Strategies To Address Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health and Healthcare: An Evidence Map
This report is based on research conducted by the Minnesota Evidence-based Practice Center (EPC) under contract to the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), Rockville, MD (Contract No. 75Q80120D00008). The findings and conclusions in this document are those of the authors, who are responsible for its contents; the findings and conclusions do not necessarily represent the views of AHRQ. No statement in this article should be construed as an official position of AHRQ or of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

None of the investigators have any affiliations or financial involvement that conflicts with the material presented in this report.

The information in this report is intended to help healthcare decision makers—patients and clinicians, health system leaders, and policymakers, among others—make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of healthcare services. This report is not intended to be a substitute for the application of clinical judgment. Anyone who makes decisions concerning the provision of clinical care should consider this report in the same way as any medical reference and in conjunction with all other pertinent information, i.e., in the context of available resources and circumstances presented by individual patients.

This report is made available to the public under the terms of a licensing agreement between the author and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Most AHRQ documents are publicly available to use for noncommercial purposes (research, clinical or patient education, quality improvement projects) in the United States, and do not need specific permission to be reprinted and used unless they contain material that is copyrighted by others. Specific written permission is needed for commercial use (reprinting for sale, incorporation into software, incorporation into for-profit training courses) or for use outside of the U.S. If organizational policies require permission to adapt or use these materials, AHRQ will provide such permission in writing.

AHRQ or U.S. Department of Health and Human Services endorsement of any derivative products that may be developed from this report, such as clinical practice guidelines, other quality enhancement tools, or reimbursement or coverage policies, may not be stated or implied.

A representative from AHRQ served as a Contracting Officer’s Representative and reviewed the contract deliverables for adherence to contract requirements and quality. AHRQ did not directly participate in the literature search, determination of study eligibility criteria, data analysis, interpretation of data, or preparation or drafting of this report.

AHRQ appreciates appropriate acknowledgment and citation of its work. Suggested language for acknowledgment: This work was based on an evidence report, Strategies To Address Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health and Healthcare: An Evidence Map, by the Evidence-based Practice Center Program at the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ).

Evidence Map. Technical Brief No. 46. (Prepared by the Minnesota Evidence-based Practice Center under Contract No. 75Q80120D00008.) AHRQ Publication No. 24-EHC017. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; March 2024. DOI: https://doi.org/10.23970/AHRQEPCTB46. Posted final reports are located on the Effective Health Care Program search page.
Preface

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), through its Evidence-based Practice Centers (EPCs), sponsors the development of evidence reports and technology assessments to assist public- and private-sector organizations in their efforts to improve the quality of healthcare in the United States. The reports and assessments provide organizations with comprehensive, science-based information on common, costly medical conditions and new healthcare technologies and strategies. The EPCs systematically review the relevant scientific literature on topics assigned to them by AHRQ and conduct additional analyses when appropriate prior to developing their reports and assessments.

This EPC evidence report is a Technical Brief. A Technical Brief is a rapid report, typically on an emerging medical technology, strategy, or intervention. It provides an overview of key issues related to the intervention—for example, current indications, relevant patient populations and subgroups of interest, outcomes measured, and contextual factors that may affect decisions regarding the intervention. Although Technical Briefs generally focus on interventions for which there are limited published data and too few completed protocol-driven studies to support definitive conclusions, the decision to request a Technical Brief is not solely based on the availability of clinical studies. The goals of the Technical Brief are to provide an early objective description of the state of the science, a potential framework for assessing the applications and implications of the intervention, a summary of ongoing research, and information on future research needs. In particular, through the Technical Brief, AHRQ hopes to gain insight on the appropriate conceptual framework and critical issues that will inform future research.

AHRQ expects that the EPC evidence reports and technology assessments will inform individual health plans, providers, and purchasers as well as the healthcare system as a whole by providing important information to help improve healthcare quality.
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Structured Abstract

**Background.** Racial and ethnic disparities in health and healthcare continue to endure in the United States despite efforts in research, practice, and policy. Interventions targeted at patients, clinicians, and/or health systems may offer ways to address disparities and improve health outcomes in prevention/treatment of chronic conditions in adults.

**Purpose.** This evidence map identifies existing interventions to be considered for implementation by healthcare system leaders and policymakers, and to inform researchers and funding agencies on gaps in knowledge and research needs.

**Methods.** We searched MEDLINE®, CINAHL®, and Scopus from January 2017 through April 2023 for U.S.-based studies from the peer-reviewed published literature. We incorporated supplementary information from systematic reviews. We supplemented this with the gray literature, when available, from pertinent organizations, foundations, and institutes. We held discussions with Key Informants who represented stakeholders in healthcare disparities.

**Findings.** A vast and varied literature addresses healthcare system interventions to reduce racial and ethnic health and healthcare disparities. We identified 163 unique studies from 174 reports, and 12 intervention types not mutually exclusive in their descriptions. The most studied intervention type was self-management support, followed by prevention/lifestyle support, then patient navigation, care coordination, and system-level quality improvement (QI). Most of the interventions specifically targeted patient behaviors. Few studies (5) used a comparator, which made it difficult to determine whether disparities between groups were reduced or eliminated. Most of the studies (45%) included multiple race/ethnic groups (i.e., enrolled participants from more than one racially/ethnically minoritized group or enrolled racially minoritized people and non-minoritized groups). We found few studies that exclusively enrolled Asians (6%) and American Indians/Alaska Natives (1%). Cancer was the most studied chronic condition. Randomized controlled trials were common, but less rigorous study designs were often used for system-level QI and collaborative care model interventions. Few studies reported patient experience as primary outcome. Studies did not report on harms or adverse events, nor did they report on factors necessary for determining applicability or sustainability of the interventions. A number of studies reported on cultural adaptation or community involvement (either partnership or collaboration). Future studies should seek to standardize the terms in which they describe interventions and aim to specifically address whether disparities between groups are reduced or eliminated. Nonetheless, this evidence map provides a resource for health systems to identify intervention approaches that have been examined elsewhere and that might be imported or adapted to new situations and environments.
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Executive Summary

Main Points

- A vast and varied literature addresses healthcare system interventions to reduce racial and ethnic health and healthcare disparities. From 163 studies, we identified 12 categories of intervention types. However, based on the information/label reported by the study authors in the original literature, these interventions were not mutually exclusive. Research on interventions addressing healthcare disparities would benefit from more consistent terminology and better consensus around terms used.
- Interventions to reduce racial/ethnic health and healthcare disparities have been extensively studied across various chronic conditions and multiple race/ethnic group (i.e., studies often enroll participants from more than one racially/ethnically minoritized group or enroll both racially minoritized people and other groups). Cancer was the most studied chronic condition, and racially/ethnically minoritized people such as Asians and American Indians/Alaska Natives are less reported.
- The literature on healthcare interventions to reduce racial and ethnic health and healthcare disparities is actively expanding. While most studies aimed to improve care for a target group, and very few directly addressed the question of whether disparities between groups were reduced or eliminated to improve health outcomes. This leaves the important issue of improving health equity largely unaddressed.

Background and Purpose

Racial and ethnic disparities in health and healthcare, including for chronic conditions, continue to endure in the United States despite major efforts in research, practice, and policy. The COVID-19 pandemic worsened disparities and catalyzed a bolder call for action and accountability in United States. Healthcare system strategies/interventions might offer ways to address racial and ethnic health and healthcare disparities and improve health outcomes in the prevention/treatment of chronic conditions in adults.

Here we present an evidence map to identify existing interventions to be considered for implementation by healthcare system leaders and policymakers and to inform researchers and funding agencies on gaps in knowledge and research needs.

Methods

We searched MEDLINE®, CINAHL®, and Social Sciences Citation Index through April 2023 for U.S.-based published literature. Relevant current systematic reviews were hand searched for supplementary information. Our gray literature search focused on pertinent organizations, foundations, and institutes. We held discussions with Key Informants representing stakeholders in healthcare system strategies/interventions to reduce racial/ethnic disparities. Further details on the methods are contained in the full report.

Findings

We identified 163 unique studies from 174 reports, and 12 intervention types. However, based on the information/label reported by the study authors in the original literature, these interventions were often not mutually exclusive. The most studied intervention type was self-
management support, followed by prevention/lifestyle support, then patient navigation, care coordination, and system level quality improvement. Most studies indicated that interventionists began by selecting a population (or populations) identified as suffering disparities, then set about trying to improve care for that target group. Few studies (5) used a comparator, which made it difficult to determine whether disparities between groups were reduced or eliminated. Most studies (45%) included multiple racially/ethnically minoritized groups (i.e., they enrolled participants from more than one racially/ethnically minoritized group or enrolled racially minoritized people and non-minoritized groups). We found few studies that exclusively enrolled Asians (6%) and American Indians/Alaska Natives (1%). Asians and American Indians/Alaska Natives were included in studies that enrolled multiple race/ethnic groups, but their findings were not separately reported. Cancer was the most studied (29%) chronic condition.

Our full report contains additional findings on the intervention type; intervention target; study design; outcome types; study setting and delivery personnel; chronic conditions; race/ethnic groups; cultural adaptation and community involvement; harms and adverse events; and applicability and sustainability of the interventions.

**Summary and Implications**

Overall, a large and diverse literature set addresses healthcare system interventions to reduce racial and ethnic health and healthcare disparities. However, our evidence map is significantly limited by the reporting in the original studies and the lack of consensus on standardized terms used in healthcare system interventions literature. In addition, very few studies specifically addressed whether disparities between groups were reduced or eliminated, which leaves the important issue of improving health equity largely unaddressed. Further, few studies exclusively enrolled single race/ethnic groups such as Asians and American Indians/Alaskan Natives. The relative absence of literature for these groups was consistent with what was available in previously published systematic reviews. Cancer was the most frequently exclusively studied chronic condition; more attention is needed for other less studied chronic conditions (such as mental health, liver disease, metabolic syndrome, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), chronic pain not related to cancer, and kidney disease) that disproportionately impact racially/ethnically minoritized people. Nonetheless, this evidence map (and especially the supporting evidence tables) provides a resource for health systems to identify intervention approaches that have been examined elsewhere and that might be imported or adapted to new situations and environments.

**Next Steps**

Our evidence map highlighted several areas for future research, including (1) research aimed at standardizing and better operationalizing terms used in interventions and strategies to address healthcare disparities; (2) including racially/ethnically minoritized groups, including Asians and American Indians/Alaska Natives in research studies; and (3) research that specifically reports outcomes that directly measure disparity reduction between racially/ethnically minoritized people and other groups. Our full report highlights other potential research opportunities.

**References**

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

For at least three decades, a growing body of evidence has documented the problem of health and healthcare disparities, defined as preventable differences in disease burden, injury, violence, or opportunities to achieve optimal health among socially disadvantaged populations.\(^1\) Health disparities have reached crisis proportions among racial and ethnic groups across the United States.\(^2\) The COVID-19 pandemic, which further exposed and worsened healthcare inequities, led to a renewed call for action and accountability.\(^3\) Data show that racially and ethnically minoritized people have higher rates of morbidity and mortality across many health conditions, including chronic conditions such as mental health disorders, cardiovascular disease (including hypertension), cancer, asthma, HIV/AIDS, renal disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), and diabetes.\(^4\) Broadly, in most examinations of long-term health and healthcare disparities, African Americans/Blacks fare worse than all other groups in health outcomes.\(^5\)

Figure 1 provides a conceptual framework drawn from the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities (NIMHD) Research Framework and the work of Purnell and colleagues, both of which consider the many factors that influence disparities in health and healthcare.\(^6,7\) Racial and ethnic disparities occur in the context of broader inequality and are directly related to the historical and current unequal distribution of social, political, economic, environmental, educational, and healthcare factors and systems.\(^8\) These include economic policies and systems, development agendas, social norms, social policies, structural racism and discrimination, climate change, healthcare financing, and political structures that shape the conditions in which people are born, work, live, learn, play, worship, and grow older—factors and systems also known as social determinants of health.

Figure 1. Understanding the drivers of and interventions for health and healthcare disparities
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Within this conceptual framework, healthcare-related factors are a critical concern. Addressing racial and ethnic health and healthcare disparities in the United States would not only eliminate much unnecessary human suffering, but also decrease healthcare expenditures. Health disparities are estimated to account for $93 billion in excess medical care costs and $42 billion in untapped productivity.\(^9\) Specifically, to reduce healthcare expenditures, healthcare systems can focus on patient, clinician, and healthcare system factors (Figure 1).\(^{10,11}\) Patient factors that might affect disparities include individual beliefs and preferences, health behaviors, and mitigating the impact of social determinants of health (e.g., housing, education, employment, socio-economic status).\(^{10}\) Clinician factors can include knowledge, attitudes, racial bias, implicit or not, practice, and financial incentives. Healthcare system factors can include healthcare organizational culture, quality improvement, and elements of the healthcare system (e.g., organization, financing, care delivery).\(^{10}\)

The federal government has contributed important work to draw attention to and support efforts to reduce disparities. The Department of Health and Human Services’ Healthy People 2000 established national objectives for improving health and well-being that recognized health equity as a goal.\(^{12}\) Since then, efforts to eliminate disparities have increased. The President’s Office recently signed an executive order on Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government, followed by the release of actionable recommendations in the Health Equity Task Force report.\(^{13,14}\) However, much remains to be done, given that many factors contribute to disparities.

Healthcare strategies/interventions might offer ways to address racial and ethnic health and healthcare disparities. Our conceptual framework suggests that healthcare strategies/interventions may be complex in design and implementation. They may take place at a single level (i.e., target only one part of the healthcare system such as solely patients, solely clinicians, or solely the healthcare organization) or involve multiple levels of the healthcare system (i.e., target more than one part of the healthcare system such as both clinicians and the healthcare organization).

1.2 Purpose and Scope

Our report supplements an Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) 2012 report that examined the effectiveness of quality improvement interventions in reducing disparities in health and healthcare on a limited set of clinical conditions.\(^{15}\) Here we expand the scope of that report by including an unrestricted set of chronic conditions in adults. Also, the 2012 report only included studies if they directly compared a population that was experiencing disparities with a population that was not in order to determine whether the intervention closed the distance between the two groups’ health outcomes. We did not constrain the intervention comparisons to populations only, which allowed a broader range of healthcare strategies/interventions to be examined.

This Technical Brief presents an evidence map based on a systematic search of the recent literature on healthcare strategies/interventions for reducing racial and ethnic disparities and improving health outcomes in the prevention/treatment of chronic conditions in adults. The aim is to identify existing interventions that could be considered for implementation by healthcare system leaders and policymakers, and to inform researchers and funding agencies on gaps in knowledge and research needs.
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1.3 Guiding Questions

We developed the questions below in collaboration with AHRQ to guide our mapping of the available evidence.

What is the current evidence for strategies designed to reduce racial and ethnic disparities and improve health outcomes in the prevention/treatment of chronic conditions in adults?

a. What interventions have been studied?
b. What racial and ethnic populations have been studied?
c. What common (multiple and single) chronic conditions have been studied?
d. What primary outcomes have been studied?
e. What are the reported effects (that is, a summary of the direction of effects) of the strategies used in studies of interventions to reduce disparities?
f. What are the reported unintended consequences, harms, or adverse events of the strategies used in studies of interventions to reduce disparities?
g. Within race/ethnic groups, what other intersectional influences (e.g., income, sexual orientation, geographic location, language, gender) have been targeted in studies of interventions to reduce disparities?
h. What study designs have been used?
i. What information is available on the applicability and sustainability of interventions?
j. What gaps exist in the current research?
2. Methods

To address the Guiding Questions, we created an evidence map of primary studies from the peer-reviewed published literature and incorporated supplementary information from existing systematic reviews. Evidence maps are an approach to systematically identify and report the range of research activity in broad topic areas. Because they describe the quantity, design, and characteristics of relevant research, evidence maps are best used to inform research priorities and to help define the focus of evidence synthesis such as systematic reviews when an abundant and diverse research base is available. Despite these conventions, no widely accepted standards exist for evidence mapping; instead, products and methods vary based on project goals. Because of limited time and resources, our approach to the evidence map was similar in some ways to a scoping review. While we applied dual review during screening because of the difficulty applying the inclusion criteria, we limited the search period and relied heavily on study author language without reinterpretation. We provide more detail on specific methods below.

When information was absent from peer-reviewed published literature, we aimed to supplement with information from the gray literature. Key Informant discussions provided additional context to support the gray literature searches and offered opinions on the current major practices and issues surrounding healthcare strategies/interventions designed to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in health and healthcare.

2.1 Published Literature

2.1.1 Search Strategies

We conducted a comprehensive literature search from January 2017 through April 2023, searching MEDLINE® (Ovid), CINAHL® (EBSCOHost), and Scopus (Elsevier B.V.). We chose 2017 due to resource constraints and the 2017 National Academy of Medicine call for innovations in health disparities interventions, including cross-sector partnerships, to address social determinants of health. We also scanned the references cited by included studies and relevant existing systematic reviews. For further details on the search methods, see the review protocols and Appendix A. (Initially two reports were intended but because of the overlapping nature of the evidence base, the information has been combined into a single report.) We also performed a hand search to identify relevant current existing systematic reviews from 2015 to present and incorporated supplemental information from these reviews in this Brief. A SEADS portal was open for 4r weeks ending January 12, 2023.

2.1.2 Study Selection

We developed eligibility criteria for study inclusion and exclusion based on the Guiding Questions and selected studies based on the population, intervention, comparator, outcome, timing, and setting (PICOTS) framework if they were published in a peer-reviewed journal. We detail our inclusion and exclusion criteria in Appendix B, and Appendix C provides a detailed list of studies excluded at full text screening, sorted by reason for exclusion.

Studies needed to enroll participants with or at risk of chronic disease and enroll only or primarily racially/ethnically minoritized people (i.e., racially/ethnically minoritized people make up over 50% of the sample size). We included only U.S.-based studies with randomized
controlled trial study design, non-randomized controlled trials, cohort studies with comparator arms, pre-post, quality improvement, single-arm studies of implemented strategies with outcomes captured before and after implementation, or mixed-method study designs. We generally included studies that aimed to address race/ethnic disparities in health and healthcare. These studies fell into two groups: 1) studies that specifically aimed to examine the potential reduction of a disparity (i.e., by examining differences in outcomes between specific racially/ethnically minoritized people and other groups); and 2) studies that aimed to improve outcomes for specified racially/ethnically minoritized people. Further, we included studies that either took place in a healthcare setting or showed strong links between a healthcare organization and community-based settings. We excluded studies of medical interventions where racial subgroup analyses were not intended or stated at the start of the study conduct (i.e., post hoc exploratory analyses).

We screened the literature using PICO Portal software at title/abstract and full text. We used PICO Portal’s machine learning algorithm to prioritize the literature most likely to be included. Two independent reviewers screened for possible inclusion at title/abstract as well as full text. We resolved conflicts through discussion and consensus with a third reviewer. Team members with content expertise provided advice where design features were unusual or ambiguous. To ensure reproducibility of the list of included studies, we confirmed that exclusion reasons were clearly captured. To ensure consistency in interpreting eligibility criteria, our review team met at least weekly to discuss questions arising from screening.

2.1.3 Data Extraction and Data Management

To answer the Guiding Questions, we extracted data from included studies into a data evidence table. These tables are available in Appendix D. Review team members met at least weekly to discuss questions about data extraction and to ensure consistency in abstraction.

2.1.4 Data Presentation

We used information reported in the included studies to group intervention types, intervention targets, study designs, outcomes (specifically primary outcomes), study settings, delivery personnel, race/ethnic groups, and chronic conditions. We used the exact terms used by study authors wherever possible. We list and define groupings in the Findings section of this Brief.

To develop categories for intervention type, intervention target, and outcomes, we reviewed the author’s terms and descriptions to determine an initial set of categories. We revised categories and finalized our decisions through discussion and consensus with content expert team members.

For intervention type, we used wherever possible the exact terms used by study authors to label the interventions. When the studies used uncommon terms to label interventions, for example using only a study name, brand, or acronym, we then looked for next best author language. Finally, when information was conflicting or unclear, we categorized them based on our estimation of the primary purpose or approach. We used this approach in an attempt to be faithful to study authors’ reported intentions and avoid reinterpreting interventions. Each study was assigned to only one intervention category.

