006;60(11):1471-83.
15 [12] American Diabetes Association. Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes 2013. *Diabetes*
16 *Care*. 2013;36(Supplement 1):S11-S57.
17 [13] National Collaborating Centre for Chronic Conditions. Type 2 diabetes National clinical
18 guideline for management in primary and secondary care (update). Royal College of physicians,
19 2008.
20 [14] Canadian Diabetes Association. 2008 Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Prevention and
21 Management of Diabetes in Canada. *Can J Diabetes* 2008.32(supplement 1):S1-S201.
22 [15] Esposito K, Gentile S, Candido R, De Micheli A, Gallo M, Medea G, et al. Management
23 of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes: evidence and uncertainty. *Cardiovas diabetol*.
24 2013;12(1):81.
25 [16] Clark CM, Snyder JW, Meek RL, Stutz LM, Parkin CG. A systematic approach to risk
26 stratification and intervention within a managed care environment improves diabetes outcomes
27 and patient satisfaction. *Diabetes Care*. 2001;24(6):1079-86.
28 [17] Harris M, Greaves F, Patterson S, Jones J, Pappas Y, Majeed A, et al. The North West
29 London Integrated Care Pilot: innovative strategies to improve care coordination for older adults
30 and people with diabetes. *J Ambul Care Manage*. 2012;35(3):216-25.
31 [18] Chan J, So W, Ko G, Tong P, Yang X, Ma R, et al. The Joint Asia Diabetes Evaluation
32 (JADE) Program: a web - based program to translate evidence to clinical practice in Type 2
33 diabetes. *Diabetic Med*. 2009;26(7):693-9.
34 [19] So WY, Raboca J, Sobrepena L, Yoon KH, Deerochanawong C, Ho LT, et al.
35 Comprehensive risk assessments of diabetic patients from seven Asian countries: The Joint Asia
36 Diabetes Evaluation (JADE) program*. *Journal of diabetes*. 2011;3(2):109-18.
37 [20] Fung CS, Chin WY, Dai DS, Kwok RL, Tsui EL, Wan YF, et al. Evaluation of the
38 quality of care of a multi-disciplinary risk factor assessment and management programme
39 (RAMP) for diabetic patients. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2012;13:116.
40 [21] Jiao FF, Fung CS, Wong CK, Wan YF, Dai D, Kwok R, et al. Effects of the
41 Multidisciplinary Risk Assessment and Management Program for Patients with Diabetes
42 Mellitus (RAMP-DM) on biomedical outcomes, observed cardiovascular events and
43 cardiovascular risks in primary care: a longitudinal comparative study. *Cardiovas diabetol*.
44 2014;13(1):127.
45 [22] Jiao F, Fung CS, Wan YF, McGhee SM, Wong CK, Dai D, et al. Long-term effects of the
46 multidisciplinary risk assessment and management program for patients with diabetes mellitus
47 (RAMP-DM): a population-based cohort study. *Cardiovas Diabetol*. 2015;14(1):105.
48 [23] Dehejia RH, Wahba S. Propensity score-matching methods for nonexperimental causal
49 studies. *Rev Econ Stat*. 2002;84(1):151-61.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 [24] Charlson M, Peterson J, Szatrowski TP, MacKenzie R, Gold J. Long-term prognosis after
5 peri-operative cardiac complications. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 1994;47(12):1389-400.
6 [25] Laupacis A, Sackett DL, Roberts RS. An assessment of clinically useful measures of the
7 consequences of treatment. *New Engl J Med.* 1988;318(26):1728.
8 [26] Antolini L, Boracchi P, Biganzoli E. A time - dependent discrimination index for
9 survival data. *Stat Med.* 2005;24(24):3927-44.
10 [27] Tesfaye S, Chaturvedi N, Eaton SE, Ward JD, Manes C, Ionescu-Tirgoviste C, et al.
11 Vascular risk factors and diabetic neuropathy. *New Engl J Med.* 2005;352(4):341-50.
12 [28] Group UPDS. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared
13 with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS
14 33). *The Lancet.* 1998;352(9131):837-53.
15 [29] Patel A, MacMahon S, Chalmers J, Neal B, Billot L, Woodward M, et al. Intensive blood
16 glucose control and vascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *New Engl J Med.*
17 2008;358(24):2560-72.
18 [30] Gæde P, Lund-Andersen H, Parving H-H, Pedersen O. Effect of a multifactorial
19 intervention on mortality in type 2 diabetes. *New Engl J Med.* 2008;358(6):580-91.
20 [31] Stock S, Drabik A, Büscher G, Graf C, Ullrich W, Gerber A, et al. German diabetes
21 management programs improve quality of care and curb costs. *Health Affair.* 2010;29(12):2197-
22 205.
23 [32] Stefánsson E, Bek T, Porta M, Larsen N, Kristinsson JK, Agardh E. Screening and
24 prevention of diabetic blindness. *Acta Ophthalmol Scan.* 2000;78(4):374-85.
25 [33] Holman RR, Paul SK, Bethel MA, Matthews DR, Neil HAW. 10-year follow-up of
26 intensive glucose control in type 2 diabetes. *New Engl J Med.* 2008;359(15):1577-89.
27 [34] Wong CK, Wong WC, Wan Y, Chan AK, Chan FW, Lam CL. Patient Empowerment
28 Programme (PEP) and Risk of Microvascular Diseases Among Patients With Type 2 Diabetes in
29 Primary Care: A Population-Based Propensity-Matched Cohort Study. *Diabetes Care.*
30 2015;38(8):e116-e7.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure legends

