



Do Patient Characteristics Impact Decisions by Clinicians on Hemoglobin A_{1c} Targets?

Diabetes Care 2016;39:e145–e146 | DOI: 10.2337/dc16-0532

Saeid Shahraz,¹ Anastassios G. Pittas,²
Christine M. Lundquist,¹
Goodarz Danaei,³ and David M. Kent¹

In setting hemoglobin A_{1c} (HbA_{1c}) targets, physicians must consider individualized risks and benefits of tight glycemic control (1,2) by recognizing that the risk-benefit ratio may become unfavorable in certain patients, including the elderly and/or those with multiple comorbidities (3,4). Customization of treatment goals based on patient characteristics is poorly understood, partly due to insufficient data on physicians' decisions in setting targets. We used the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) to analyze patient-reported HbA_{1c} targets set by physicians and to test whether targets are correlated with patient characteristics.

Data from the NHANES waves 2005–2006, 2007–2008, 2011–2012, and 2013–2014 (the 2009–2010 wave lacked HbA_{1c} data) comprised 2,641 individuals with self-reported diabetes, of which 1,782 responded to the question, “What does [your doctor] say [your] ‘A1C’ level should be?” On the basis of the distribution of responses, we analyzed the following targets: <6%, <7%, and higher cutoffs (<8%, 9%, and 10%) combined. Using ordered logistic regression, we assessed the influence of age; sex; race; diabetes duration; comorbidities; BMI; variables on physical, mental, and biological health; and health care utilization. We used NHANES sample weights to calculate population rates of target

HbA_{1c} categories across the survey waves. We specified and fit an ordered logistic regression with survey year as a fixed effect to assess whether the covariates influenced target decisions. ANOVA was used to test the differences across the subsamples.

Of 1,782 respondents, 958 (54%) reported a target; others responded that they did not know or that no target was set. Patients in the two unknown target categories were comparable with patients in the known target categories on the majority of variables. Only 4% of our sample reported target HbA_{1c} >7%. Twenty-six percent of those reporting that a target was not set were over the age 75 years, significantly higher than in other target categories ($P < 0.05$). Seventy percent of patients who were not aware of their target HbA_{1c} were nonwhite, which was also significantly higher than in other categories ($P < 0.05$), except for higher cutoffs. Weighted proportions of response categories show that the proportion responding “do not know” consistently declined from 2005 to 2013: 30% (95% CI 22–39) of patients were not aware of their target HbA_{1c} in 2005, compared with 10% (6–14) in 2013. Changes to other response categories were not statistically significant over time.

Figure 1 summarizes the results of regression analysis on patients who

reported a target level ($n = 958$). Variables representing demographics (age, sex, race); medical history (comorbidities, BMI, duration of diabetes); biological, physical, and mental health (self-reported health, physical activity, level of disability, memory loss or confusion, health compared with last year); and health service use were not correlated with reported target HbA_{1c}. The odds ratios for independent variables of target HbA_{1c} (except for the fixed-effect variable) were within a narrow range close to unity. Compared with 2005–2006, the odds of physicians in 2013 setting the target one unit lower decreased by 41% (OR 0.58 [95% CI 0.39–0.87]). The overall pattern of null effects remained when age and comorbidity were combined. The proportion of target HbA_{1c} <7% in young and healthy patients (<45 years old with no comorbidities) was 61% (95% CI 49–71), compared with 62% (95% CI 52–72) in those older than 65 years with at least two comorbidities.

Although self-reported HbA_{1c} targets (and awareness of targets) have increased over the past decade, the targets remained very low. Additionally, we did not find any evidence that U.S. physicians systematically consider important patient-specific information when selecting the intensity of glycemic control. Rising targets seen during the

¹Predictive Analytics and Comparative Effectiveness Center, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, MA


²Division of Endocrinology, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, MA

³Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA

Corresponding author: Saeid Shahraz, sshahraz@tuftsmedicalcenter.org.

Received 10 March 2016 and accepted 5 June 2016.

© 2016 by the American Diabetes Association. Readers may use this article as long as the work is properly cited, the use is educational and not for profit, and the work is not altered. More information is available at <http://diabetesjournals.org/site/license>.



* For subgroups described in parentheses, first subgroup listed is reference group.

Figure 1—Target HbA_{1c} decision (outcome) and its association with selected patient-level characteristics with potential impact on the outcome. The higher the odds ratio, the more intense the target HbA_{1c}.

study period may reflect gradual adoption of the 2010 American Diabetes Association recommendation to encourage more relaxed HbA_{1c} targets for the elderly (1) and/or changes in quality measures for diabetes control. One parallel explanation is that more contemporary quality metrics permit payers to equally focus on disincentivizing poor HbA_{1c} control (e.g., HbA_{1c} >9%), whereas prior metrics were simple binary targets sensitive only to the proportion of patients achieving tight control (HbA_{1c} <7%) (5). Such emerging incentive models could have influenced target decisions to shy away from intensive control regardless of the patient-level characteristics in recent years. Nevertheless, the lack of variation with patient characteristics suggests overreliance on a general approach, without consideration of individual variation in the risks and benefits (or patient preference) of tight control. As “de-adoption” of tight control in diabetes diffuses into

practice, it must be targeted to those in whom it is of low value or harmful.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Jennifer Lutz at the Predictive Analytics and Comparative Effectiveness Center at Tufts Medical Center for her guidance in the manuscript submission process.

Funding. This study was supported by the Predictive Analytics and Comparative Effectiveness Center at the Institute for Clinical Research and Health Policy Studies, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, MA.

Duality of Interest. No potential conflicts of interest relevant to this article were reported.

Author Contributions. S.S. analyzed the data, drafted the manuscript, and contributed to the discussion. A.G.P., C.M.L., G.D., and D.M.K. reviewed and edited the manuscript and contributed to the discussion. S.S. and D.M.K. are the guarantors of this work and, as such, had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Prior Presentation. Parts of this study were presented in poster form at the 76th Scientific Sessions of the American Diabetes Association, New Orleans, 10–14 June 2016.

References

1. Kirkman MS, Briscoe VJ, Clark N, et al. Diabetes in older adults. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:2650–2664
2. Lipska KJ, Montori VM. Glucose control in older adults with diabetes mellitus—more harm than good? *JAMA Intern Med* 2013;173:1306–1307
3. Inzucchi SE, Bergenstal RM, Buse JB, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2015: a patient-centered approach: update to a position statement of the American Diabetes Association and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:140–149
4. Skyler JS, Bergenstal R, Bonow RO, et al.; American Diabetes Association; American College of Cardiology Foundation; American Heart Association. Intensive glycemic control and the prevention of cardiovascular events: implications of the ACCORD, ADVANCE, and VA diabetes trials: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association and a scientific statement of the American College of Cardiology Foundation and the American Heart Association. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:187–192
5. National Committee for Quality Assurance. NCQA’s 2009 Diabetes Recognition Program Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) [Internet], 2009. Available from http://www.ncqa.org/portals/0/programs/recognition/2009_DRP_FAQ.pdf. Accessed 12 May 2016