For intervention target, we assigned categories based on one or more of several factors: 1) whether studies primarily examined interventions directed at patients (e.g., studies examining various methods of patient education (group or individual education); 2) whether studies were
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primarily examined interventions directed at clinicians (such as cultural competence); 3) whether studies involved changes in the process of healthcare delivery targeted at clinicians (such as use of guidelines and algorithms); 4) whether studies sought to make changes to collaborative models at healthcare organization and public health (such interventions that targeted the healthcare system institution); 5) the extent to which interventions were rolled out within or across healthcare organizations. Some interventions were rolled out across many healthcare provider departments in one healthcare organization or involved many healthcare organizations, and we categorized these as targeting the healthcare system. In addition, when interventions were rolled out in only one provider department in a healthcare organization and involved changes in healthcare provision related directly to clinician behavior or practice, we categorized them as targeting clinicians. Further, when interventions were rolled out in only one provider department in a healthcare organization and were related directly to patient behavior, we categorized them as targeting patients. But when interventions were rolled out across many healthcare provider departments in one healthcare organization or involved many healthcare organizations, and were related directly to patients, we categorized them as targeting patients and the healthcare system institution. Finally, when interventions were rolled out across healthcare organizations and public health, we categorized them as targeting the healthcare system institution.

For the primary outcomes, we created categories based on common outcomes categories used in healthcare system research. We provide further information on the categories in the findings section (Table 1). We do not present direction of effect in the report, but this information is available in Appendix D.

We used graphics—bar charts, heat maps, and bubble plots, using Tableau—to summarize information relevant to the Guiding Questions. Bubble plots make it possible to display three-dimensional study characteristics data.22

2.1.5 Gray Literature

We performed supplemental gray literature searches to locate relevant articles on healthcare strategies/interventions that may have been poorly or inaccurately indexed or unindexed. We browsed the first 200 results from Google and Google Scholar for each search string using a combination of terms and word variations. We also browsed relevant organizations with involvement in racial/ethnic health and healthcare disparities including the Culture of Health Program, the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Equity, the American Hospital Association HEAL Health Equity Action Library, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Culture of Health Partnerships, the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute Portfolio, and the Dissemination & Implementation Models in Health website. We provide additional details in Appendix A, including a table of the organization websites that were browsed.

2.1.6 Discussions With Key Informants

At the beginning of the project, we identified Key Informants representing a broad range of experiences and perspectives to (1) provide additional context to support the gray literature searches; and (2) offer opinions on the current major practices and issues surrounding healthcare systems’ efforts to reduce racial and ethnic disparities.

We identified potential Key Informants from frequently listed and cited authors of relevant peer-reviewed literature, internet searches for people with relevant viewpoints, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Learning Health System partnerships and stakeholder lists, and nominations by review team members. We included patient advocates/representatives,
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advocacy organizations, clinicians, provider organizations, and researchers as Key Informants. When we could not identify a specific individual to represent an organization, we invited the organization to nominate an individual.

We conducted nine discussions for two reviews, using a set of semi-structured questions to provide an agenda for the conversations (60–90 minutes), via teleconferences in September and October 2022. One to three Key Informants participated in each discussion. Appendix A provides example questions. We tailored questions to the unique expertise and perspectives of our Key Informants. Prior to the discussions, the Key Informants received invitation letters briefly explaining the project, and their expected role, appropriate disclosure forms for conflict of interest, and discussion questions. We assigned Key Informants to conference calls based on two affiliation groupings: (1) patient advocates/representatives, and (2) advocacy organizations, clinicians, provider organizations, and researchers. We did this to maximize the synergy of group discussions and minimize unhelpful conflict. We recorded all calls and circulated call summaries (including themes from individual calls and the overall Key Informant discussions) so participants could confirm the content.

During the discussions, Key Informants raised the following major points:

- The field lacks a general established conceptual framework for healthcare system interventions/strategies to address racial/ethnic health and healthcare disparities.
- While a vast body of literature is available, Key Informants expressed concern that implementing healthcare strategies/interventions could be difficult because the interventions/strategies would, if implemented, be embedded in the healthcare systems that might perpetuate disparities.
- Key Informants underscored the need for sustainable interventions. In their opinion, financial support represents the biggest barrier to sustaining interventions. Other crucial factors include the use of no-cost local resources and community coalition building.

In addition to the initial input, Key Informants were offered the opportunity to comment on the draft report as part of the peer review and public comment process from March 19, 2023 to April 20, 2023. Experts in health services delivery, health equity, and stakeholder/used communities were also invited to provide external peer reviews; AHRQ and an associate editor also provided comments. A disposition of comments table addressing all peer and public comments will be posted on the Effective Health Care website 3 months after the Agency posts the final report.
3. Findings

This section addresses the findings of our evidence map from the peer-reviewed published literature based on our Guiding Questions. Where relevant, we incorporated findings from the gray literature as discussed in the Methods section of this Brief.

3.1 Results of Published Literature Searches

Figure 2 presents the literature flow of the search results. Database searches of published literature resulted in 8,386 potentially relevant articles. After dual review of abstracts and titles, we assessed 489 articles for eligibility at full text, of which 315 were excluded (Appendix C). We determined that 174 articles reporting on 163 unique studies met the inclusion criteria, and we included those in the evidence map.23-196

We observed no major trends in the number of published studies annually.

Figure 2. Literature flow PRISMA diagram: search results to included studies

PRISMA Flow Diagram for systematic reviews

3.2 Descriptive Evidence Map

Below, we summarize the characteristics of the included studies. Appendix D provides a table with detailed information for each included study. We organized the results on intervention type, and present results by intervention target, study design, and outcomes.
3.2.1 Intervention Type

The strategies/interventions to address racial/ethnic health and healthcare disparities did not fall into clean categories. We used study author intervention labels when provided, but often had to categorize the interventions by study descriptions or statement of the primary purpose or approach. Through this process, we grouped the interventions into 12 types, or categories. All categories except the “Other Single Component” category represented interventions that were comprised of bundles of intervention components. These categories could not be designed to be mutually exclusive, and while each study was placed into only one category, the detailed descriptions of the interventions generally involved considerable overlap in the components used. Thus, for example, patient education may have been examined as a study author-identified intervention, yet patient education can also be a reasonable and common element in many intervention categories.

Multiple definitions exist in the published literature for intervention types in health services research. Below, we provide definitions that can be considered conventional and fairly describe our categorization scheme, organized from most to least commonly reported in the literature.

**Self-management support** can be broadly defined as an intervention designed to help patients better manage health conditions through education, training, and support to improve knowledge, skills, or psychological and social resources, together with self-monitoring and regular review from health professionals.\(^{197,198}\) The interventions may incorporate patient education, appointment reminders, and adherence to medication and care plans. One example was a community health worker involved, self-management support study to help African Americans with hypertension overcome barriers to self-management for through enhancement of shared decision-making skills and problem-solving skills.\(^{38}\)

**Prevention/lifestyle support** refers to interventions that aim to prevent or delay the onset of disease or disease symptoms through risk reduction. It commonly introduces activities that limit risk exposure or decrease the susceptibility of at-risk individuals to prevent disease from progressing. It emphasizes early disease detection and targets healthy-appearing individuals.\(^{199}\) The interventions may include elements such as exercise coaching, diet coaching, or referral for treatment. For example, one study described a lifestyle intervention delivered by a trained, same-race community health worker who supported African American women with type 2 diabetes in making small changes in diet and activity level.\(^{115}\)

**Patient navigation** refers to services that improve engagement in healthcare by providing personal guidance through the healthcare system.\(^{200}\) Patient navigators often help patients overcome challenges to following their healthcare plan, allowing them to progress efficiently through treatment.\(^{201}\) For example, one study assessed the impact of a patient navigator program on adherence to followup appointments and psychosocial outcomes among Vietnamese-American women who received abnormal mammogram findings. The patient navigator provided emotional support, education, translation, and assistance with understanding medical bills and doctor’s appointments.\(^{173}\)

**Care coordination** can be defined as organizing patient care activities between two or more participants to improve delivery of healthcare services. Organizing care involves the marshalling of personnel and other resources needed to carry out required care activities and managing the exchange of information among participants responsible for different aspects of care.\(^{202}\) Examples of broad care coordination approaches include: teamwork, care management, medication management, health information technology, and patient-centered medical home.\(^{203}\)
For example, one study enrolled an uninsured population of multiple race/ethnicities, and examined care coordination involving population health services and the Patient-Centered Medical Home (PCMH). Participants received primary care visits at the PCMH and attended at least one Population Health wellness, prevention, or social determinants of health (SDOH) program to improve outcomes for type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease, as well as to reduce hospital utilization.106

System level quality improvement (QI) involves the use of a systematic and coordinated approach to solving a problem using specific methods and tools with the aim of bringing about a measurable improvement within a healthcare setting.204 One example was a QI project to improve equitable access to cervical cancer screening and management for Hispanics.105 Following a preparatory stage that included a systematic review of cervical cancer screening, the project included 1) team engagement through team meetings; 2) patient engagement via a tool on cervical cancer screening provided in both English and Spanish (an adaptation of the Ottawa Personal Decision Guide); 3) a Well Woman Health Check Program (WWHP) eligibility screening and enrollment tool for registration staff that included updated registration guidelines and a WWHP registration log of all women enrolled in the program; and 4) the implementation of a case log for case management.

Patient education provides learning experiences on health topics, and can be defined as the process of influencing patient behavior and producing the changes in knowledge, attitudes, and skills to maintain or improve health.205 For example, one intervention led by community health workers examined whether group education is as effective as individual culturally tailored education in improving cervical cancer screening among underserved Hispanic women.43 Another intervention examined whether computer-tailored patient education improved colorectal cancer screening among low-income African Americans.143

Collaborative care model is a systematized way of managing care and treatment for people with chronic conditions. It is a multiprofessional approach to patient care that adopts four key components: (1) a multiprofessional approach to patient care; (2) a structured management plan tailored to the individual needs of the patient; (3) proactive followup delivering evidence-based treatments; (4) processes to enhance interprofessional communication such as routine and regular team meetings and/or shared record.206 One study that illustrates the collaborative care approach used a pharmacist-physician model to reduce the time to goal blood pressure in an uninsured population comprising mostly (80%) Black adults.131

Comprehensive system level change refers to a redesign of a healthcare system model and may include a collaboration between healthcare organizations and community-based organizations or public health systems. One example is a study that incorporated a centralized community clinic linkage hub to connect patients to community resources for participating clinics.59

Mobile Health (m-Health) single component refers to using mobile and wireless devices to improve health and deliver care through text messaging, wireless data transmission, and smartphone apps to send health-related information.207 In one m-Health intervention, Hispanic people with type 2 diabetes received up to three motivational, educational, and/or call-to-action texts per day over 6 months.86

Coordination of transitions of care can be defined as movement of patients between healthcare practitioners and settings as their condition and care needs change. Transitions may occur between hospitals, ambulatory primary care practices, ambulatory specialty care practices, long-term care facilities, home health, and rehabilitation facilities.208 One illustrative study
enrolled high-need, high-cost patients who were predominantly non-Hispanic Black, and examined hospital-based, real-time screening, patient engagement, enrollment, enhanced discharge care coordination, intensive home visits, and telephone follow-up for at least 45 days. 31

**Electronic health record (EHR)-based** interventions comprise real-time, patient-specific data platforms that make secure information available immediately to authorized users. EHRs are designed so that information can be shared with other clinicians or healthcare providers and organizations, such as laboratories, imaging facilities, consultants, pharmacies, and collaborating inpatient and outpatient clinics. 209 One EHR study examined a laboratory health information exchange (LHIE) system intervention that involved a bi-directional exchange of laboratory information (between ordering physician and laboratory staff) through an existing EHR system to improve antiretroviral therapy (ART) use. 60

**Other single component** category captured interventions examining a single component but were not otherwise easily grouped. These single components could potentially be added to other complex interventions and may in fact be present in any of the other intervention categories listed above. These single component interventions included language concordance, 158 a screening decision aid, 96 risk calculator counseling, 149 training in Web portal use, 116 automated appointment reminders, 126 shared medical appointments, 133 group education for community-to-clinic settings, 193 attending one population health program per year, and stress management training tools, 113 to mention a few.

Figure 3 displays the breakdown of intervention types across the included studies. The largest category (22% [35/163]) of included interventions was self-management support. 27, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 50, 65, 66, 76, 77, 80, 91-93, 95, 110, 112, 117, 120, 124, 128, 132, 135, 136, 139, 141, 142, 159, 165, 170, 171, 175, 178, 189

Other interventions that accounted for a relatively larger proportion of our included studies were patient navigation (12% [20/163]), 29, 48, 57, 58, 61, 69, 75, 81, 97, 119, 122, 127, 130, 145, 150, 162, 167, 173, 174, 180 followed by prevention/lifestyle support (12% [19/163]), 23, 30, 36, 40, 49, 67, 68, 87, 111, 115, 125, 152, 154, 156, 168, 172, 184, 185, 194 then care coordination (9% [14/163]), 28, 32, 44, 47, 52, 71, 101, 102, 104, 106, 137, 151, 161, 195 and system level QI interventions (8% [13/163]). 33, 39, 56, 63, 64, 85, 99, 105, 121, 153, 166, 187, 191

Other single components category (captured interventions examining a single component but not otherwise easily grouped) accounted for 14 percent (22/163) of the included interventions. Overall, collaborative care models, 72, 73, 84, 100, 129, 131, 144, 148, 164, 169 comprehensive system level change, 54, 59, 88, 114, 155, 163, 177 single component m-Health, 26, 51, 70, 86, 192, 196 transition of care, 31, 82, 118 and EHR-based interventions accounted for 24 percent of included interventions. Transition of care and EHR-based interventions accounted for the smallest category of included interventions (2% [3/163]) and (1% [2/163]), respectively). Other single components category (captured interventions examining a single component but not otherwise easily grouped) accounted for 14 percent (22/163) of the included interventions. 25, 45, 46, 78, 79, 90, 96, 108, 109, 113, 116, 123, 126, 133, 138, 147, 149, 157, 158, 160, 179, 193
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Figure 3. Number of studies by intervention type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Categories</th>
<th>Total Count of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-management support</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient navigation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention/Lifestyle support</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care coordination</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System level QI</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative care model</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive system level change</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Health single component</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition of care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR based</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other single component</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: We used wherever possible the exact terms used by study authors to label the interventions.

Other single component interventions category captured interventions examining a single component but not otherwise easily grouped. Other single component interventions category includes language concordance, screening decision aid, risk calculator counseling, training in Web portal use, automated appointment reminders, shared medical appointments, group education for community-to-clinic settings, attending one population health program per year, and stress management training tools.

Abbreviations: m-Health = mobile health; EHR = Electronic Health Record; QI=quality improvement

3.2.2 Intervention Target

We describe our categorization scheme for the intervention target in the Methods section. Interventions were targeted at various parts of the healthcare system—i.e., we identified patient targeted, clinician targeted, and healthcare system targeted interventions. Single targeted interventions (also referred to as single level interventions in this report) are those that target only one part of the healthcare system, such as only the patient. Multitargeted interventions (referred to as multilevel interventions in this report) are those with components that target more than one part of the healthcare system. One example of a multilevel intervention targeted at the healthcare system and the patient would be an intervention that incorporated a centralized community clinic linkage hub to connect patients to community resources for participating clinics.59

Figure 4 displays the breakdown of intervention targets across the included studies. Self-management support interventions mainly targeted patients as a single level intervention (16% [26/163]), followed by prevention/lifestyle support (10% [17/163]), and patient navigation (10% [17/163]).
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study reported on single level interventions targeted solely at clinicians. All clinician targeted interventions were part of multilevel interventions, most often occurring alongside patient targeted components or healthcare system plus patient targeted components.

Healthcare system targeted interventions accounted for very few (4% [6/163]) included studies of single targeted/level interventions (i.e., target the healthcare organization), most of which were collaborative care model interventions. Most healthcare system targeted intervention (31% [51/163]) studies were part of multilevel interventions, and most of these included patient targeted components or clinician plus patient targeted components.

Thirty-eight percent (38% [62/163]) of included studies examined multilevel interventions. Most of the multilevel interventions (22% [36/163]) of included studies were healthcare system plus patient targeted interventions. One exemplar study reported the adaptation and implementation of Kaiser Permanente’s Hypertension management program targeted at multiple race/ethnicities (but enrolling predominantly Hispanic people) and rolled out healthcare system wide in 12 urban safety net clinics. The intervention consisted of four key elements: (1) development of internal hypertension patient registry; (2) evidence-based treatment intensification protocol; (3) standardized blood pressure measurement protocol; and (4) blood pressure check visits.

Other multilevel interventions were (1) patient plus clinician targeted interventions (7% [11/163] of included studies) that were mostly self-management support interventions, followed by patient education interventions; (2) healthcare system, clinician, plus patient targeted interventions (7% [11/163] of included studies) that were mostly system level QI interventions; (3) healthcare system plus clinician level interventions (2% [4/163] of included studies) that were system level QI interventions, an EHR-based intervention, and “other single component” intervention. Healthcare system plus clinician level interventions accounted for the lowest number of studies.
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#### Figure 4. Intervention type by target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention categories</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Patient + System</th>
<th>Patient + Clinician</th>
<th>Patient + System + Clinician</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Clinician + System</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-management support</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient navigation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention/Lifestyle support</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care coordination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System level QI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative care model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive system level change</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Health single component</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition of care</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other single component</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Count of Studies**

Note: Patient targeted interventions refer to interventions that related directly to patient behavior. Clinician targeted interventions refer to interventions that are related directly to clinician behavior. Healthcare system targeted interventions refer to interventions that are targeted at the healthcare system. Patient+clinician targeted interventions refer to interventions targeted at both patients and clinicians. Healthcare system+patient targeted interventions refer to interventions targeted at both the healthcare system and patients. Healthcare system+clinician targeted interventions refer to interventions targeted at both the healthcare system and clinicians. Healthcare system+clinician+patient targeted interventions refer to interventions targeted at the healthcare system, clinicians, and patients.

We used wherever possible the exact terms used by study authors to label the interventions.

Other single component interventions category captured interventions examining a single component but not otherwise easily grouped. Other single component interventions category includes language concordance, screening decision aid, risk calculator counseling, training in Web portal use, automated appointment reminders, shared medical appointments, group education for community-to-clinic settings, attending one population health program per year, and stress management training tools.

**Abbreviations:** m-Health=mobile health; EHR=Electronic Health Record; QI=quality improvement.

#### 3.2.3 Study Design

We classified included studies according to the authors’ reported study designs, illustrated in Figure 5. Some categories for study designs might overlap (e.g., quality improvement study design could overlap with cohort observational study design). A notably large number (58% [94/163]) of included studies were randomized controlled trials (RCTs). Among RCTs, the most frequently examined intervention was self-management support, followed by some “other single component,” then patient navigation and prevention/lifestyle support interventions. Other reported study designs include pre-post, mixed-methods, observational cohort study with
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comparator arms, nonrandomized controlled trial, quality improvement, or implementation science (to improve understanding of how to implement interventions). System level QI and collaborative care model interventions mostly did not use RCT study design.

**Figure 5. Intervention type by study design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention categories</th>
<th>RCT</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Pre-post</th>
<th>QI</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>NonRCT</th>
<th>Mixed-methods</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-management support</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient navigation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention/Lifestyle support</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care coordination</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System level QI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative care model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive system level change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Health single component</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition of care</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR based</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other single component</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Count of Studies**

![Count of Studies](image)

Note: We classified the included studies according to the authors' reported study design.

We used wherever possible the exact terms used by study authors to label the interventions.

Other single component interventions category captured interventions examining a single component but not otherwise easily grouped. Other single component interventions category includes language concordance, screening decision aid, risk calculator counseling, training in Web portal use, automated appointment reminders, shared medical appointments, group education for community-to-clinic settings, attending one population health program per year, and stress management training tools.