Figure 1. Kaplan-Meier survival curves

ESRD, End stage renal disease; STDR, Sight-threatening diabetic retinopathy.

All the P values were from Log-rank test.



Table 1. Basic Characteristics at Baseline and the end of follow-up

	At baseline			At the end of follow-up*		
	RAMP (N=14,835)	Control (N=14,835)	P value ^a	RAMP (N=14,381)	Control (N=13,778)	P value ^a
	Mean ± SD or %	Mean ± SD or %		Mean ± SD or %	Mean ± SD or %	
Socio-demographic						
Age (year)	65.0±11.2	65.1±11.9	0.85			
Female	53.29%	53.43%	0.82			
On CSSA	9.86%	9.88%	0.95			
Clinical measures						
T2DM	99.73%	99.76%	0.56			
Duration of DM (year)	8.1±6.7	8.1±6.2	0.63			
Current smoker	9.86%	9.88%	0.61	8.29%	8.58%	0.60
SBP (mmHg)	136±17	136±17	0.89	130±15	132±16	<0.001
DBP (mmHg)	75±10	75±10	0.98	71±10	73±10	<0.001
HbA1c (%)	7.16±1.17	7.16±1.25	0.83	7.10±1.07	7.21±1.21	<0.001
TC (mmol/L)	5.03±0.94	5.04±0.96	0.40	4.41±0.81	4.46±0.87	<0.001
HDL-C (mmol/L)	1.22±0.32	1.21±0.33	0.16	1.27±0.33	1.30±0.35	<0.001
LDL-C (mmol/L)	3.09±0.82	3.10±0.84	0.26	2.49±0.69	2.52±0.72	<0.001
Triglyceride (mmol/L)	1.62±1.04	1.64±1.05	0.69	1.45±0.89	1.43±0.96	0.20
eGFR (ml/min/1.73m ²)	81.27±20.89	81.38±20.36	0.15	82.37±25.17	81.38±24.78	0.002
Charlson comorbidity score ^b	0.14±0.49	0.14±0.49	0.88	0.10±0.40	0.10±0.42	0.12
Treatment modality						
On glucose-lowering drugs	86.98%	86.89%	0.82	89.28%	84.60%	<0.001
On insulin	1.48%	1.64%	0.24	5.89%	4.75%	<0.001
On anti-hypertensive drugs	75.82%	75.86%	0.94	81.93%	78.85%	<0.001
On ACEI or ARB drugs	42.43%	43.70%	0.03	52.65%	47.14%	<0.001
On lipid-lowering drugs	16.73%	16.91%	0.69	52.26%	49.17%	<0.001

^a Significant differences ($P < 0.05$) between groups by independent t-test or by Chi-square test, as appropriate

^b Add up the comorbidity component score in Charlson comorbidity index

* The number of subjects decreases with time due to death.