**Abbreviations:** m-Health=mobile health; EHR=Electronic Health Record; RCT=randomized controlled trial; QI=quality improvement; IS=implementation science

3.2.4 Outcomes

We present mainly the authors’ reported primary outcomes to show the key focus of the studies. Some studies reported secondary outcomes. Evidence tables of data from all included studies in Appendix D present reported primary (including direction of effect), and secondary outcomes. Table 1 provides information on the outcome categories used.
3.2.4 Findings, Descriptive Evidence Map, Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Definition and Example Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Outcomes</td>
<td>Change in symptoms, overall health, ability to function, quality of life and survival outcomes that result from giving care to patients. Example: Disease specific morbidity and mortality, blood pressure control, blood sugar control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of service</td>
<td>Examined the reduction of disparities (i.e., by examining differences in outcomes between racially and ethnically minoritized people and other groups). Promotion of health for all individuals by adapting services to eliminate disparities in the delivery of services or accessibility. Example: Treatment completion assessed between African American/Black group and white group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care utilization</td>
<td>How much healthcare people use, the type of healthcare and the timing of that care. Example: Uptake of services, completing screening, primary care clinic visits, inpatient hospitalizations, emergency department visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient experience of care</td>
<td>Individual patient experience of how healthcare intervention works for them. Example: Patient satisfaction, patient-reported measures of healthcare access and quality, acceptability (such as confidence in using information given in an intervention).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/financial reimbursement</td>
<td>Monetary incentives to healthcare systems or clinicians. Example: reimbursement schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple category outcomes</td>
<td>No one primary outcome was identified, or specifically stated that more than one outcome was a primary outcome. Example: Clinical outcome (such as blood pressure control) and care utilization outcomes (such as primary care clinic visits) reported together in a study with no specifically stated primary outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 provides the breakdown of outcomes by intervention type. Studies commonly reported process and clinical outcomes as primary outcomes. Forty-one percent (68/163) reported process of care outcomes and 31 percent (51/163) reported clinical outcomes as primary outcomes. More specifically, prevention/lifestyle support and m-Health single component interventions mostly reported clinical and process of care outcomes. Self-management support, “other single component,” patient navigation, and patient education interventions mostly reported process of care outcomes. Collaborative care model and care coordination interventions mostly reported clinical outcomes.

Very few studies reported information on equity of service35, 52, 63, 81, 121 as primary outcomes. Only 3 percent (5/163) of studies specifically assessed reduction of disparities by reporting primary outcomes that directly measured equity of service between racially/ethnically minoritized people and other groups. Patient navigation,81 system level QI,63, 121 care coordination,52 and EHR-based35 intervention studies reported equity of service outcomes.

Care utilization and patient experience of care were also limited in the literature. Care utilization was reported in 3 percent (5/163) of studies as a primary outcome. “Other single component” (such as automated appointment reminder and interactive kiosk-delivered education),179 patient education,43, 83 and transition of care118 interventions reported care utilization outcomes. Two percent (3/163) of studies reported patient experience of care37, 40, 158 as a primary outcome. Only self-management support37 “other single component” (language concordant care),158 and prevention/lifestyle support40 interventions reported patient experience of care outcomes.

Multiple category outcomes were reported in 19 percent (31/163) of studies as primary outcomes. Most system level QI interventions reported multiple outcomes.39, 105, 166, 187, 191
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Cost/financial reimbursement outcomes were lacking as either primary or secondary outcomes. Cost/financial reimbursement outcomes were reported alongside other types of outcomes and categorized as “multiple outcomes” in two studies that examined a collaborative care model intervention,129, 164 and a comprehensive system level change intervention.88 These three studies were in fact the only studies in our literature set that reported cost/financial reimbursement outcomes.

Figure 6. Intervention type by outcome categories

Note: We classified the included studies according to the authors' reported outcomes. We used wherever possible the exact terms used by study authors to label the interventions.

Other single component interventions category captured interventions examining a single component but not otherwise easily grouped. Other single component interventions category includes language concordance, screening decision aid, risk calculator counseling, training in Web portal use, automated appointment reminders, shared medical appointments, group education for community-to-clinic settings, attending one population health program per year, and stress management training tools.

Abbreviations: m-Health=mobile health; EHR=Electronic Health Record; QI=quality improvement; Multiple=multiple category outcomes

3.2.5 Intersectional Factors

We aimed to document other intersectional influences in addition to race/ethnicity (e.g., income, sexual orientation, geographic location, language, gender)210 that had been a focus in the included studies; however, studies did not report this.
3.2.6 Cultural Adaptation and Community Involvement

Cultural adaptation is when interventions are modified to consider language, culture, and context. When adapted, the essential components of interventions are maintained but delivered in ways that are compatible with the participant’s cultural patterns, meanings, and values in order to increase relevance and engagement.\(^{211}\) Forty-four percent (71/163) of studies reported some form of cultural adaptation, such as availability of an interpreter, information offered in several languages, use of culturally aware peers, and use of community health workers that share sociodemographic characteristics with the patient population served (including race/ethnic background and language).\(^{24, 27, 39, 40, 43-46, 48, 49, 51-53, 55, 56, 63, 66, 69, 71, 74, 75, 80-84, 86-88, 92, 93, 96, 99, 100, 105, 106, 111, 113, 114, 117, 119, 120, 125, 128, 132, 133, 135, 138, 139, 143, 145-147, 152, 158, 159, 164, 168, 171, 173-176, 179, 180, 184, 185, 188, 193-196

Notably, a high number of patient education interventions (83% [10/12]) reported some form of cultural adaptation. Cultural adaptation was used in other intervention categories as follows: self-management support (40% [14/35]); prevention/lifestyle support (53% [10/19]); patient navigation (45% [9/20]); care coordination (36% [5/14]); system level QI (31% [4/13]); collaborative care model (30% [3/10]); comprehensive system level change (28% [2/7]); m-Health (50% [3/6]); and transition of care (33% [1/3]).

In addition, a minority of studies (34% [24/70]) that enrolled participants from more than one racially/ethnically minoritized group or enrolled racially/ethnically minoritized people along with white participants reported some form of cultural adaptation.\(^{39, 40, 44-46, 53, 55, 63, 66, 69, 82, 83, 92, 93, 125, 132, 139, 145, 147, 152, 159, 164, 171, 174}

Community involvement (either partnership or collaboration) is defined as a process of healthcare systems working collaboratively with community organizations or groups of people to address issues affecting their health and well-being.\(^{212}\) These affiliations may be based on geographic proximity, special interests (such as religious institutions, faith-based wellness centers, faith-based social service agency, and community health centers), or similar situations (such as peers with similar health conditions). Thirty-nine percent (63/163) of studies reported community involvement (either partnership or collaboration).\(^{23, 25, 28, 35, 43, 48, 50, 52, 57, 59, 61, 69, 74, 81, 84, 87, 101, 102, 106, 109, 111, 115, 117, 119, 122, 125, 127, 129, 130, 132, 133, 139, 141, 143, 145, 148, 152, 156, 158, 159, 161, 162, 164-166, 168, 169, 171-176, 178-180, 184, 185, 188, 193-196

Notably, a high number of patient navigation interventions (70% [14/20]) reported some form of community involvement such as religious institutions and community health centers. Other interventions that reported community involvement include: prevention/lifestyle support (63% [12/19]); self-management support (29% [10/35]); care coordination (50% [7/14]); patient education (42% [5/12]); collaborative care model (50% [5/10]); system level QI (8% [1/13]); comprehensive system level change (14% [1/7]); m-Health (17% [1/6]); and EHR-based interventions (50% [1/2]). Transition of care interventions did not report any form of community involvement.

3.2.7 Harms or Adverse Events

A chronic pain self-management educational program identified falls as an adverse event that occurred during usual activities outside the self-management support program; however, authors noted that patients might have been more active than usual due to the influence of the program.\(^{178}\) No other study reported harms or adverse events of interventions (such as
unintended negative consequences, including misallocation of effort, decreased patient satisfaction, stigma, etc.) Similarly, we found no additional information on harms or adverse events of interventions in the gray literature.

### 3.2.8 Applicability and Sustainability of Interventions

In this Brief, applicability is defined as the extent to which the intervention could be implemented in a setting other than the one where it was researched. Overall, studies did not report on the feasibility or ease of adhering to the intervention in other environments. However, two studies (with no reported findings on applicability) highlighted that their interventions were potentially applicable/generalizable to general clinic settings because they tested them under real-world conditions following previous success in a randomized controlled trial. One study focused on a Mobile Insulin Titration Intervention (MITI) program, which was a multilevel, patient plus healthcare system targeted intervention to help patients with type 2 diabetes find their correct basal insulin dose without in-person care. The other study examined a Prevention of Cardiovascular Outcomes in African Americans with Diabetes (CHANGE) intervention, which was a multilevel, patient plus healthcare system targeted intervention aimed at improving adherence to medication for cardiovascular disease. Sustainability was defined in this Brief as the continued use of program components and activities for the ongoing achievement of desirable program and population outcomes. Studies did not report sustainability of interventions. We found no additional information on applicability and sustainability of interventions in the gray literature.

### 3.2.9 Study Funding Information

The biggest funder of the included studies was government (55% [90/163]), followed by multiple funding sources (11% [18/163]), foundations (9% [15/163]), academic (5% [9/163]), and nonprofit (5% [9/163]). Self-funded work by healthcare systems was not reported. Fourteen percent (22/193) of studies did not report funding source.

### 3.3 Evidence Map – Bubble Plots

After examining the descriptive characteristics of our included studies, we constructed bubble plots (as shown in the sections below) to display the relationship between three dimensions of included study characteristics, thus providing richer information. We grouped bubble plots results by intervention type, in relation to (1) study setting and delivery personnel; and (2) race/ethnic group and chronic conditions.

#### 3.3.1 Study Setting and Delivery Personnel

Figure 7 shows a bubble plot displaying all included studies by intervention type across study settings and delivery personnel. Interventions were implemented in a wide array of settings. Because disparity types and causes can be many and varied, including social determinants of health, the settings capture a continuum of public health to highly specialized medical care. Some categories for study settings might overlap. Most studies were carried out in clinic-based settings. Ownership or size of clinics vary from large health systems to community-based nonprofits. Federally qualified health centers (FQHCs) receive federal funding to provide comprehensive health services to underserved populations, which means they might conceptually...
overlap with clinics, while also potentially providing hospital or specialty care. Community-based settings were used for strategies that reach out to the patient communities, such as interventions based in churches, local libraries, or community centers. State or large city governments may provide preventive or other health services through public health systems. Other settings may include communication platforms such as telehealth, websites, mobile platforms, phones, or mailings. Multiple settings represent studies in more than one setting.

Within the above settings, interventions to address disparities were delivered by a wide array of personnel. When chosen for their ability to represent or reach patient populations, personnel are even more varied, with a range of titles and job descriptions provided by study authors, including peer/lay navigators drawn directly from the target population, peer navigators recruited as employees, community health educators, and community health workers. Several studies used researchers and/or administrative staff to conduct tasks related to the new intervention. Some studies used “other” delivery personnel and/or multiple delivery personnel. The “other” delivery personnel category represents studies that did not involve a delivery personnel but used some form of mobile or electronic tools to deliver interventions such as e-referral systems, interactive kiosk-delivered education, mobile gaming, smart phone apps, registry appointment scheduling systems, entertainment-education decision aids, social media, and electronic dashboards. Multiple delivery personnel category represents studies that comprise more than one delivery personnel category (such as a combination of patient navigators and clinicians). 122 The provider/clinician delivery personnel category included physicians, nurses, and pharmacists.

Self-management support interventions were mostly delivered by clinicians in the clinic and FQHC settings. 34, 37, 50, 76, 91, 117

Prevention/lifestyle support interventions were also commonly delivered by clinicians in community-based, hospital, FQHC, and nonprofit system settings.30, 36, 40, 168, 184

Patient navigation interventions were mostly delivered by peer navigators employed by the healthcare organization, particularly in community-based and hospital settings.48, 69, 75, 130, 145, 167, 173

Care coordination was mainly delivered by community health workers in clinic settings.28, 47, 52, 101, 102, 195

System level QI interventions were commonly delivered by “multiple” delivery personnel in clinic, hospital, FQHC, and public health system settings.28, 47, 52, 101, 102, 195

Patient education interventions were mainly delivered by peer or lay community outreach workers in community-based and “other” settings (including mailings and phone call),176, 188, 190 and researcher or administrative staff in clinic and hospital settings.53, 74, 107

Collaborative care model interventions were mainly delivered by multiple delivery personnel in FQHC settings,84, 144, 148 followed by clinic,131 community-based,129 and hospital settings.72

Comprehensive system level change interventions were delivered by clinicians and “multiple” delivery personnel in clinic settings,59, 114, 155, 163 and clinicians and “other” delivery personnel in public healthcare settings.54, 177

M-Health single component interventions were delivered by “other” delivery personnel in clinic and “other” settings,26, 51, 192, 196 providers/clinicians in clinic settings,70 and researcher or administrative staff in FQHC settings.86

Transition of care interventions were delivered by clinicians in clinic, hospital, and nonprofit system setting.31, 82, 118
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**EHR-based** interventions were delivered by clinicians and “other” delivery personnel (an e-referral system) in clinic settings.\(^3^5,^6^0\)
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**Figure 7. Intervention type by setting and delivery personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention categories</th>
<th>Clinic</th>
<th>Community-based</th>
<th>FQHC</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Public health system</th>
<th>Nonprofit system</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-management support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient navigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention/Lifestyle support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System level QI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative care model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive system level change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Health single component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition of care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other single component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Delivery Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Navigator (employee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer/Lay Community Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher/ Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider/ Clinician</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Sample Size (Bubble Size)**

- 50
- > 1,000

No sample size reported
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Note: All the studies identified in our evidence map are presented in the bubble plot.

Each bubble represents one study. Bubble size reflects the participant sample size. Smaller bubbles indicate smaller sample sizes and larger bubbles indicate larger sample sizes. The color of the bubble represents the delivery personnel for the intervention as presented in the literature.

27 studies with sample size > 1000 (ranging from 1087 -298,921), were winsorized at 1000 for visualizing the vast majority of studies with sample size <1000.

The categories for study setting and delivery personnel were the exact information reported by the study authors. The definition of the study setting categories may overlap between studies.

Other settings may include communication platforms such as telehealth, websites, mobile platforms, or mailings.

Multiple delivery personnel category represents studies that comprise more than one delivery personnel category such as a combination of patient navigators, and clinicians.

Other delivery personnel category represents studies that did not involve a delivery personnel but used some form of mobile or electronic tools to deliver interventions such as e-referral systems, interactive kiosk-delivered education, mobile gaming, smartphone apps, registry appointment scheduling systems, entertainment-education decision aids, social media, and electronic dashboards.

We used wherever possible the exact terms used by study authors to label the interventions.

Other single component interventions category captured interventions examining a single component but not otherwise easily grouped. Other single component interventions category includes language concordance, screening decision aid, risk calculator counseling, training in Web portal use, automated appointment reminders, shared medical appointments, group education for community-to-clinic settings, attending one population health program per year, and stress management training tools.

Abbreviations: CHW=community health worker; FQHC=Federally Qualified Health Center; NR=not reported; m-Health=mobile health; EHR=Electronic Health Record; QI=quality improvement

3.3.2 Race/Ethnicity and Chronic Condition

Figure 8 shows a bubble plot displaying all included studies by intervention type across populations and chronic conditions. Each bubble represents one study, and the size of the bubble represents the study sample size for intervention type and chronic condition. The color of the bubble represents the race/ethnic group as presented in the literature.

Of the studies that included a single race/ethnic group, African Americans/Blacks accounted for the highest proportion (28%), followed by the Hispanics/Latinos (20%), then Asians (6%). Only two studies (1%) included exclusively American Indian/Alaskan Native people. About 45 percent of included studies enrolled participants from more than one racially/ethnically minoritized group or enrolled racially/ethnically minoritized people and other groups—categorized as “multiple race/ethnic group” in this Brief. This multiple race/ethnic group category included African Americans/Blacks, Hispanics/Latinos, Asians, American Indians/Alaskan Natives, and whites.

Seven percent (11/163) of studies enrolled Asians as part of the “multiple race/ethnic group” category, and 4 percent (6/163) of studies enrolled American Indians/Alaskan Natives as part of the “multiple race/ethnic group” category.

Cancer accounted for the highest exclusively studied chronic condition (29% [47/163]), followed by diabetes (20% [32/163]), then hypertension (13% [22/163]), HIV (11% [18/163]), cardiovascular diseases (7% [12/163]), mental health (4% [6/163]), and asthma (3% [5/163]).
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Multiple chronic conditions category represents studies that examine more than one category of chronic condition. The “other chronic conditions” category represents chronic conditions that were reported in only one or two studies, and therefore too few to represent a unique category in our evidence map including liver disease,107 metabolic syndrome,172 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD),174 chronic pain not related to cancer,178 kidney disease,177, 190 or studies where study authors noted that chronic conditions were broadly examined but did not report specific chronic conditions.88

Multiple chronic conditions and “other chronic conditions” categories accounted for ten percent (16/163) and four percent (7/163) of studies, respectively.

Self-management support interventions encompassed all chronic condition categories presented in this Brief. Self-management support interventions were mainly focused on diabetes in “multiple race/ethnic groups”.92, 93, 124, 132 Overall, across the chronic conditions, self-management support was mostly focused on “multiple race/ethnic groups”, followed by African Americans/Blacks.

Patient navigation interventions were focused on asthma,29 cancer,48, 69, 75, 81, 119, 122, 127, 130, 145, 162, 173 diabetes,97, 150, 183 HIV,57, 61, 167 mental health,58 and “other chronic conditions”.174 Patient navigation interventions were mostly focused on cancer in “multiple race/ethnic groups”,61, 69, 97, 145, 162, 167, 174 African Americans/Blacks,29, 48, 57, 58, 122, 130 and Asians.81, 119, 173 Overall, across the chronic conditions, patient navigation was mostly focused on “multiple race/ethnic groups”,61, 69, 97, 145, 162, 167, 174 followed by African Americans/Blacks.

Prevention/lifestyle support interventions were focused on cancer,49, 87, 168 cardiovascular diseases,67, 152, 156 diabetes,40, 111, 115, 125, 185 HIV,36, 68, 154 hypertension,184, 194 “multiple chronic conditions”,23, 30 and “other chronic conditions”.172 Prevention/lifestyle support interventions were mostly focused on cardiovascular diseases in “multiple race/ethnic groups”.67, 152, 156 Overall, across the chronic conditions, prevention/lifestyle support was mostly focused on “multiple race/ethnic groups”36, 40, 67, 68, 125, 152, 156 followed by African Americans/Blacks.

Care coordination interventions were focused on asthma,28 cancer,71 cardiovascular diseases,195 diabetes,44, 47, 52, 104, 137, 151, 161 and “multiple chronic conditions”.32, 101, 102, 106 Care coordination interventions were mostly focused on diabetes in “multiple race/ethnic groups”.44, 47, 52, 104, 137, 151, 161 Overall, across the chronic conditions, care coordination was mostly focused on “multiple race/ethnic groups”,32, 44, 137, 161 and African Americans/Blacks.

System level QI interventions were focused on cancer,63, 105, 187 cardiovascular diseases,39, 64 diabetes,191 HIV,56, 166 and hypertension33, 85, 99, 121, 153 System level QI interventions were mainly focused on hypertension in “multiple race/ethnic groups”.33, 85, 153 Overall, across the chronic conditions, system level QI was mostly focused on “multiple race/ethnic groups”,33, 39, 56, 63, 64, 85, 153, 166, 191 followed by Hispanics/Latinos.99, 105, 187

Patient education interventions were focused on asthma,24 cancer,43, 53, 55, 74, 83, 143, 146, 176, 188 and “other chronic conditions”.107, 190 Patient education interventions were mostly focused on cancer in “multiple race/ethnic groups”.53, 55, 83, 190 Overall, across the chronic conditions, patient education was mostly focused on “multiple race/ethnic groups”,53, 55, 83, 190 followed by African Americans/Blacks and Hispanics/Latinos.24, 43, 74, 107, 143, 146, 188

Collaborative care model interventions were focused on cancer,73 diabetes,84, 131, 164 hypertension,72 and “multiple chronic conditions”.144, 148 Collaborative care model interventions
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were mostly focused on diabetes in African Americans/Blacks, Hispanic/Latinos, and “multiple race/ethnic groups” and mental health in “multiple race/ethnic groups” and Hispanics/Latinos. Overall, across the chronic conditions, collaborative care model was mostly focused on “multiple race/ethnic groups”.

Comprehensive system level change interventions were focused on hypertension, cardiovascular diseases, “multiple chronic conditions,” and “other chronic conditions.” Comprehensive system level change interventions were mostly focused on hypertension in Asians, Hispanics/Latinos, and “multiple race/ethnic groups”. Overall, across the chronic conditions, comprehensive system level change was mostly focused on “multiple race/ethnic groups”.

M-Health single component interventions were focused on cancer in “multiple race/ethnic groups” and American Indians/Alaskan Natives, HIV in Hispanics/Latinos and “multiple race/ethnic groups”, and hypertension in Hispanics.

Transition of care interventions were focused on HIV in African Americans/Blacks, hypertension in “multiple race/ethnic groups”, and “multiple chronic conditions” in African Americans/Blacks.

EHR-based interventions were focused on hypertension in Hispanics/Latinos, and HIV in “multiple race/ethnic groups.”
Figure 8. Intervention type by race/ethnicity and chronic disease
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Note: All the studies identified in our evidence map are presented in the bubble plot.

Each bubble represents one study. Bubble size reflects the participant sample size. Smaller bubbles indicate smaller sample sizes and larger bubbles indicate larger sample sizes. The color of the bubble represents the race/ethnic group as presented in the literature.

27 studies with sample size > 1000 (ranging from 1087 - 298,921), were winsorized at 1000 for visualizing the vast majority of studies with sample size <1000.

The race/ethnic groups represent studies that comprise a single racial or ethnic group, and the multiple race/ethnic group represents studies that enroll more than one race or ethnic group. Multiple race/ethnic group category included African Americans/Blacks, Hispanics/Latinos, Asians, and American Indians/Alaskan Natives.

The categories for chronic condition were the exact information reported by the study authors. Other chronic conditions category represents chronic conditions that were reported in only one or two studies, and therefore too few to represent a unique category in our evidence map including liver disease, metabolic syndrome, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), chronic pain not related to cancer, kidney disease, or studies where study authors noted that chronic conditions were broadly examined but did not report specific chronic conditions. Multiple chronic conditions category includes more than one category of chronic condition such as a combination of hypertension, cancer, mental health, obesity, COPD, cardiovascular diseases, kidney diseases, asthma, diabetes, liver disease, Alzheimer’s, or dyslipidemia.

We used wherever possible the exact terms used by study authors to label the interventions.

Other single component interventions category captured interventions examining a single component but not otherwise easily grouped. Other single component interventions category includes language concordance, screening decision aid, risk calculator counseling, training in Web portal use, automated appointment reminders, shared medical appointments, group education for community-to-clinic settings, attending one population health program per year, and stress management training tools.

Abbreviations: CHW=community health worker; CVD=Cardiovascular diseases; EHR=Electronic Health Record; FQHC=Federally Qualified Health Center; HIV=human immunodeficiency virus; HTN=Hypertension; NR=not reported; m-Health=mobile health; Multiple CC=Multiple chronic conditions; Other CC=Other chronic conditions; QI=quality improvement;

3.4 Further Detail on Selected Interventions

Because an evidence map necessarily glosses over the rich detail available from the heterogeneous studies included in this review, we selected a few intervention types about which to provide more detail. Initially, we selected the top two intervention types for a specific chronic condition based on the number of included studies. Tables 2 and 3 present deeper examinations of patient navigation for cancer and self-management support for diabetes. Because these two examples are targeted at the patient level, we also present in Table 4 comprehensive system level change interventions, which tend to target more process or structural aspects of care that might affect health equity. The goal is to show how diverse interventions in the literature were, and to capture the considerable variety of terms used in the literature to describe them. In addition, this information will inform researchers and funding agencies on areas where we found a relatively high cluster of evidence while detailing the components of the interventions for implementation by healthcare system leaders and policymakers. More information on these selected interventions can be found in evidence tables of data from all included studies in Appendix D.
### Table 2. Patient navigation interventions focused on cancer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Target Population(s) (Race/Ethnicity)</th>
<th>Cancer (Type) Intervention Components</th>
<th>Delivery Personnel*</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reuland, 2017¹⁴５</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Multiple ((Latino 62%, non-Latino white 15%, non-Latino Black or mixed race 23%)</td>
<td>Colorectal cancer</td>
<td>Patient Navigator (employee)</td>
<td>Technology: Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combination of CRC decision aid (15-minute video in English or Spanish), plus patient navigation by bilingual clinic or affiliated health system employees with previous training as medical assistants, social workers, or master’s degree–level public health professionals to increase screening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fang, 2017¹¹</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Asian (Korean American)</td>
<td>Cervical cancer</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Patient navigation assistance from study staff for follow-up for participants with an abnormal screening result (includes help in arranging transportation, scheduling medical appointments).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Education program led by bilingual community health educators.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, 2018¹⁹</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Asian (Korean American)</td>
<td>Liver cancer</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Patient navigation services from bilingual patient navigators (included language translation, appointment scheduling, transportation, provision of information related to the healthcare system).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Interactive group education led by community health educators.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menon, 2020¹²¹</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Colorectal cancer</td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community sites were randomized to group education or group education plus tailored navigation to increase attendance at primary care clinics (Phase I). Individuals who completed a clinic appointment received the tailored navigation in person or via phone (Phase II). Both were facilitated</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4 Findings, Further Detail on Selected Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Target Population(s) (Race/Ethnicity)</th>
<th>Cancer (Type) Intervention Components Delivery Personnel* Technology</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by community health workers. The tailored navigation intervention was based on the previously tested Tailored Intervention Messaging System, in which messages are matched to theoretically based variables of knowledge; perceptions of risk, benefits, barriers, and self-efficacy. Community Health Worker Technology: Telephone</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai, 2022(^{175})</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Asian (Vietnamese American)</td>
<td>Breast cancer Participants with abnormal mammograms were paired with a Vietnamese patient navigator to provide emotional support, education, translation, and assistance with medical bills and doctor’s appointments following screening. Patient Navigator (employee) Technology: NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, 2017(^{122})</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>Colorectal cancer Community and patient education, provider training and education, expansion of improved screening technology, and patient navigation (screening completion, address barriers to completion). Patient navigators were medical assistants and nurses hired from clinic staff, and educators were clinic nursing staff and physicians. Multiple Technology: Telephone</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castaldi, 2017(^{14})</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Multiple (African American/Black 44.5%, Hispanic/Latino 39%, Asian 8%, white 8.5%)</td>
<td>Breast cancer Breast health education accompanied by bilingual oncology staff patient navigators to increase screening for breast cancer. The patient navigators made reminder calls prior to follow-up appointments and meet the patient at all outpatient radiology and oncology appointments as well as on the day of surgery. The navigator conducted a financial consultation with the patient as needed, including negotiating fee scale payment through treatment and coverage for undocumented residents.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4 Findings, Further Detail on Selected Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Target Population(s) (Race/Ethnicity)</th>
<th>Cancer (Type) Intervention Components Delivery Personnel* Technology</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DeGroff, 2017<sup>60</sup> | Hospital | Multiple (Hispanic and non-Hispanic Black) | Colorectal cancer  
Bilingual patient navigators primarily worked with participants via telephone, although some activities were conducted in person and by mail. Typical activities included assessing for barriers, informing, and educating patients about the colonoscopy procedure and bowel preparation, ensure they received screening results addressing emotional concerns about the procedure, making appointments, sending reminders about bowel preparation and screening appointment date and, following the procedure, and arranging for escorts and transportation services.  
Patient Navigator (employee)  
Technology: Telephone | NR | X | X |
| DuHamel, 2020<sup>75</sup> | Hospital | Hispanic/Latino | Colorectal cancer  
Participants were randomized to receive patient navigation only, patient navigation plus standard Centers for Disease Control and Prevention print materials, or patient navigation plus culturally targeted print materials to improve screening colonoscopy rate.  
Patient navigation included 3 telephone calls: 1) the initial scheduling call, which occurred after the consent process; 2) a follow-up call 2 weeks before the scheduled procedure; and 3) a final appointment reminder 3 days prior to the procedure.  
Patient Navigator (employee)  
Technology: Telephone | X | X | NR |
| Molina, 2018<sup>130</sup> | Hospital | African American/Black | Breast cancer  
Patient navigation services provided by study staff for participants focused on identification of barriers to mammography screening and intervention via a shared decision-making process provided by study staff, including a patient teach back method where navigators encouraged patients to report their understanding of the information exchanged and ask questions about their appointments, care options, and selected solutions. | NR | NR | X |
### 3.4 Findings, Further Detail on Selected Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Target Population(s) (Race/Ethnicity)</th>
<th>Cancer (Type) Intervention Components</th>
<th>Delivery Personnel*</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singal, 2017(^{162})</td>
<td>Public Health System</td>
<td>Multiple (Hispanic 37.8%, African American/Black 32.1%, and white 28.3%)</td>
<td>Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC)</td>
<td>Patient Navigator (employee)</td>
<td>Technology: NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were randomized to receive visit-based screening, mailed outreach invitations for screening ultrasound, or mailed screening outreach plus patient navigation to improve screening in patients with cirrhosis. Mailings were provided in English and Spanish, and written at a low literacy level with assistance from health communication experts and underwent cognitive testing with English and Spanish speakers. Research staff conducted all mailings and reminder telephone calls. Research staff provided patient navigation activities by calling patients 5–7 days before ultrasound appointments to remind them of the appointment, address any concerns, and reschedule the appointment if needed.

Research/Admin
Technology: NR

*Refers to legend in Figure 8 bubble plot.

Note: General cultural adaptation in this Brief refers to culture adaptation with or without language as part of the modification of an intervention to fit the participant’s cultural patterns, meanings, and values more appropriately.

**Abbreviations:** CA= Cultural adaptation (author reported); CC=Community Collaboration; LA=Language adaptation; FQHC=Federally Qualified Health Center; NR=Not reported; Colorectal cancer=CRC; CDC=Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; HCC=Hepatocellular carcinoma; Multiple=multiple race/ethnic groups; X = yes
### Table 3. Self-management support interventions focused on diabetes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Population (Race/Ethnicity)</th>
<th>Intervention Components</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heisler, 2019&lt;sup&gt;102&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Multiple (Black 62%, white 36%)</td>
<td>Veterans Affairs patients with A1c&gt;8.0% received a six-month intervention with an initial session with a peer coach (trained fellow patients) who used an individually tailored, interactive Web-based tool (iDecide), followed by weekly phone calls to discuss behavioral goals.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, 2019&lt;sup&gt;117&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>Registered Dietician delivered group sessions including nutrition education, a short physical activity, social support, and a group discussion about goals, progress, and barriers to behavior change. Participants set behavioral goals for diet, physical activity, and self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) at each session and used logs and pedometers to self-monitor those behaviors between sessions.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, 2017&lt;sup&gt;132&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Multiple (white 45.6%, African American/Black 26.5%, American Indians/Alaskan Natives, 6%, Asian 5.7%, Multiracial 7%; Other (unspecified) 9.2%)</td>
<td>Four mandatory home visits, with an optional extra visit, by a CHW set health goals and behavioral self-management plans.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heitkemper, 2017&lt;sup&gt;73&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>Multiple (Hispanic/Latino 52%, African American/Black 42%)</td>
<td>A 1-time intervention training conducted by a research team member, which included basic technology help, introduction to the Mobile Diabetes Detective (MoDD) website and text message features, and account activation that included subject-specific tailoring. Four additional on-site sessions for participants needing computer or Internet access or technology support were made available based on need.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4 Findings, Further Detail on Selected Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Population (Race/Ethnicity)</th>
<th>Intervention Components</th>
<th>Delivery Personnel*</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayberry, 2017</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>Multiple (African American/Black 68%, Hispanic/Latino 7%, Other (unspecified) 6%)</td>
<td>Daily texts and weekly automated calls to address patients’ self-identified barriers to adherence along with medication reminders. The communications were set by trained research assistants after completing a medical chart review.</td>
<td>Researcher/Admin</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menon, 2022</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Biweekly health coaching phone calls and 3 in-person visits with a bilingual employee patient navigator trained in effective communication, designed to assist patients with self-management using sociolinguistic strategies with chronically ill patients.</td>
<td>Patient Navigator</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egede, 2017</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>12 telephone-delivered 30-min diabetes education modules and behavioral skills intervention which focused on four behaviors: physical activity, diet, medication adherence, and blood glucose self-monitoring over a 12-week period. The modules were led by full-time masters-level employee health educators.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy, 2018</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Mobile Insulin Titration Intervention (MITI) patients received weekday text messages from the program coordinator asking for their fasting blood glucose (FBG) values and a weekly titration call from on-site nurses.</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presley, 2020</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>Community-based DSME course plus peer support provided by CHWs recruited from a neighborhood outreach network, using a mHealth Web application.</td>
<td>Community Health Worker</td>
<td>mHealth</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refers to legend in Figure 8 bubble plot.
3.4 Findings, Further Detail on Selected Interventions

Note: General cultural adaptation in this Brief refers to culture adaptation with or without language as part of the modification of an intervention to fit the participant’s cultural patterns, meanings, and values more appropriately.

**Abbreviations:** CA= Cultural adaptation (author reported); CC=Community Collaboration; LA= Language adaptation; LIFE= Lifestyle Improvement through Food and Exercise; DSME=Diabetes self-management education; CHW=community health worker; FBG=Fasting Blood Glucose, Multiple=multiple race/ethnic groups FQHC=Federally Qualified Health Center; NR=not reported; m-Health=mobile health; MoDD=Mobile Diabetes Detective; MITI=Mobile Insulin Titration Intervention; X = yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Comprehensive system level change interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4 Findings, Further Detail on Selected Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Population (Race/Ethnicity)</th>
<th>Chronic Condition</th>
<th>Intervention Technology</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery Personnel Details</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallegos, 2022</td>
<td>FQHC and UIHC</td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>Multiple (hypertension, diabetes, asthma, COPD)</td>
<td>Collaborative Practice Model: collaboration between FQHC and UIHC to share pharmacy staff and provide same day remote pharmacy verification for UIHC; Collaborative Drug Therapy Management (CDTM) protocols to augment integrated patient care; optimized 340B cost savings for the clinic by establishing contracts with pharmacy benefit managers and implementing adjudication software to obtain medication reimbursement from Medicaid and other third-party insurances. Technology: Digital camera technology</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, 2019</td>
<td>Clinic (network of urban clinics, 14 sites)</td>
<td>Asian (immigrant Asian as target, but included Black/African American, Hispanic; proportion race/ethnicity not disclosed)</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Collaboration of network of independent clinics serving immigrants, health insurance company, and Independent quality improvement organization: EHR-embedded Clinical Decision Support Systems (registry, order sets, practice alerts); CHWs using culturally tailored in-language patient education materials, quality improvement organization supported application for Meaningful Use/Primary Care Medical Home status. Technology: Health information technology</td>
<td>Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenthaler, 2020</td>
<td>Clinic (single NY health center developed for and funded by unions; designed as a patient centered medical home)</td>
<td>Hispanic/ Latino</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>System-level model: teamlets of two-person teams, consisting of a PCP and MA worked consistently and collaboratively to care for a panel of patients. EHR-embedded office workflow and patient data collection; health needs registry. MA and PCP use daily huddles. MAs drawn from the same population as patients, bilingual, with health coach certification. Technology: Health information technology</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4 Findings, Further Detail on Selected Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Population (Race/Ethnicity)</th>
<th>Chronic Condition Intervention Technology</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery Personnel Details</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soreide, 2022</td>
<td>Clinic (6 of 30 primary care clinics within health system)</td>
<td>Multiple (Black 96.8%, Hispanic 1%, White 3%)</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Provider/Clinician Pharmacist</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic medication optimization pharmacist program: pharmacists manage hypertension medication for patients by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) proactively using a data analytics tool composed of an electronic report linked to the electronic health record to identify patients, or (2) through referrals from other clinicians. Collaborative practice agreement allows pharmacist to add, adjust, or discontinue medications. Provide counseling for adherence and lifestyle changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology: Health information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuot, 2018</td>
<td>Public Healthcare System (2 primary care clinics within public healthcare delivery system)</td>
<td>Multiple (Black 35.7%, Hispanic 24.5%, Asian 24.4%, non-Hispanic White 8%)</td>
<td>Chronic kidney disease</td>
<td>Multiple MA, PCP</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team-based primary care CKD registry; CKD registry identified patients and provided point-of-care data with CKD-relevant information. MAs schedule appointments based on data. Built in alerts for guideline concordant care. Quarterly feedback to teams and PCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology: Health information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: General cultural adaptation in this Brief refers to culture adaptation with or without language as part of the modification of an intervention to fit the participant’s cultural patterns, meanings, and values more appropriately.

**Abbreviations**: CA= Cultural adaptation (author reported); CC=Community Collaboration; CHW = community health worker; CKD = chronic kidney disease; EHR=electronic health record; FQHC=Federally Qualified Health Center; HTN=hypertension; LA=Language adaptation; MA=medical assistant; NR=Not reported; PCP=primary care provider; UIHC=urban Indian health clinic; WRC=wellness referral center; ; X = yes
3.5 Existing Evidence Reviews on Interventions

To further examine the literature and provide supplementary information, we performed a hand search of relevant systematic reviews. We identified 42 peer-reviewed current systematic reviews relevant to healthcare strategies/interventions to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in health and healthcare and improve health outcomes in the treatment/prevention of chronic conditions in adults, published from 2015 to present.\(^4, 200, 215-254\) We summarize the characteristics of the systematic reviews in Table 5 below, and Appendix E provides more detailed study characteristics of the reviews.

### Table 5. Summary characteristics of current reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Review Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US: 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of studies reviewed: 5-56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of populations: 6-87, 916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search Dates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earliest: 1998-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest: Inception to 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Single”: 27 studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mixed”: 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Populations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single focus: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple/mixed: 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer: 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular disease: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musculoskeletal conditions: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple: 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes(^*)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient experience of care: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of care: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical: 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some reviews had more than one outcome.

**Abbreviations:** NR=Not reported

We based our narrative summary of the current systematic reviews on study location, intervention type, chronic conditions, race/ethnic groups, harms or adverse events, applicability, and sustainability of interventions.

Notably, our evidence map in this Brief includes an unrestricted set of chronic conditions in adults. In addition, by examining healthcare strategies/interventions broadly, our evidence map also includes an unrestricted set of interventions. However, most of the systematic reviews examined interventions to address reducing disparities for a specific chronic condition or limited set of chronic conditions. Most of the systematic reviews that reported study location were U.S.-based.

Overall, the systematic review literature largely corroborates the findings we describe for the peer-reviewed primary studies in our evidence map. Most of the reviews focused on more than one category of race/ethnic groups; African American/Blacks and Hispanic/Latinos were the most reported groups, whether in reviews that included a wider range of race/ethnic groups or
reviews for a single race/ethnic group. Relatively few reviews for a single-studied race/ethnic group focused on Asians\textsuperscript{217, 228} and American Indians/Alaskan Natives.\textsuperscript{235, 241}

Because we found very few studies to include in our evidence map that included American Indians/Alaskan Natives, we further examined eight reviews \textsuperscript{229, 235-238, 241, 242, 250} that did include American Indians/Alaskan Natives to confirm the lack of studies. We provide expanded information on those reviews in Appendix E, including the number of papers that included this race/ethnic group in the review, year of publication of the primary studies included in the review, and the percentage representation of American Indians/Alaskan Natives within the populations included in each primary study. Overall, the reviews included one to six primary studies that either exclusively enrolled American Indians/Alaskan Natives or enrolled multiple race/ethnic groups (i.e., more than one category of race/ethnic groups) where American Indians/Alaskan Natives were represented in the study sample population.

Further, nearly all the reviews included studies published outside our search date, except two that included studies published prior to 2017 as well as those from 2017 onwards.\textsuperscript{238, 242} With the longer research time frame (pre and post 2017), studies that enrolled American Indians/Alaskan Natives (either exclusively or where American Indians/Alaskan Natives were represented in the study sample population) remains limited.