Table 2. Number of diabetic complication and all-cause death at a median follow-up of 36 months

	RAMP-DM group (N=14,835)				Control group (N=14,835)					
	Cumulative incidence		Incidence rate (Cases/ 100 person-years)		Cumulative incidence		Incidence rate (Cases/ 100 person-years)			
	No. of events	Rate (%)	Estimate	95% CI*	No. of events	Rate (%)	Estimate	95% CI*		
Any microvascular complication	760	5.13%	1.77	(1.65,1.91)	42,818	6.31%	2.29	(2.15,2.45)	40,755	85
NPDR/pre-PDR	535	3.61%	1.24	(1.14,1.35)	43,029	4.01%	1.45	(1.33,1.57)	41,087	250
STDR or blindness	51	0.34%	0.12	(0.09,0.15)	43,972	0.61%	0.21	(0.17,0.26)	41,912	370
Nephropathy	163	1.10%	0.37	(0.32,0.43)	43,899	1.79%	0.64	(0.56,0.72)	41,777	145
ESRD	20	0.13%	0.05	(0.03,0.07)	44,026	0.32%	0.11	(0.08,0.15)	42,007	526
Neuropathy	49	0.33%	0.11	(0.08,0.15)	43,986	0.35%	0.12	(0.09,0.16)	41,966	5,000
Lower limb ulcer or amputation	28	0.19%	0.06	(0.04,0.09)	44,019	0.33%	0.12	(0.09,0.15)	41,976	714

ESRD, End stage renal disease;HR,Hazard Ratio;NNT, number needed to treat; NPDR, non-proliferative diabetic retinopathy; SE,standard error;STDR, Sight-threatening diabetic retinopathy.

* The 95%CI was constructed based on Poisson Distribution

Table 3

Table 3. Multivariable Cox proportional hazard regression all endpoints

	RAMP-DM vs Control			
	HR†	SE	95%CI	P-value
RAMP-DM subjects vs Control subjects (All subjects, N=29,670)				
Any microvascular complications	0.73	0.04	(0.66,0.81)	<0.001
NPDR/pre-PDR	0.85	0.05	(0.76,0.96)	0.01
STDR or blindness	0.55	0.10	(0.39,0.78)	0.001
Nephropathy	0.54	0.05	(0.45,0.66)	<0.001
ESRD	0.40	0.11	(0.24,0.69)	<0.001
Neuropathy	0.94	0.21	(0.61,1.45)	0.78
Ulcer or amputation	0.49	0.12	(0.30,0.80)	0.01

ESRD, End stage renal disease;HR=Hazard Ratio;NPDR, non-proliferative diabetic retinopathy; SE=standard error;STDR, Sight-threatening diabetic retinopathy.

† HR>1 indicates greater risk for endpoints

Adjusted for age, sex, whether on CSSA, duration of DM, smoking status, SBP, DBP, HbA1c, TC, LDL triglyceride, eGFR, Charlson comorbidity score, glucose-lowering drugs, insulin, anti-hypertensive drugs and lipid-lowering drugs.

Supplementary Table

Supplementary Table. ICD-9CM, ICPC-2 codes for diabetic macrovas

Disease	ICPC-2 Codes
Nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy /pre-proliferative diabetic retinopathy	F83
Sight threatening diabetic retinopathy (STDR) or blindness	F94
Diabetic nephropathy	NA
End-stage renal disease (ESRD)	NA
Neuropathy	N94
Ulcer of lower limb or amputation	L81

Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