Generally, the systematic reviews focused on interventions for a specific exclusively studied chronic condition, with cancer being the most frequently studied,\textsuperscript{200, 220, 221, 223, 226, 227, 234, 235, 242, 243, 247-249} followed by diabetes.\textsuperscript{217, 218, 224, 230, 236, 237, 251, 252} Other exclusively studied chronic conditions were mental health conditions,\textsuperscript{222, 238, 240, 241} HIV,\textsuperscript{216, 231, 254} asthma,\textsuperscript{235, 246} hypertension,\textsuperscript{239} cardiovascular diseases,\textsuperscript{253} and musculoskeletal conditions.\textsuperscript{232} A few reviews studied multiple chronic conditions.\textsuperscript{4, 219, 225, 228, 229, 244, 245, 250}

Often, similar to our approach, the interventions in the systematic reviews did not fall into mutually exclusive categories, and the reviewers did not reclassify interventions but reported what the study authors used as labels. For example, one review that aimed to examine interventions to reduce bias and discrimination in the management of musculoskeletal pain included clinician education and perspective-taking, patient decision tools, and community outreach tools.\textsuperscript{252} Most of the systematic reviews focused on specific strategies/interventions broadly related to the intervention type categories we used in this Brief, including patient navigation,\textsuperscript{200, 221, 234, 247} QI interventions,\textsuperscript{251} decision aids,\textsuperscript{227, 244} self-management support,\textsuperscript{224, 229, 233, 237} patient education,\textsuperscript{215, 236, 243, 253} prevention interventions,\textsuperscript{216, 220, 254} lifestyle interventions,\textsuperscript{217, 252} collaborative care,\textsuperscript{238, 240} and digital health technologies\textsuperscript{4, 218, 230, 231, 239} (e.g., Web-based intervention, telemedicine, telehealth, m-Health (e.g., text or app-based approaches). Other reviews focused on intervention types not present in the literature from the peer reviewed primary studies in our evidence map, such as provider pay for performance interventions\textsuperscript{250} and interventions that had extremely heterogenous descriptions because of the broad aim(s) of the reviews.\textsuperscript{219, 222, 223, 225, 226, 228, 232, 235, 241, 242, 245, 246, 248, 249}

Mostly, the systematic reviews reported clinical outcomes. A few reviews reported information on process of care\textsuperscript{240, 250} and patient experience of care\textsuperscript{228, 232, 239} outcomes. Harms or adverse events, applicability, and sustainability of interventions were not reported in the reviews. Further, uncertainty exists around the systematic review literature because many of the reviews did not report risk of bias assessment of each study included. Risk of bias assessment documents potential flaws in the summarized evidence and supports the certainty or uncertainty in the overall evidence.\textsuperscript{255}
4. Summary and Implications

This Technical Brief presents an evidence map based on a systematic search of the recent literature on healthcare strategies/interventions for reducing racial and ethnic disparities and improving health outcomes in the prevention/treatment of chronic conditions in adults. The aim was to identify existing interventions that could be considered for implementation by healthcare system leaders and policymakers, and to inform researchers and funding agencies on gaps in knowledge and research needs. This evidence map reports on 163 studies published since 2017 and categorized into 12 intervention types.

Overall, the literature on healthcare system interventions is large and diverse. Clearly, considerable attention by and for health systems has been devoted to finding ways to improve health equity. Most studies indicated that interventionists began by selecting a population (or populations) identified as suffering disparities, then set about trying to improve care for that target group. This means the current literature set is best able to address the possibility of improving health outcomes for specific groups. But very few studies used a comparator that would allow us to understand whether disparities between groups were reduced or eliminated, which leaves the important issue of improving health equity largely unaddressed.

One difference between intervention approaches to address improved health outcomes versus improved health equity might lie in the heavily weighted use of patient-targeted interventions. For the goal of improving outcomes of a particular group, recruiting the agency of the individual to steward their own health could be a positive approach—i.e., focusing on what an individual can choose to do, or what is in their power to do. This idea is preliminarily supported by the fact that we identified a self-management intervention type commonly put forward by researchers. Self-management interventions sought to support patients as important members of the care team, rather than re-designing processes to organize care. However, to the extent that inequities are driven by structural factors, patient targeted interventions such as self-management may be only partly effective and may even delay effective change by focusing responsibility on patients, rather than the health systems. In the end, perhaps both approaches are necessary, and neither is enough on its own for either outcome goal. This literature’s focus on individual actions rather than systemic changes deserves critical attention and rebalancing. However, we must be cautious in arriving at this conclusion based solely on our literature set.

The wide range of organizations, locations, and personnel that delivered interventions reveals the interplay or interdependence between the roles of patients, community, and health systems to address disparities. For example, community involvement, especially if carried through to cultural adaptations, can increase the likelihood that interventions will be widely accepted. Community involvement can also create more effective solutions in several ways, including by drawing on local knowledge from one or more diverse groups; by raising public awareness of relevant issues; and by giving people a voice in decisions that affect their lives, health, and wellbeing. About a third to half of the interventions included in our map reported some community involvement. On the other hand, only a few included studies collected outcomes related to patient experience as a primary focus. A deeper understanding of patient experience might better inform shared decision making and contribute to more effective responses by the healthcare system.

Our evidence map shows that most of the studies included participants drawn from more than one racially or ethnically minoritized group and often also including white participants. The racial group studied most frequently as an exclusive study population was African Americans/Blacks. Meanwhile, we found very limited reporting of studies that exclusively
enrolled other single race/ethnic groups, such as Asians and American Indians/Alaskan Natives. Asians and American Indians/Alaskan Natives were included in studies that enrolled multiple race/ethnic groups, but their findings were not separately reported. The relative absence of literature for these groups was consistent with what was available in previously published systematic reviews. During Key Informant discussions, we heard of many commendable initiatives and efforts to improve healthcare and services in Indian Country, much of which is not reported in peer reviewed journals. Nonetheless, health systems who serve diverse populations may need to focus attention on some groups with high local disparities.

The chronic conditions that predominantly affect disadvantaged groups were not fully captured in our literature set. Cancer was the most frequently exclusively studied chronic condition. Other relatively less studied chronic conditions that disproportionately affect racially/ethnically minoritized people would also benefit from more attention, such as mental health, liver disease, metabolic syndrome, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), chronic pain not related to cancer, and kidney disease.

We also note study authors did not report harms, adverse events, or unintended consequences for examined interventions. While behavior change or care delivery change interventions may at first consideration seem less open to harm because they are based on established standards of clinical care, the possibility of unexpected harms is not zero. A recent study found that even while team-based care may decrease the time required of a primary care physician to provide all guideline-recommended care, the time is still “excessive.” Clinicians have to make decisions about what to stop doing to make time for something new. The challenge with implementing new approaches to improve health equity in one area is attending to these decisions in order to avoid unintentionally increasing disparities in another.

In the end, sustainability is crucial for a successful intervention. Cost/financial reimbursement outcomes were limited in our evidence map, but a core concern for healthcare systems. With 64 percent of studies funded by government or foundations, the question of sustainability persists.

This Technical Brief is limited by the challenge of grouping interventions into categories meaningful to health systems. As noted in the Methods section, we had to, based on the volume and heterogeneity of the evidence, create groupings for some study characteristics. Lack of consistency in terminology and intervention design presented a major obstacle. We grouped interventions into 12 types based on the intervention labels used by the study authors (when provided). Often, we had to categorize the interventions by study descriptions or statement of the primary purpose or approach. Components of the interventions were not standardized and varied widely. Many studies described interventions in a way that overlapped with one or more intervention types, yet study authors reported on the interventions in a manner that implied they had specific meaning (e.g., patient education and patient navigation interventions overlapping descriptions of self-management support interventions). Because of this inability to create mutually exclusive categories, health systems may have to cast broader nets when searching for potential approaches to address an identified disparity. Likewise, communication needs to be clear, because, for example, patient navigation may mean different things to different people.

---

*The use of the following terms are commonly used dealing with the Indian Health Service, federally recognized tribes, and Urban Indians. American Indian and Alaska Natives is the most common term in federal law; “Indian Country” is a commonly used term that is inclusive of American Indian and Alaska Natives, Native Americans, Natives, and Urban Indians, as defined by Elder Dr. Linda Bane Frizzell (Eastern Cherokee/Lakota).*
4. Summary and Implications

Similarly limiting, we used the exact information/label reported by the study authors in the original literature to categorize study designs and practice settings. Some categories for study designs and settings potentially overlap. For example, a quality improvement study design could overlap with cohort observational study design, and Federally Qualified Health Centers could be grouped as community based and/or public health hospital based.

We acknowledge that our categorization scheme for the interventions, study designs, and study settings are imprecise. Other researchers might arrive at different categorizations based on their chosen theoretical or conceptual frameworks.

Given the array of interventions we identified and the wide variation in intervention components and processes within individual health systems, it seems to us that interventions are very often tailored to address disparities arising from specific local conditions experienced by the specific healthcare system. Our own qualitative take-away from engaging with this literature is that some instances of changes in care delivery included in this evidence map may have improved outcomes for particular groups of disadvantaged people. However, this is only a preliminary determination since this brief report does not provide the assessments of study quality or outcome analysis necessary for stronger statements. Nonetheless, this evidence map (and especially the supporting evidence tables) provides a resource for health systems to identify intervention approaches that have been examined elsewhere and that might be imported or adapted to new situations and environments.

4.1 Next Steps

Next steps can be drawn from the summary and implications discussed above. Briefly, the specific areas we note are:

- More research is needed that specifically assesses the impact of interventions on reducing disparities. Such research would need to report outcomes that directly measure differences in outcomes between racially/ethnically minoritized people and other groups.
- Research is needed to assess the difference, if any, between interventions aimed at reducing disparities between groups and those aimed at improving outcomes for particular groups of disadvantaged people. Both goals are worthy of attention. Understanding potential commonalities, synergies, or conflicts between these approaches would be informative.
- Terms used in healthcare system interventions need much better standardization and operationalization, and, crucially, the components and categories of varied interventions need a comprehensive examination in order to make it easier for healthcare organizations to understand what works and what does not.
- Focused research is needed to include racially/ethnically minoritized groups, including Asians and American Indians/Alaska Natives.
- Future research can include other chronic conditions (such as mental health, liver disease, metabolic syndrome, COPD, chronic pain not related to cancer, and kidney disease) not present in this literature set yet important within racially/ethnically minoritized groups.
- Harms, adverse events, and unintended consequences from healthcare system interventions need more attention.
- The applicability and sustainability of healthcare system interventions needs more attention.
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Appendix A. Methods

Search Strategy

The search strategy was designed and conducted by a medical librarian with input from the investigators. We used text mining software to identify additional relevant keywords and MeSH search terms (Yale MeSH Analyzer https://mesh.med.yale.edu/). To find additional relevant studies, reference lists of included articles were manually screened. We applied the following limits or filters to the database searches:

- **Date.** A start date of 2017 was considered sufficient for the purpose of the review.
- **Language.** Publications were excluded if they were written in a language other than English. This was due to resource constraints.
- **Publication Status.** We searched for published studies in peer-reviewed journals.
- **Study Design.** The search was restricted to randomized controlled trials and non-randomized controlled trials, observational studies, pre-post design, and mixed methods.
- **Other restrictions.** The following search limits were then applied (MeSH Terms): clinical trial, or exp controlled clinical trial, or comparative effectiveness research, or comparative study, or evaluation study, or health services research, or outcome assessment, health care, or quality assurance, health care, or quality improvement.

We conducted a comprehensive literature search in July 2022 (updated in April 2023). We searched the following databases:

- **Ovid MEDLINE(R) and Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process, In-Data-Review & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Daily and Versions <1946 to July 25, 2022>**
- **CINAHL Plus with Full Text (EBSCOhost) Date searched: August 9, 2022**
- **Scopus (Elsevier B.V.) Date searched: August 8, 2022**

We conducted a grey literature search in April 2023 that included the following resources:

- Supplemental searches were performed for key questions on workforce diversity and applicability and sustainability. Supplemental searches were also performed in order to locate relevant articles poorly or inaccurately indexed or unindexed. We browsed the first 200 results from Google and Google Scholar for each search string using a combination of terms and word variations (health equity, healthcare disparities, racial / ethnic groups, American Indian or Indigenous or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, discrimination, racial/ethnic, racism, implicit bias; chronic conditions; learning health systems, safety net hospital, hospital systems, Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC); sustainability, scale-up, scalability, spread, applicability, transferability, generalizability, external validity, and workforce diversity.

- **We searched relevant organizations including the National Academy of Medicine, (NAM) Culture of Health Program, the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Equity, the American Hospital Association HEAL Health Equity Action Library, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Culture of Health Partnerships, the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute Portfolio, and the Dissemination & Implementation Models In Health website. Bibliographies of peer reviewed articles from website(s) of multiple**
organizations were scanned. No unique eligible reports were identified. Information from the search of websites was used to contextualize the published search results.

- Journal Table of Contents. Learning Health Systems, (Online ISSN:2379-6146) table of contents were browsed from October 2017-April 2023.

Table A.1. Websites: grey literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Websites Searched November 2022</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Hospital Association HEAL Health Equity Action Library</td>
<td><a href="https://equity.aha.org/health-equity-transformation-model-literature-overview">https://equity.aha.org/health-equity-transformation-model-literature-overview</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Medicine, (NAM) Culture of Health Program</td>
<td><a href="https://nam.edu/programs/culture-of-health/">https://nam.edu/programs/culture-of-health/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Culture of Health Partnerships-&quot;A Framework for Promoting Equity and Excellence in Healthcare&quot;</td>
<td><a href="https://rtbhealthcare.org/about/">https://rtbhealthcare.org/about/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCORI Addressing Disparities Portfolio</td>
<td><a href="https://www.pcori.org/explore-our-portfolio">https://www.pcori.org/explore-our-portfolio</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination &amp; Implementation Models In Health</td>
<td><a href="https://dissemination-implementation.org/tool/">https://dissemination-implementation.org/tool/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins Center for Health Equity</td>
<td><a href="https://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-health-equity/learning-resources/publications/academic-publications/">https://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-health-equity/learning-resources/publications/academic-publications/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington Health Workforce Research Center – Health Equity</td>
<td><a href="https://familymedicine.uw.edu/chws/hwrc/health-equity/">https://familymedicine.uw.edu/chws/hwrc/health-equity/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente Division of Research Health Equity</td>
<td><a href="https://divisionofresearch.kaiserpermanente.org/research/health-equity">https://divisionofresearch.kaiserpermanente.org/research/health-equity</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ovid MEDLINE(R) and Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process, In-Data-Review & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Daily and Versions <1946 to July 25, 2022>

- healthcare disparities/ or Health inequities/ or Health Status Disparities/ 37607
- (health* adj3 (access* or disparit* or equity or inequit*)).ti,ab,kf. 76539
- exp "health disparity, minority and vulnerable populations"/ or Minority health/ 107398
- "Ethnic and Racial Minorities"/ 379
- exp "Emigrants and Immigrants"/ 15009
- Medically Underserved Area/ or Medically Uninsured/ or Safety-Net Providers/ 16376
- exp Racism/ or Bias, Implicit/ 5663
- ((race or racial) adj3 (diffference* or disparit* or inequit* or gap*)).ti,ab,kf. 14516
- exp Poverty/ or sociodemographic factors/ or socioeconomic factors/ 209931
- ((sociodemographic* or socioeconomic*) adj3 (disparit* or equit* or inequit*)).ti,ab,kf. 3738
- or/1-10406702
- exp chronic disease/ or cardiovascular diseases/ or exp diabetes insipidus/ or exp diabetes mellitus/ or Disabled Persons/ 1249711
• (AIDS or asthma or cancer or cardiovascular disease* or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or COPD or diabetes or HIV or hypertension or mental disorder* or mental illness* or (chronic adj3 disease*)).ti,ab,kf. 3967949
• Multimorbidity/ 2349
• (multimorbidit* or multi-morbidit*).ti,ab,kf. 7550
• (patient adj3 (burden or complex*)).ti,ab,kf. 9336
• or/12-16 4606688
• 11 and 17 104105
• clinical trial/ or exp controlled clinical trial/ or comparative effectiveness research/ or comparative study/ or evaluation study/ or health services research/ or outcome assessment, health care/ or quality assurance, health care/ or quality improvement/ 2994570
• (strategies or intervention or improve* or address).ti. 505158
• 19 or 20 3402367
• 18 and 21 18225
• limit 22 to (english language and yr="2017 -Current") 4595
• comment/ or editorial/ or letter/ 2083352
• 23 not 24 4519

Ovid Field Searching Codes
.ab=Abstract
.ti=Title
.kf=Subject Heading Word

CINAHL Plus EbscoHost

1 S1 (MH "Healthcare Disparities") OR (MH "Racism") OR (MH "Sexual and Gender Minorities") OR (MH "Minority Groups") OR (MH "Socioeconomic Factors+") OR (MH "Sociodemographic Factors") OR (MH "Racism+") OR (MH "Transphobia") OR (MH "Indigent Persons") OR (MH "Immigrants") OR (MH "Medically Uninsured") OR (MH "Medically Underserved") OR (MH "Medically Underserved Area") OR (TI (health N3 (disparit* OR inequit* OR equit*)) OR (AB (health N3 (disparit* OR inequit* OR equit*)) OR (TI (minorit* N3 (racial OR ethnic OR gender OR group* OR health OR sexual )) OR (AB (minorit* N3 (racial OR ethnic OR gender OR group* OR sexual )) OR (TI (socioeconomic* OR AB socioeconomic*))

2 S2 (MH "Chronic Disease+") OR (MH "Mental Disorders, Chronic") OR (MH "Pulmonary Disease, Chronic Obstructive") OR (MH "Renal Insufficiency, Chronic") OR (MH "Leukemia, Myeloid, Chronic") OR (MH "Kidney Failure, Chronic") OR (MH "Asthma-Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Overlap Syndrome") OR (MH "Diabetic Patients") OR (MH "Hypertension") OR (MH "Coronary Disease") OR (MH "Comorbidity") OR (TI (chronic N3 (condition* OR disease* OR illness*)) OR (TI ("long term conditions") OR (TI (mental N3 (disorder* or illness*)) OR (AB (chronic N3 (condition* OR disease* OR illness*)) OR (AB ("long term conditions") OR (AB (mental N3 (disorder* or illness*))

3 S3 (MH "Health Services Research") OR (MH "Outcomes Research") OR (MH "Quality of Care Research") OR (MH "Evaluation Research") OR (MH "Administrative Research+") OR (MH S3 "Analytic Research") OR (MH "Applied Research") OR (MM "Clinical Research") OR
(MH "Quality of Care Research") OR (MH "Evaluation and Quality Improvement Program") OR (MH "Quality Improvement") OR (MH "Quality Assessment") OR (MH "Quasi-Experimental Studies+") OR (MH "Prospective Studies+") OR (MH "Clinical Trials+") OR (MH "Experimental Studies+") OR (PT clinical trial OR PT nursing interventions OR PT other)
4 S1 AND S2 AND S3

Limiters - Peer Reviewed; Published Date: 20170101-20221231; English Language; Geographic Subset: Australia & New Zealand, Canada, Europe, UK & Ireland, USA
Expanders - Apply equivalent subjects
Search modes - Boolean/Phrase

SCOPUS (Elsevier B.V.)

INDEXTERMS ( "healthcare disparities" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "health inequities"
) OR INDEXTERMS ( "health status disparities" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "socioeconomic factors"
) OR INDEXTERMS ( "health disparity, minority and vulnerable populations"
) OR INDEXTERMS ( "Ethnic and Racial Minorities" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "Safety-Net Providers" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "Medically Underserved Area" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "Medically Uninsured" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "Minority health" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "Emigrants and Immigrants" ) OR TITLE-ABS ( health W/5 disparit* ) OR TITLE-ABS ( racial W/5 disparit* ) OR TITLE-ABS ( ethnic W/5 disparit* ) OR TITLE-ABS ( minorit* W/5 health ) AND ( INDEXTERMS ( "chronic disease" ) OR TITLE-ABS ( chronic W/5 condition* ) OR TITLE-ABS ( "chronic obstructive pulmonary disease"
) OR TITLE-ABS ( cancer ) OR TITLE-ABS ( "cardiovascular disease*" ) OR TITLE-ABS ( diabetes ) OR TITLE-ABS ( "HIV" ) OR TITLE-ABS ( hypertension ) OR TITLE-ABS ( mental W/5 disorder* ) OR TITLE-ABS ( mental W/5 illness* ) OR TITLE-ABS ( multimorbidit* ) OR TITLE-ABS ( "complex w/5 patient" ) AND ( INDEXTERMS ( "clinical trial" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "controlled clinical trial" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "comparative effectiveness research" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "comparative study" ) OR TITLE ( random* ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "outcome assessment, health care" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "quality improvement" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "health services research" ) OR INDEXTERMS ( "quality assurance, health care" ) OR TITLE ( intervention ) OR TITLE ( strategies ) OR TITLE ( improve* ) OR TITLE ( address )

Limited to: Affiliated Country: United States, Australia & New Zealand, Canada, Europe, UK & Ireland; Document Type: article; Language: English, Publication Years, 2017-2022; Source Type: Journal; Subject Areas: Medicine, Nursing, Health Professions, Multidisciplinary.
Questions for Key Informants

Technical Brief 1

Questions for Researchers/Advocacy Organizations/Provider Organizations/Practicing Clinicians

1. What patient-level and health professional-level efforts has your organization or institution employed to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in chronic conditions healthcare and health outcomes?
2. Can you describe the rationale for this effort, for instance what was driving the decision of the problem and the solution/intervention? Was the intervention successful or not? What were the challenges? How are you measuring disparities and evaluating interventions?
3. Do you engage community partnerships in your approach? If so, how?
4. Are there similar approaches you are aware of? Which other entity is trying similar approaches?
5. Are there concepts, or conceptual frameworks, that are important in understanding the patient-level and health professional-level interventions to reduce racial/ethnic disparities in health and healthcare?
6. How do you identify social identity groups that are not being served, and how do you prioritize which groups for designing interventions? What are the challenges?
7. How does your organization tailor the patient-level and health professional-level approach to reach racial and ethnic that may be marginalized due to other factors (such as disability status, income, sexual identity and orientation etc.)? Which of these factors have been most challenging to address and why?
8. What concerns do you have about the sustainability of patient-level and health professional-level strategies/interventions intended to address racial and ethnic disparities in health and healthcare?
9. Gray literature: What are prominent sources where you obtain information on patient-level and health professional-level strategies/interventions? Who has conducted such interventions?
10. What information and resource does your organization or institution need to be more effective in incorporating patient-level and health professional-level interventions in reducing racial and ethnic disparities in health and healthcare?
11. What are current gaps in the research and what future research is needed most?

Questions for Patient Advocates, Families, Caregivers

1. Data clearly shows that racial and ethnic minority groups often have worse health and care. Why do you think this is the case?
2. Have you or your loved ones experienced differences in care received, are you aware of any healthcare organizational efforts to rectify these differences? What are the efforts/programs?
3. Have you or your loved ones participated in (or are you aware of) such program(s)? Was there any effort to consider your race and other social factors (such as your gender, disability, sexual identity and orientation etc.) in the program(s)?
4. Are you aware of community collaboration efforts of such programs to rectify the differences in your health and care? Should community organizations be involved in these efforts? How? What are some barriers that community organizations face in collaborating with healthcare organizations?

5. What types of efforts do you think a healthcare organization could do that might reduce these differences in the care received by racial and ethnic minority groups? What would be needed for them to work?

6. Are there sources where you obtain information about these efforts?
Technical Brief 2

Questions for Researchers/Advocacy Organizations/Provider Organizations/Practicing Clinicians

1. Data clearly shows that racial and ethnic minority groups often have worse health and care. Why do you think this is the case?
2. Have you or your loved ones experienced differences in care received, are you aware of any healthcare organizational efforts to rectify these differences? What are the efforts/programs?
3. Have you or your loved ones participated in (or are you aware of) such program(s)? Was there any effort to consider your race and other social factors (such as your gender, disability, sexual identity and orientation e.t.c) in the program(s)?
4. Are you aware of community collaboration efforts of such programs to rectify the differences in your health and care? Should community organizations be involved in these efforts? How? What are some barriers that community organizations face in collaborating with healthcare organizations?
5. What types of efforts do you think a healthcare organization could do that might reduce these differences in the care received by racial and ethnic minority groups? What would be needed for them to work?
6. Are there sources where you obtain information about these efforts?

Questions for Patient Advocates, Families, Caregivers

1. Data clearly shows that racial and ethnic minority groups often have worse health and care. Why do you think this is the case?
2. Have you or your loved ones experienced differences in care received, are you aware of any healthcare organizational efforts to rectify these differences? What are the efforts/programs?
3. Have you or your loved ones participated in (or are you aware of) such program(s)? Was there any effort to consider your race and other social factors (such as your gender, disability, sexual identity and orientation e.t.c) in the program(s)?
4. Are you aware of community collaboration efforts of such programs to rectify the differences in your health and care? Should community organizations be involved in these efforts? How? What are some barriers that community organizations face in collaborating with healthcare organizations?
5. What types of efforts do you think a healthcare organization could do that might reduce these differences in the care received by racial and ethnic minority groups? What would be needed for them to work?
6. Are there sources where you obtain information about these efforts?
## Appendix B. Inclusion Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>Studies that enroll only or primarily racial/ethnic minoritized people (i.e., racial/ethnic minoritized people make up over 50% of the sample size). Sample size &gt; 50, or 25 per group analyzed (to achieve a reasonable representation of the population) Health Professionals providing healthcare for racial and ethnic minoritized adults with chronic conditions or at risk of chronic conditions Healthcare system providing healthcare for racial and ethnic minoritized adults with common chronic conditions or at risk of chronic conditions</td>
<td>Non-U.S populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Strategies that are specifically targeted to reduce racial and ethnic health and healthcare disparities with links to the healthcare system Strategies in community-based settings with relevant links to healthcare system Studies that specifically aimed to examine the reduction of a disparity (i.e., by examining differences in outcomes between specific racial/ethnic minoritized people and other groups) Studies that aimed to improve outcomes for specified racial/ethnic minoritized people</td>
<td>Medical interventions where racial subgroup analyses were not intended or stated at the start of the study conduct (i.e., post hoc exploratory analyses). Public health/policy-based interventions without relevant links to a healthcare system Interventions aimed at medical school students, pharmacy students, and other allied health students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparators</strong></td>
<td>Standard care Alternative strategy/intervention</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Clinical outcome measures (e.g., disease specific morbidity and mortality, BP control, Hba1c levels) Process of care measures Care utilization outcome measures Barriers to care measures Cost/re-imbursement measures Harms or adverse events (e.g., unintended negative consequences) Patient experience of care - stigma other related experience of discrimination Others</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing</strong></td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settings</strong></td>
<td>Any; no exclusion based on type of healthcare provider organization</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study design</strong></td>
<td>Randomized controlled trials, non-randomized controlled trials, cohort studies with comparator arms, pre-post, quality improvement, single-arm studies of implemented strategies with outcomes captured before and after implementation, mixed-method</td>
<td>Stand-alone qualitative studies, systematic reviews, narrative reviews, case reports, case series protocols, conference abstracts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Excluded Studies at Full Text

Reasons for Exclusion
P = Population
I = Intervention
C = Comparison
O = Outcomes
S = Study Design
X = Other reasons


## Appendix D. Evidence Tables

### Care Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apter, 2019¹ (31181221)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>Web-based patient portal with CHW assistance</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes (primary), asthma-related quality of life; yearly rate of ED visits, hospitalizations and prednisone bursts</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazzoli, 2017² (27305914)</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Case management, patient education</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Equity of service</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calman, 2018³ (29415785)</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>Multi-faceted care plan</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrasquillo, 2017</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Disease management support 1 year Patient Community Health Worker</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Systolic blood pressure, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol levels, and HbA1c levels (primary), body mass index, medication regimen intensification, and self-reported measures of diet, physical activity, and medication regimen adherence. NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang, 2018</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Health education, counseling, navigation, social support 52 weeks Patient Community Health Worker</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Equity of service Self-reported access to care (primary), EHR (health care utilization, including primary care clinic visits, hospitalizations, and emergency department) NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessources, 2020</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Patient navigation 4 years System Patient navigator (employee)</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Receiving ≥5 cycles of weekly cisplatin, initiation of BT during EBRT, completion of EBRT &amp; BT, and pCRT completion within 63 days NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangovi, 2017(^7) (28817334) Kangovi, 2017(^8) (27717532) RCT Clinic PA</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>IMPaCT: individualized management for patient-centered targets 12 months Patient + System CHW</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care HbA1c, BMI, BP, self-reported number of cigarettes per day (primary), achievement of chronic disease management goals, mean change in self-rated health</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangovi, 2018(^8) (30422224) RCT Clinic PA</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>IMPaCT: individualized management for patient-centered targets 9 months Patient + Health Professional + System CHW</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Self-rated physical health (primary), self-rated mental health, change in patient-selected chronic disease marker, change in patient activation measure, proportion of patients reporting high quality care, and all-cause hospitalization</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsell, 2017(^9) (29161972) Pre-post FQHC FL</td>
<td>27 clinics (14136 person years) 59 years 59.8% 42.4% African American, 49.7% White, 1.5% Asian, 6.4% other (unspecified), 46.3% Hispanic Diabetes NR</td>
<td>Patient-centered medical home 3 years Patient + System Other</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care HbA1c, BP, BMI (primary), interaction effects of race, age, and payer type African Americans had significantly worse HbA1c and BP values compared to Caucasian patients</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitzman, 2022¹¹ (35497399) Observational-Cohort Community-based TX</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>Integration of population health strategies into primary care 12 months</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes BP, HbA1c (primary), participation, ED use and cost patterns, and IP use and cost patterns</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul, 2020¹² (33416685) Pre-post FQHC NM</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>Project ECHO (Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes): is an innovative, scalable model of health care that extends specialty care to medically underserved areas through ongoing telementorship of community primary care providers 1 year</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Patient experience of care; equity of service Healthcare access, and quality (primary)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rovner, 2020¹³ (32043561) RCT Clinic PA</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Two white providers delivered standardized treatment and diabetes education tailored to participants’ cognitive abilities 6 months</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes HbA1c</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp, 2018¹⁴ (29121408) RCT Clinic IL</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>(Group 1): Pharmacist + CHW (Pharmacists provided medication and disease management services to patients following an established Pharmacist Management Protocol, which included a comprehensive needs assessment, health promotion, patient-centric goal setting and education, interventions to encourage behavioral change, and collaboration with the PCP); (Group 2): Pharmacist only</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes HbA1c (primary), systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, HDL, LDL, BMI, QoL, and perceived social support</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zullig, 2018¹⁵ (29432589) Pre-post Clinic NC, MI, WV</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Cholesterol, Hypertension, And Glucose Education (CHANGE): self-management education modules and medication management facilitation</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes HbA1c</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** ART = Antiretroviral therapy, BMI = body mass index, BP = Blood pressure, BT = brachytherapy, CHW = Community health workers, EBRT = External beam radiation therapy, ED = Emergency department, EHR = Electronic health records, FQHC = federally qualified health center, HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin, HDL = high-density lipoprotein, LDL = low-density lipoprotein, NR = Not reported, PCP = Primary care provider, QoL = Quality of life, PC = Pharmacist.
Collaborative Care Model

Table D.2. Characteristics of included studies: collaborative care model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Setting</th>
<th>Study Location (State)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Age (Mean)</th>
<th>Sex (% Female)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chronic Condition</th>
<th>Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, 2018</td>
<td>Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>48 years</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Black 80%, White 17% Hypertension</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Care coordination with pharmacist-physician collaboration</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient + System Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Time from the initial visit to the first follow-up visit with a BP &lt;140/90 mm Hg</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doe, 2020</td>
<td>Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>62 years</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Hispanic 30%, Asian 29%, Black 20%, White 15% Cancer</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Care coordination 2 years System Researcher/Admin</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Mean time from diagnosis to treatment, and patient compliance</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn, 2020</td>
<td>Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>54 years</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino Mental health</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Care coordination, patient education, patient navigation, nutrition services 12 months Patient + System Multiple</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient + System</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Improved HbA1c (primary), BP, BMI, depressive symptoms, and quality of life</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaltman, 2019</td>
<td>NonRCT</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>84.8 years</td>
<td>48 years</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino Mental health</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Adapted collaborative care program 8 months Patient + System</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>Patient + System Researcher/Admin</td>
<td>Head-to-head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Changes in depressive symptoms, changes in trauma exposure/PTSD symptoms, satisfaction with care</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lipoprotein, HIV = human immunodeficiency virus, LDL = low-density lipoprotein, NR = Not reported, PCP = Primary care provider, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, NR = not reported, QoL = Quality of life, RCT = randomized controlled trial
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Age (Mean)</th>
<th>Sex (% Female)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millender, 2020 (NA) Pre-post Community-based FL</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>37 years</td>
<td>Hispanic 22%, Black/African American 35.6%, White 47.5%, Other/multiracial (unspecified) 16.9% Mental health NR</td>
<td>Nurse-led interprofessional model of care 5 years System Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes; process of care; care utilization; cost/financial reimbursement Successfully completed transition plan, psychiatrically stable, gained connection to community mental health provider, and had health insurance before exit NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narain, 2020 (32144694) NonRCT Clinic CA</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>64 years</td>
<td>Black Diabetes NR</td>
<td>UCMyRx: involves embedding clinical pharmacists trained in motivational interviewing into primary care practices to co-manage complex patients along with their primary care physicians NR System Multiple</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes HbA1c, and systolic blood pressure NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray, 2020 (31381470) Mixed-method FQHC WI</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>56 years</td>
<td>Hispanic 3%, White 3%, African American 94% Hypertension, Diabetes NR</td>
<td>Pharmacists within a primary care team managed patients with chronic illnesses utilizing a collaborative practice agreement NR System Other</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes HbA1c NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ross, 2020²³  
(32945767)  
IS FQHC MS | 335  
60 years  
61.2% Black 95%; white 4.5%; 0.5% other race (unspecified)  
Hypertension, diabetes, other CC | Educational topics  
1 year  
Patient + Health  
Professional + System  
Multiple | Pre-post | Process of care  
MTM intervention score (primary), BP, triglycerides, HbA1c, cholesterol, and LDL | NR | Positive | Yes | NR | NR | Government |
| Sous, 2021²⁴  
(34909549)  
Pre-post  
Clinic NY | 50  
48 years  
60%  
Diabetes NR | Integrated care management  
12 months  
Patient + System  
Patient navigator | Pre-post | Process of care; care utilization  
Chronic disease parameters, and care utilization | NR | Mixed | Yes | NR | NR | Academic |
| Swavely, 2020²⁵  
(31226884)  
Mixed-method  
Clinic PA | 200  
NR  
59%  
African American 74%, Asian 2%, 10% White, Hispanic/black 6%, Hispanic/other 5%, Other (unspecified) 4%  
Mental health NR | The program included using a behavioral health technology platform, a behavioral health collaborative composed of community mental health agencies, and a community health worker  
7 months  
Patient + System  
NR | Standard/usual care | Clinical outcomes  
Rate of patients diagnosed with depression | NR | Positive | Yes | NR | NR | NR |

Abbreviations: BMI = body mass index, BP = Blood pressure, CC = chronic condition, FQHC = federally qualified health center, HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin, IS = implementation science, LDL = low-density lipoprotein, MTM = medication therapy management, NA = not available, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, PTSD = post-traumatic stress disorder, RCT = randomized controlled trial
## Comprehensive System-Level Change

### Table D.3. Characteristics of included studies: comprehensive system level change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Age (Mean)</th>
<th>Sex (% Female)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chronic Condition</th>
<th>Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheng, 2018 <a href="29321134">26</a></td>
<td>404</td>
<td>57 years</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Hispanic 68%, Black 15%, Asian 10%</td>
<td>Cardiovascular disease</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Nurse practitioner/physician assistant care manager, group clinics, self-management support, report cards, decision support, and ongoing care coordination</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient + System</td>
<td>Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes; change in systolic blood pressure</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz, 2022 <a href="36374606">27</a></td>
<td>2920</td>
<td>55 years</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White 30%, Hispanic 60%, Native American 1.5%</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>A hub to connect referred patients to self-management programs</td>
<td>2 years, 9 months</td>
<td>Patient + Health Professional + System</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes; BMI, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, HbA1c</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallegos, 2022 <a href="35068248">28</a></td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native Other CC</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Access improvement, financial barrier reduction</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Patient + System</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care; cost/financial reimbursement; equity of service</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, 2019&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt; (31095056) Islam, 2023&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt; (36815464) NonRCT Clinic NY</td>
<td>14 practices (6974 patients) NR 46.6% Asian Hypertension NR</td>
<td>EHR health information technology 12 months Patient + Health Professional + System Provider/ Clinician</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes BP, acceptability, feasibility, and fidelity NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No NR NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoenthaler, 2020&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt; (31625041) RCT Clinic NY</td>
<td>119 61 years 49.6% Hispanic/Latino Hypertension NR</td>
<td>Health needs registry + coaching 6 months Patient + System Multiple</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Medication adherence (primary), BP, and self-reported medical adherence NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No NR NR</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soreide, 2022&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt; (35420749) Observational-Cohort Clinic MI</td>
<td>222 60 years 57% Black 96.8%, Hispanic 1%, White 3% Hypertension NR</td>
<td>System multilevel QI care process Pharmacist-led hypertension management program 2 years Patient + System Provider/ Clinician</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes BP goals at 3 months (primary), BP goals at 6 months, time and number of visits to goal, adherence</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No NR NR NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuot, 2018&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt; (29699885) RCT Public health system CA</td>
<td>746 57 years 53% non-Hispanic White 8%, Black 35.7%, Hispanic 24.5%, Asian 24.4% Chronic kidney disease NR</td>
<td>CKD registry 12 months Health Professional + System Other</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Systolic blood pressure NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No NR NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** BMI = body mass index, BP = Blood pressure, CC = chronic condition, CKD = chronic kidney disease, EHR = Electronic health records, FQHC = federally qualified health center, HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, QI = quality improvement, RCT = randomized controlled trial, UIHC = urban Indian health clinic
### Electronic Health Records-Based

#### Table D.4. Characteristics of included studies: Electronic Health Records-based

| Study (PMID) | Study Design | Study Setting | Study Location (State) | Sample Size | Age (Mean) | Sex (% Female) | Race/Ethnicity | Chronic Condition | Intervention Description | Intervention Target | Intervention Delivery | Comparison Description | Outcome Category Outcomes | Harms | Effect Code for Primary Outcome | Community Involvement (Yes/No) | Applicability (Yes/No) | Sustainability (Yes/No) | Funding |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Bettano, 2019 (31441768) IS Clinic MA | 34 | IS | MA | 21,701 (aim 1), 3,817 (aim 2) | NR NR | Non-Hispanic Black 10.4%, Hispanic 38% Non-Hispanic White 36.5%, other 15.1% | Hypertension NR | Clinical-Community Partnerships for Prevention (CCPP): bidirectional referrals between clinic and community partnership 4 years Health Professional + System Other | Standard/usual care | Care utilization Completing an e-Referral (primary), and improvements in BP NR | Mixed | Yes NR NR Government |
| Cunningham, 2017 (28368951) RCT Clinic CA | 35 | RCT | CA | 1181 | 45 years 11% White 46%, Latino 28%, Black 22% HIV NR | EHR - bi-directional exchange of laboratory information 3 years Patient + System Provider/Clinician | Pre-post | Process of care; clinical outcomes ART pharmacy fill, and HIV viral load NR | Positive | No NR NR Government |

**Abbreviations:** ART = antiretroviral therapy, BP = blood pressure, EHR = electronic health record, HIV = human immunodeficiency virus, IS = implementation science, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, RCT = randomized controlled trial
## Mobile-Health Single Component

Table D.5. Characteristics of included studies: mHealth single component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Setting</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Age (Mean)</th>
<th>Sex (% Female)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chronic Condition</th>
<th>Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony, 2019 (31456465)</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinic TX</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino HIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text appointment reminders (mHealth)</td>
<td>14 months</td>
<td>Patient Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care</td>
<td>Change in clinic follow-up adherence rates</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, 2019 (30959858)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Clinic SC</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45 years</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino Hypertension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile app medication adherence (mHealth)</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>Patient + Health Professional</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes</td>
<td>Changes in clinic based systolic blood pressure</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denizard-Thompson, 2020 (32381556)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Clinic NC</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>57 years</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>White 57%, African American 38%, Hispanic 2% Cancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision aid, guided patient self-ordering of tests, follow-up electronic message reminders (mHealth)</td>
<td>24 weeks</td>
<td>Patient Provider/Clinician</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care</td>
<td>Chart-verified completion of a colorectal cancer screening test within 24 weeks</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortmann, 2017 (28600309)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>FQHC CA</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>48 years</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino Hypertension, Diabetes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivational, educational, and/or call-to-action text messages (mHealth)</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Patient Researcher/Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes</td>
<td>HbA1c (primary), lipids, blood pressure, BMI</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Study Location (State)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Intervention Target</td>
<td>Intervention Delivery</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Harms</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller, 2017</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>2386</td>
<td>47 years</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native Cancer</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Three culturally tailored text messages one month apart 12 months Patient + System</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Screening uptake</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteley, 2021</td>
<td>Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>Other MS</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Black/African American 85.5, Hispanic/Latinx 6% HIV NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>iPhone gaming adherence intervention (mHealth) 24 weeks Patient Other</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Adherence</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** BMI = body mass index, FQHC = federally qualified health center, HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin, NR = not reported, RCT = randomized controlled trial
### Other Single Component

Table D.6. Characteristics of included studies: other single component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amornsiripanitch, 2022 (342666693)</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>Electronic worklist for mammography screening 9 months Health Professional + System Researcher/Admin</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care Turnaround time (primary), diagnostic exam, and time to tissue sampling</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, 2020 (33416742)</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>Communication skills training, screening 10 months Patient + Health Professional + System Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Head-to-head</td>
<td>Process of care CRC screening completion within six months of recommendation, participant knowledge, and documentation of CRC screening recommendation</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, 2021 (33410359)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Screening outreach events 3 years Patient Multiple</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care Prostate screening decision, knowledge improvement</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Study Location (State)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Sample Size Description</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egede, 2017&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt; (28581821) RCT Clinic SC</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>55 years</td>
<td>81% Black, 75%, White 21% Diabetes</td>
<td>Telehealth monitoring device with a case manager (mHealth)</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Patient + Health Professional Provider/ Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes HbA1c</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggly, 2017&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt; (28073615) QI Hospital MI</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57 years</td>
<td>90% Black Cancer</td>
<td>Communication coach, communication guide booklet</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Patient + Health Professional Provider/ Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care</td>
<td>Observational measures: patient active participation, oncologist-Patient talk time ratio, oncologist patient-centereded communication (primary), self-reported measures: patient-centerededness, patient role in treatment decisions, patient trust in oncologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, 2019&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt; (3571190) RCT Clinic TX</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>48 years</td>
<td>65% White 49%, Asian 27%, Black 16% Cancer</td>
<td>Mailings with monetary incentive to increase screening</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Patient Provider/ Clinician</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care</td>
<td>Completion of any colorectal cancer screening (primary), FIT or colonoscopy completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman, 2017&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt; (28001305) RCT Clinic TX</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57 years</td>
<td>70% African American Cancer</td>
<td>Patient entertainment-education</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Patient Provider/ Clinician</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care</td>
<td>Ordered screening test, completed screening at 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Intervention Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kranker, 2018[^9] (28279086) RCT FQHC MS</td>
<td>544 NR</td>
<td>28 years</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Hypertension, Diabetes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Financial incentives for weight loss, medication compliance and physical activity</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laiyemo, 2019[^10] (31478919) RCT Clinic DC</td>
<td>399 58 years</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Peer navigation, screening</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Peer/Lay Community Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loi, 2017[^11] (27817180) RCT Clinic Unclear</td>
<td>221 55 years</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino Cancer, mental health</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Self-administered stress management intervention</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Patient + System</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyles, 2019[^12] (30850461) RCT Public Health System CA</td>
<td>93 54 years</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>White 39%, Black 29%, Asian or PI 14%, Hispanic 12%, 6%</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Online video curriculum</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Researcher/Admin Multiple</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Study Location (State)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2017(^5) (27623103) Non-RCT Clinic CA</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>60 years</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>African American 36%, Hispanic 13%, Asian or PI 3%, Unspecified Cancer NR</td>
<td>Opportunity to &quot;fast track&quot; to an endoscopy appointment on short notice</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care Screening uptake NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehranbod, 2019(^4) (31820116) RCT Clinic CA</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>57 years</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Latino 70%, African American 30% Diabetes NR</td>
<td>Automated telephone reminder system 7 weeks</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Care utilization Show Rates for Diabetic Retinopathy Screening NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noya, 2020(^\text{\textregistered}) (32114939) NonRCT Clinic CA</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>54 years</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino NR</td>
<td>Culturally tailored shared medical appointment program 6 months Patient + Health Professional + System Multiple</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcome HbA1c (primary), LDL, BP NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payan, 2020 (&lt;a href=&quot;#&quot; target=&quot;_blank&quot;&gt;32449396&lt;/a&gt;) RCT Hospital CA</td>
<td>240 52 years 100% Hispanic/Latino Cancer NR</td>
<td>Group 1 (CUIDARSE brochure) received the formatively developed Spanish-language breast health brochure featuring four fictional narratives from Latinas with varying BC risk levels; For Group 2 (CHW-delivered CUIDARSE brochure), a CHW verbally reviewed content from the CUIDARSE brochure in a 15-20 minute session 3 months</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care Knowledge, perceived susceptibility, self-efficacy NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritchie, 2019 (&lt;a href=&quot;#&quot; target=&quot;_blank&quot;&gt;29986597&lt;/a&gt;) Observational-Cohort Hospital CO</td>
<td>1140 48 years 77.5% Hispanic 58.9%, non-Hispanic white 21.5%, non-Hispanic black 19.8% Diabetes NR</td>
<td>The National Diabetes Prevention Program (NDPP): lifestyle intervention 1 year</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care Duration &amp; intensity of NDPP attendance, weight loss NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roussi, 2018 (&lt;a href=&quot;#&quot; target=&quot;_blank&quot;&gt;28810355&lt;/a&gt;) RCT Clinic PA</td>
<td>128 47 years 0% African American 52%, Caucasian 48% Cancer NR</td>
<td>Cognitive–affective preparation 6 months</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care Knowledge NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz, 2021&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt; (34505886) Observational-Cohort FQHC IL</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Individualized breast cancer risk estimate 13 months</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care Mammography rate NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seible, 2021&lt;sup&gt;60&lt;/sup&gt; (3571782) RCT Community-based CA</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Patient-provider language concordance, the same physicians speaking Spanish directly to the patient</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Patient experience Satisfaction NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapiro, 2020&lt;sup&gt;61&lt;/sup&gt; (31515735) RCT FQHC CA</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>(Group 1) a combination of fixed payments, contingent payments, and lotteries; (Group 2) $20 at each study visit 6 months</td>
<td>Comparative effectiveness</td>
<td>Process of care Systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdez, 2018&lt;sup&gt;62&lt;/sup&gt; (27573420) RCT Clinic CA</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>Interactive multimedia cervical cancer education 6 months</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Care utilization Self-reported cervical cancer screening, knowledge, attitude NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyatt, 2020&lt;sup&gt;61&lt;/sup&gt; (33252951) Pre-post Community-based CA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Couples-based behavioral HIV prevention</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care Condom use NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 years</td>
<td>3 months Patient Provider/Clinician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49% African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIV NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali, 2019&lt;sup&gt;64&lt;/sup&gt; (31662806) Pre-post Clinic NY</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Group education and asthma control program</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Care utilization; avoidable hospital admission; Number of patients requiring ER visits and hospital admission before and after intervention (primary), asthma control, requirement for systemic steroids</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 years</td>
<td>27 months Patient + Health professional Provider/Clinician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75% Hispanic 75%, African American 25%, 2% other, unspecified Asthma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** BMI = body mass index, BP = blood pressure, CRC = Colorectal cancer, FIT = fecal immunochemical test, FQHC = federally qualified health center, HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin, IS = implementation science, LDL = low-density lipoprotein, NDPP = National diabetes prevention program, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, QI = quality improvement, QoL = Quality of life, RCT = randomized controlled trial

**Patient Education**

Table D.7. Characteristics of included studies: patient education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Study Location (State)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calderon-Mora, 2020&lt;sup&gt;65&lt;/sup&gt; (31455085) RCT Community-based TX</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>44 years</td>
<td>100% Hispanic/Latino Cancer NR</td>
<td>Patient education, screening</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Patient Community Health Worker</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Care Utilization Self-reported cervical cancer screening at 4 months (primary), a comparison of change scores in constructs from the HBM, TRA, and SCT NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao, 2017&lt;sup&gt;66&lt;/sup&gt; (28035649) Observational-Cohort Clinic FL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50 years</td>
<td>85% African American 78%, Asian 11%, Hispanic 11% Cancer NR</td>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Patient Researcher/Admin</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Knowledge, perceived risk for developing melanoma, and skin self-examination practices (primary) NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy, 2019&lt;sup&gt;67&lt;/sup&gt; (29177920) RCT FQHC FL</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>56 years</td>
<td>56% White 67%, Black 26%, Other, unspecified 7% Cancer NR</td>
<td>Patient education</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Awareness, health beliefs NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dougherty, 2021&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt; (33638816) Observational-Cohort Hospital OH</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>48 years</td>
<td>0% African American Cancer NR</td>
<td>Culturally tailored education</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient Researcher/Admin</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care Knowledge assessment NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming, 201869 (29309089) RCT FQHC CA</td>
<td>3415</td>
<td>60 years</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>White 33%, Asian 25%, Hispanic 22%, African American 20% Cancer NR</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopp, 202070 (32483634) RCT Clinic GA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60 years</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>African American Hepatitis NR</td>
<td>Hepatitis</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In person conversation, telephone, or letter about screening 12 months Patient Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Care utilization FIT returns NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and counseling, online survey tool 12 weeks Patient Researcher/Admin</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Treatment adherence measured through number of clinic visits attended, number of refill completed, and number of lab tests completed (primary), difference in treatment response (RVR and SVR) between control and intervention groups NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawl, 2021&lt;sup&gt;71&lt;/sup&gt; (33549682) RCT Clinic IN, KY</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>Computer-tailored intervention assessed a participant’s perceived risk, benefits and barriers to CRC screening, age, gender and family history in real time followed by tailored messages to support development of beliefs that would be most aligned with a decision to screen for CRC</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care Screening uptake</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeway, 2022&lt;sup&gt;72&lt;/sup&gt; (4320856) RCT Clinic AZ</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>Patient education Bilingual written and interpersonal education to increase mammography's participation and initiating screening</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care; MBD knowledge, awareness (primary), talking to provider about MBD and initiating screening</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tong, 2017&lt;sup&gt;73&lt;/sup&gt; (27564924) RCT Community-based CA</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>CRC education 3 months</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care; care utilization Changes in self-reported ever-screening, up-to-date CRC screening</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Warner, 2019 
(30306449) | 318 NR 79% (21% other gender) Hispanic/Latino Cancer NR | Two promotora-led (lay health educator) educational sessions delivered over the telephone, in person at a location selected by the participant, or at one of the local businesses 13 months Patient Peer/Lay community outreach | Pre-post | Process of care Knowledge, adherence NR | Mixed | Yes | NR | Yes | Multiple |
| Waterman, 2019 
(31227225) | 561 54 years 51% Black 72% Other CC NR | Patient education (Group 1): Explore Transplant at Home patient-guided, 4 modules of KT education sent directly to patients using print, video, and text messages; (Group 3): Explore Transplant at Home educator-guided, the patient-guided intervention plus 4 telephonic discussions with an educator 8 months Patient Peer/Lay community outreach | Standard/usual care | Process of care Patient knowledge (primary), deceased donor kidney transplantation attitude, living donor kidney transplantation attitude NR | Positive | No | NR | NR | Government |

**Abbreviations:** CC = chronic condition, CRC = Colorectal cancer, ER = Emergency room, FIT = fecal immunochemical test, FQHC = federally qualified health center, HBM = Health belief model, KT = kidney transplantation, MBD = Metastatic bone disease, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, RCT = randomized controlled trial, RVR = rapid virologic response, SCT = Social cognitive theory, SVR = sustained virologic response, TRA = Theory of reasoned action,
### Patient Navigation

**Table D.8. Characteristics of included studies: patient navigation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Setting</th>
<th>Study Location (State)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Age (Mean)</th>
<th>Sex (% Female)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chronic Condition</th>
<th>Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Intervention Description Duration</th>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apter, 2020⁷⁶ (32673877) RCT Clinic PA</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>51 years</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66% African American, 24% White, 8% Hispanic Asthma NR</td>
<td>Patient navigation</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient Patient Navigator (employee)</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Asthma control (primary), asthma-related quality of life; yearly rate of ED visits, hospitalizations and prednisone bursts</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No NR Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castaldi, 2017⁷⁷ (27357461) Hospital Observational-Cohort NY</td>
<td>Hospital Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>57 years</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>African American 45%, Hispanic 38.5%, Asian 8%, White 8.5% Cancer NR</td>
<td>Patient Navigator</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient Patient Navigator (employee)</td>
<td>Standard/Usual Care</td>
<td>Process of care Compliance with care plan (primary), time to treatment</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes NR Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colson, 2020⁷⁸ (32385678) RCT Clinic NY</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>35 years</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Black HIV NR</td>
<td>Peer navigation, support groups, text message reminders</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient Peer/Lay Community Outreach</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Medication adherence</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes NR Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrigan, 2017⁷⁹ (28093056) RCT Public Health System IL</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Public Health System</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52 years</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>African American Mental Health NR</td>
<td>Peer navigation</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient Peer/Lay Community Outreach</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes General health status, psychological experience of physical health, recovery</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No NR Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Intervention Target</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cunningham, 2018  
(29769078)  
RCT  
Clinic  
CA  |          | 356  
40 years  
0% (15% other gender)  
Black 45%, Hispanic 29%, White 26% HIV NR | Peer navigation  
12 months  
Patient  
Patient Navigator (employee) | Standard/usual care | Process of care; care utilization; clinical outcomes  
Viral suppression, linkage to care, retention to HIV care (primary), Current ART use, retention and adherence knowledge, physical health, mental health NR | Positive | Yes | NR | NR | Government |
| DeGroff, 2017  
(28676254)  
RCT  
Hospital  
MA  |          | 843  
55 years  
56% Hispanic 40%, Black 40%, White 15%, other, unspecified 5% Cancer | Bilingual lay navigators provided individualized education  
6 months  
Patient  
Patient Navigator (employee) | Standard/usual care | Process of care  
Colonoscopy within 6 months NR | Positive | Yes | NR | NR | Government |
| DuHamel, 2020  
(31742670)  
RCT  
Hospital  
NY  |          | 304  
60 years  
62% Hispanic/Latino Cancer | Patient navigation, CDC print materials, culturally target materials for Latinos  
12 months  
Patient  
Patient Navigator (employee) | Head-to-Head | Process of care  
Screening colonoscopy NR | No effect | No | NR | NR | Government |
| Fang, 2017  
(27869293)  
RCT  
Community-based  
PA, NJ  |          | 705  
53 years  
100% Asian Cancer | Culturally relevant cancer education program, patient navigation  
12 months  
Patient | Standard/usual care | Equity of service  
Cervical cancer screening in the 12 months (primary), assessment of navigation services NR | Positive | No | NR | NR | Foundation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Setting</th>
<th>Study Location (State)</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category Outcomes Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horny, 2017&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (29162073)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Patient navigation</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care; clinical outcomes; care utilization</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, 2018&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (29131316)</td>
<td>1834 patients, 32 churches</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Interactive group education, patient navigation, and the engagement of health care providers, church leadership and church members in the medical field</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Proportion screened for HBV (primary), difference in HBV vaccination completion rates</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, 2017&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (28812930)</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Patient (community) and provider education, immunochemical fecal occult blood test (iFOBT) distribution, and patient navigation</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care Screening uptake (primary), cancer detected</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description Duration</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menon, 2020(^{a7}) (31676898)</td>
<td>345 NR 65% Hispanic/Latino Cancer NR</td>
<td>Group education, patient navigation 12 months Patient + System Community health workers</td>
<td>Head-to-head</td>
<td>Care utilization; process of care Scheduling a clinic appointment, and completion of CRC screening NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman, 2022(^{a8}) (35081762) RCT Community-based AZ</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>RCT Community-based AZ</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>RCT Community-based AZ</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>RCT Community-based AZ</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>RCT Community-based AZ</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>RCT Community-based AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molina, 2018(^{a9}) (28933653) RCT Hospital IL</td>
<td>2536 59 years 100% African American Cancer NR</td>
<td>Patient Navigation 2 years Patient Patient Navigator (employee)</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Adherence to initial referral and time to a definitive diagnosis (cancer/not cancer) NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuland, 2017(^{a10}) (28505217) RCT Community-based NC, NM</td>
<td>265 59 years 85% Latino 62%, non-Latino white 15%, non-Latino Black or mixed race 23% Cancer NR</td>
<td>Combination decision aid plus patient navigation NR Patient Peer navigator</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care CRC screening NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rovner, 2023(^{a11}) (36745390) NonRCT Hospital PA</td>
<td>200 67 years 75% Black Diabetes NR</td>
<td>Diabetes education and behavior activation, telehealth visits with a diabetes nurse educator and primary care physicians, and clinical pharmacist recommendations 12 months Patient Multiple</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes ED visits, glycemic control, PIMs use, diabetes self-management, diabetes self-efficacy, depression, and medical trust</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singal, 2017&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt; (27825963) RCT</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>(Group 1) mailed outreach invitations for screening ultrasound; (Group 2) mailed screening outreach plus patient navigation 2 years</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care; screening participation (primary), time-to-response to outreach activities NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stitzer, 2018&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt; (29883190) RCT</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Project HOPE: (Group 1) patient navigation; (Group 2) patient navigation plus financial incentives 6 months</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care; HIV care visits, verification of active HIV medication prescription NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai, 2022&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt; (32880868) Pre-post</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Patient navigator to provide emotional support, education, translation, and assistance with medical bills and doctor’s appointments 12 months</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care; clinical outcomes; patient experience of care Follow-up appointment adherence, psychosocial outcomes, satisfaction with navigator NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thom, 2018³⁵ (30130430) RCT NR CA</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Health coaching 9 months Patient Peer/Lay community outreach</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes QoL, dyspnea domain score (primary), Number of COPD exacerbations, exercise capacity, self-efficacy of COPD management NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, 2021⁸⁶ (32700217) Vaughan, 2022⁸⁷ (35132555) Vaughan, 2020³⁶ (30839244) Vaughan, 2017³⁷ (29047326) RCT Clinic TX</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>TIME: Telehealth-Supported, Integrated Community Health Workers, Medication-Access 12 months Patient + System Multiple</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcome HbA1c (primary), BP, BMI, Weight, adherence NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** ART = Antiretroviral therapy, BMI = body mass index, BP = blood pressure, CDC = centers for disease control, COPD = Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, CRC = Colorectal cancer, ED = Emergency department, HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin, HBV = Hepatitis B virus, HIV = human immunodeficiency virus, IS = implementation science, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, QoL = Quality of life, RCT = randomized controlled trial
## Prevention/Lifestyle Support

**Table D.9. Characteristics of included studies: prevention/lifestyle support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category Outcomes</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, 2018(^{(0)}) (28279084) Pre-post Community-based TN</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Church Health Center’s Diabetic Obesity Weight Loss Pilot Program-Healthy Living (CHC-HL) 18 months Patient Multiple</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes BMI, HbA1c, blood pressure, cholesterol, triglycerides (primary), changes in self-reported outcomes NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachhuber, 2017(^{(1)}) (29212532) IS FQHC NY</td>
<td>9119</td>
<td>Alcohol Screening and Brief Intervention, screening 1 year Patient + Health Professional Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care Documentation of screening, screening positive for unhealthy drinking, and documentation of BI provision NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow, 2017(^{(2)}) (28127808) RCT Hospital MI</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>Virtual health counseling 12 months Patient Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Drug use at 6 and 12 months (primary), weighted drug-days and days of marijuana use NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, 2022 (35849139)</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>Telehealth diabetes prevention lifestyle program 6 weeks – 6 months</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Patient experience of care Acceptability of behavior change techniques, acceptability of program components, and perceived success NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castaneda, 2018 (28634873)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(1): opportunistic clinic visit &quot;in-reach&quot; intervention; (2): system-level &quot;outreach&quot; intervention 1 year Patient + Health Professional + System CHW</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care Screening uptake (primary), and guideline appropriate follow-up NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daumit, 2020 (32530472)</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Health coach and nurse counseling, care coordination 18 months</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Change in the risk of cardiovascular disease from the global Framingham Risk Score NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson-Rose, 2017 (29229000)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Computer-administered or clinician-administered SBIRT 6 months</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Specific Substance Involvement Scores NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fung, 2018(^{107}) (29578592) RCT Clinic CA</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>Education seminars (2 months Patient Researcher/Admin)</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care Changes in knowledge, attitudes, and screening completion/intent</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lim, 2019(^{108}) (31807731) NonRCT Community-based NY</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Facilitated group sessions (nutrition/cooking, physical activity, stress management, healthcare consultations) (6 months Patient Community health worker)</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care Weight, BMI, Physical Activity, diet, blood pressure and health self-efficacy (primary), cholesterol, glucose, diabetes knowledge</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutes, 2017(^{109}) (28660719) RCT Community-based NC</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Phone-based education (12 months Patient Community health worker)</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes; process of care Change between groups in HbA1c, weight and blood pressure (primary), self-reported empowerment, diabetes self-efficacy scale, medication adherence, self-care</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer, 2019(^{110}) (31441328) RCT Community-based NY</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Patient education (6 months Patient Peer/Lay Community Outreach)</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Achieved 5% weight loss, reduced probability of developing diabetes over the next 7.5 years</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Study Location (State)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel-Hodge, 2022111 (35422132) Pre-post FQHC NC</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>FQHC NC</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>57 years</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic Black 87.4%, Non-Hispanic white 9.9% Cardiovascular disease NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>The CHANGE Intervention: A CHW-delivered, low-intensity, 4-month behavioral lifestyle intervention promoting a southern-style Mediterranean dietary pattern and physical activity NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider, 2021112 (33306562) RCT Other IL</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>Black 0% (6% trans/feminine) HIV NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>The intervention is composed of 2 parts: (1) a half-day, small group training workshop led by intervention staff and (2) a series of check-in calls (or “boosters”) between intervention staff and participants 110 weeks</td>
<td>Patient Researcher/Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Study Location</td>
<td>Sample Size Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intervention Description Duration</td>
<td>Intervention Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulz, 2017 (27357203)</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>47 years</td>
<td>90% Latino 35.2%, Non-Latino Black 60.5%, Non-Latino white 0.7%; Other (unspecified) 3.6% Cardiovascular disease NR</td>
<td>Walk Your Heart to Health (WYHH)</td>
<td>32 weeks</td>
<td>Patient Peer/Lay Community Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolley, 2017 (28628363)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>58 years</td>
<td>100% African American Cancer NR</td>
<td>Moving Forward: Interventionist-guided weight loss program supporting behavioral changes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Patient Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, 2018 (29428830)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>58 years</td>
<td>100% African American Other CC NR</td>
<td>(Group 1): supervised facility-based exercise intervention; (Group 2): home-based exercise intervention</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Patient NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Study Location (State)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor, 2018 <a href="29527972">16</a></td>
<td>Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>55 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, 2021 <a href="33957271">17</a> Polomoff, 2022 <a href="34838475">18</a> Wagner, 2022 <a href="36307274">19</a></td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>56 years</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi, 2019 <a href="31400096">20</a></td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>NY, NJ</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>55 years</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** BI = brief intervention, BMI = body mass index, CC = chronic condition, CHW = Community health workers, HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin, FQHC = federally qualified health center, HRQoL = Health-related quality of life, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, PrEP = pre-exposure prophylaxis, RCT = randomized controlled trial, SBIRT = Specific substance involvement score
## Self-Management Support

### Table D.10. Characteristics of included studies: self-management support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category Outcomes</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applegate, 2021 (33443695)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Project ACTIVE: designed to provide personalized and patient-centered preventive care in a busy urban ambulatory clinic</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Change in number of unfulfilled preventive care goals from the 12 USPSTF grade A and B recommendations, and gain in estimated life expectancy</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben-Zeev, 2018 (29793397)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>FOCUS: a multimodal, smartphone-delivered intervention for people with serious mental illness that includes three components-FOCUS application (app), clinician dashboard, and mHealth support specialist</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcome; process of care; patient experience of care Engagement, satisfaction, and general psychopathology</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouchard, 2019\textsuperscript{123} (30285186) RCT Clinic IL</td>
<td>181 68 years 0% White 56%, Black 39%, Hispanic 3%, Asian 1% Cancer NR</td>
<td>Cognitive behavioral stress management 12 months Patient Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Patient experience of care Participant engagement and acceptability of tablet-delivered CBSM NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No NR Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulware, 2020\textsuperscript{124} (31705466) RCT Clinic MD</td>
<td>159 57 years 74% African American Hypertension NR</td>
<td>Disease management support, home BP monitor 12 months Patient Community Health Worker</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes BP control (JNC-7) (primary), BP change NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No NR Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruhl, 2020\textsuperscript{125} (32151753) RCT Clinic TX</td>
<td>263 NR NR Black Asthma NR</td>
<td>Disease management support via telephone and guidebook 12 months Patient + Health professional Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care; care utilization; clinical outcomes Asthma control (ACT), asthma quality of life (MiniAQLQ), and ED visits over the previous 12 months NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No NR Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabral, 2018\textsuperscript{126} (29306990) Observational-Cohort Clinic FL, NY</td>
<td>348 39 years 26% African American 52%, Hispanic 44%, Other, unspecified 4% HIV NR</td>
<td>Peer Navigation + education 12 months Patient Peer/Lay Community Outreach</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Care utilization; clinical outcomes Retention in care and viral suppression at 12 months NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No NR Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Study Location</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cene 2017(^{127}) (27886435)</td>
<td>Primary Care Practices</td>
<td>Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>58 years</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>African American 54%, White 56%</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Phone coaching/BP monitoring at home 24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dang, 2017(^{128}) (28051357)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55 years</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>White 75%, Black 25%</td>
<td>Cardiovascular disease</td>
<td>Mobile phone-assisted case management 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daugherty, 2021(^{129}) (34913976)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>60 years</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Black 55%, White 45%</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Writing exercise delivered immediately prior to a clinic appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eck, 2021(^{130}) (34264812)</td>
<td>QI</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>58 years</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Black 65%, Hispanic 30%</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Patient education 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egede, 2017(^{131}) (28337686)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>53 years</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>African American Diabetes</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Telephone-delivered behavior skills 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D-39
<p>| Study (PMID) | Sample Size Age (Mean) | Sex (% Female) | Race/Ethnicity | Chronic Condition | Intervention Description Duration | Intervention Target | Comparison Description | Outcome Category Outcomes | Effect Code for Primary Outcome | Community Involvement (Yes/No) | Applicability (Yes/No) | Sustainability (Yes/No) | Funding |
|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|
| Ell, 2017 [132] (28684357) Oh, 2018 [133] (29588293) RCT Clinic CA | 348 | 56 years 85% Hispanic/Latino Mental health, diabetes NR | Bilingual promotoras, psychoeducational sessions 12 months | Patient + Health Professional Community Health Worker | Standard/usual care Process of care; clinical outcomes | | | | | | | | | |
| Hazard Vallerand, 2018 [134] (29466352) RCT Clinic MI | 310 | 55 years 85% African American Cancer NR | Nurse-delivered home and telephone intervention 12 weeks | Patient Provider/Clinician | Standard/usual care | | | | | | | | | | |
| Heisler, 2019 [135] (31027477) RCT Hospital MI | 300 | 63 years 9% Black 62%, White 36% Diabetes NR | Peer coaching, weekly phone calls 12 months | Patient Peer/Lay Community Member | Head-to-Head | | | | | | | | | | |
| Heitkemper, 2017 [136] (29059017) RCT FQHC NY | 220 | 51 years 67 % Hispanic 52%, African American 42% Diabetes NR | Health education via mailings, monetary and lottery incentives 12 months | Patient + System Researcher/Admin | Standard/usual care | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hightow-Weidman, 2021 [137] (33740213) RCT Clinic FL, IL, NY, LA, NC | 146 | 21 years 0% Black 80%, White 13% HIV NR | Behavioral intervention mobile app 39 weeks | Patient Patient Navigator (employee) | Head-to-Head | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levy, 2018(^{138}) (29555621) IS Clinic NY</td>
<td>113 50 years 45.1% Hispanic/Latino Diabetes NR</td>
<td>Mobile Insulin Titration (MITI) program: text-based insulin titration program into real-world settings 12 weeks Patient + System Multiple</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care; clinical outcome; care utilization MITI program outcomes, MITI clinical outcomes, MITI process outcomes, percentage providers making at least one referral, MITI patient satisfaction, and MITI program feedback NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, 2019(^{139}) (30239620) RCT Clinic IL</td>
<td>121 24 years 0% Latino 35%, Black 29%, Asian 9% HIV NR</td>
<td>Multicomponent behavioral change using SMS and interactive online content 9 months Patient Other</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Change in retention and medication adherence (primary), acceptability and use of PrEFmate NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, 2019(^{140}) (30963440) RCT Community-based IL</td>
<td>211 55 years 70% African American Diabetes NR</td>
<td>Culturally tailored lifestyle improvement through food and exercise 18 months Patient Multiple</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Difference in change in HbA1c at 12 months (primary), improvements in nutrition knowledge, diet quality, physical activity and medication adherence; hospitalizations, ER visits during study NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{138}\) Levy, 2018; \(^{139}\) Liu, 2019; \(^{140}\) Lynch, 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Setting</th>
<th>Study Location (State)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Age (Mean)</th>
<th>Sex (% Female)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chronic Condition</th>
<th>Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maly, 2017&lt;sup&gt;141&lt;/sup&gt; (28418767)</td>
<td>Mixed-method</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>53 years</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino Cancer</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Individually tailored treatment summary and survivorship care plan, in-person counseling</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Patient + Health Professional Multiple</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Process of care Physician implementation of specific recommendations for each survivorship care need identified for each participant, patient adherence to recommended survivorship care up to the 12-month interview</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayberry, 2017&lt;sup&gt;142&lt;/sup&gt; (27595710)</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50 years</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Black/African American 88%, Hispanic/Latino 7%, Other (unspecified) 6% Diabetes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>MEssaging for Diabetes (MED): includes daily text messages and weekly automated calls using interactive voice response (IVR) technology</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Patient Researcher/Admin</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes HbA1c</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menon, 2022&lt;sup&gt;143&lt;/sup&gt; (34895775)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>OH, AZ</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47 years</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino Diabetes, mental health</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Health coaching phone calls and in-person visits</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Patient Patient Navigator (employee)</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Decreased HBA1c, anxiety and depression (primary), increased self-efficacy</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, 2017(^{144}) (28182863)</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Peer Support for Achieving Independence in Diabetes (Peer-AID): low-intensity CHW diabetes self-management intervention in which a local health department provided CHW services to a community health center, public hospital, and US Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) hospital</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes, care utilization, healthcare utilization</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, 2021(^{145}) (34424331)</td>
<td>53 years</td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Community health worker</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 45.6%, Black 26.5%, AI/AN 6%, Asian 5.7%, Multiracial 7%; Other (unspecified) 9.2%</td>
<td>Interventions and intersectional features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patel, 2021¹⁴⁷ (34468691) RCT Other PA</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>59 years 69.6% Black 66.2%, white 22.8%, other (unspecified) 11% Cardiovascular disease NR</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Novel Use of Gamification With Alternative Goal-setting Experience (ENGAGE): All participants used a wearable device to track daily steps, established a baseline level, and were then randomly assigned to an attention control or 1 of 4 gamification interventions that varied only on how daily step goals were set (self-chosen or assigned) and implemented (immediately or gradually)</td>
<td>24 weeks Patient Other</td>
<td>Process of care Changes in daily steps (9-16 weeks) (primary), change in daily steps (baseline to 8 week follow-up) NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No NR</td>
<td>NR Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekmezaris, 2019¹⁴⁸ (30418101) RCT Hospital NY</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>60 years 43% Black 69%, Hispanic 31% Cardiovascular disease NR</td>
<td>Telehealth self-monitoring (TSM); TSM comprised two main components: (1) daily vital signs self-monitoring and (2) weekly telehealth visits between the patient and the research nurse coordinator</td>
<td>90 days Patient Researcher/Admin</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes; care utilization Avoidable hospital admission ED visits, hospitalization, depression, anxiety NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes NR</td>
<td>NR Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category Outcomes</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presley, 2020 (^{109}) (32700215) RCT Hospital AL</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Self-management support Community-based diabetes self-management education (DSME) plus mobile health (mHealth)–enhanced peer support intervention</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes HbA1c (primary), diabetes distress, depressive symptoms, self-efficacy</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao, 2018 (^{150}) (29528941) Observational-Cohort HIV clinic IL, AL</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>UNITY Workshops: an African American woman living with HIV (i.e., a peer) serving as the primary facilitator 1 year</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care HIV-related stigma, social support</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevelius, 2022 (^{111}) (35502891) RCT Community-based CA</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Healthy Divas consists of 6 peer-led individual sessions, held weekly, and one group workshop facilitated by a healthcare provider with expertise in HIV care and trans health</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care Engagement in HIV care</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Study Location (State)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>Sex (% Female)</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinberg, 2019&lt;sup&gt;152&lt;/sup&gt; (30905430)</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>51 years</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic Black 51%, Non-Hispanic White 30%, Hispanic 13%, Non-Hispanic other (unspecified) 6%</td>
<td>Hypertension, Diabetes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Track: weight loss intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patient + System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process of care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DASH score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taber, 2018&lt;sup&gt;153&lt;/sup&gt; (30714026)</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59 years</td>
<td>42% African American 68%, Non-AA (unspecified) 32%</td>
<td>Cardiovascular disease</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process of care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CVD risk factor control (primary), acute rejections, hospitalizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED visits, graft loss death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner, 2018&lt;sup&gt;154&lt;/sup&gt; (30398955)</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>African American 79.1%, Latino 13.2%, multi-racial (unspecified) 6.6%, white 1.1%</td>
<td>HIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process of care; clinical outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in missed HIV care appointments, increases in viral load suppression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track: weight loss intervention</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient + System</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist-led, technology-aided, education intervention</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Patient + Health professional</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weCare: a social media intervention utilizing Facebook, texting, and GPS-based mobile social and sexual networking applications to improve HIV-related care engagement and health outcomes</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Steinberg, 2019&lt;sup&gt;152&lt;/sup&gt; (30905430) | RCT | Community-based | NC | 306 | 51 years | 69% | Non-Hispanic Black 51%, Non-Hispanic White 30%, Hispanic 13%, Non-Hispanic other (unspecified) 6% | Hypertension, Diabetes |
| | | | | | | | | Track: weight loss intervention |
| | | | | | | | | 12 months |
| | | | | | | | | Patient + System |
| | | | | | | | | Multiple |
| | | | | | | | | Standard/usual care |
| | | | | | | | | Process of care |
| | | | | | | | | DASH score |
| | | | | | | | | NR |
| Taber, 2018&lt;sup&gt;153&lt;/sup&gt; (30714026) | Pre-post | Clinic | SC | 60 | 59 years | 42% African American 68%, Non-AA (unspecified) 32% | Cardiovascular disease | NR |
| | | | | | | | | Pre-post |
| | | | | | | | | Process of care |
| | | | | | | | | CVD risk factor control (primary), acute rejections, hospitalizations |
| | | | | | | | | ED visits, graft loss death |
| | | | | | | | | NR |
| | | | | | | | | No effect |
| Tanner, 2018&lt;sup&gt;154&lt;/sup&gt; (30398955) | Pre-post | Hospital | NC | 91 | 25 years | NR | African American 79.1%, Latino 13.2%, multi-racial (unspecified) 6.6%, white 1.1% | HIV |
| | | | | | | | | Pre-post |
| | | | | | | | | Process of care; clinical outcomes |
| | | | | | | | | Reduction in missed HIV care appointments, increases in viral load suppression |
| | | | | | | | | NR |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Age (Mean)</th>
<th>Sex (% Female)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chronic Condition</th>
<th>Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Intervention Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, 2021(^{155})</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>56 years</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>A tablet-computer with survivor stories three times in 12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes</td>
<td>QoL (primary), depression, concerns about recurrence</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, 2018(^{156})</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>57 years</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Hispanic 78.4%, Non-Hispanic white 12.6%, Non-Hispanic Black 9%</td>
<td>Other CC</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>(Group 1): community arm, CHW delivered nine 1-hour group meetings were held at a local library every 2 weeks for 3 months, then monthly for 3 months; the same session was offered twice weekly; (Group 2): clinic arm, clinic health educator delivered six monthly one-on-one meetings for 30-45 min</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Community health worker</td>
<td>Comparative Effectiveness</td>
<td>Process of care</td>
<td>Five times sit-to-stand test (primary), Borg perceived effort test, patient-specific functional scale, Symbol-digit modalities test</td>
<td>6-minute walk test</td>
<td>Short-form survey, physical component summary</td>
<td>Fall; adverse events</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington-Plaskett, 2021 (33915812)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>H360x Intervention for Cardiovascular Disease Self-Management: web-based or mobile application and supports behavior change by providing functionality for improving health literacy and self-efficacy through built-in coaching support for accountability and problem solving</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Process of care LS7 score (e.g., smoking status, physical activity, weight, diet, blood glucose, cholesterol, and blood pressure) (primary), CVD risk variables</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** ACT = Asthma control test, ART = Antiretroviral therapy, BP = blood pressure, CBSM = Community-based service manual, CC = chronic condition, CVD = cardiovascular disease, ED = Emergency department, FQHC = federally qualified health center, HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin, HIV = human immunodeficiency virus, IS = implementation science, JNC-7 = The Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure, LS7 = Life’s simple 7, MiniAQLQ = Mini Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire, MITI = Mobile Insulin Titration, MODD = Mean of Daily Difference, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, QI = quality improvement, QoL = Quality of life, RCT = randomized controlled trial, SMS = short messaging service, USPSTF = United States Preventative Services Task Force
## System-Level Quality Improvement

### Table D.11. Characteristics of included studies: system level QI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Study Setting</th>
<th>Study Location (State)</th>
<th>Sample Size Age (Mean)</th>
<th>Sex (% Female)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chronic Condition Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Intervention Description Duration</th>
<th>Intervention Target</th>
<th>Intervention Delivery</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category Outcomes</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Applicability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Sustainability (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behling, 2023&lt;sup&gt;158&lt;/sup&gt; (36876238) QI FQHC SC</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>QI</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>45,498</td>
<td>58 years</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Black 67%, White 29% Hypertension NR</td>
<td>Monthly practice facilitation guided by a dashboard with process metrics 1 year</td>
<td>Patient + Health Professional + System Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Change in hypertension control (primary), measure act partner metrics</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, 2020&lt;sup&gt;159&lt;/sup&gt; (33213254) Observational-Cohort Hospital MD</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>63 years</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Black 56%, White 31%, Hispanic 6%, Asian 3%, Native American 0.5% Cardiovascular disease NR</td>
<td>Staff training coordination 2 years</td>
<td>Patient + System Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Avoidable hospital admission Mortality rate, major complication rate, and readmission rate NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement, 2019&lt;sup&gt;160&lt;/sup&gt; (31233329) Observational-Cohort FQHC NC</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Observational-Cohort</td>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>28 years 0%</td>
<td>Black 62%, White 19%, Latino 18% HIV NR</td>
<td>Patient education, medication counseling 2 years</td>
<td>Patient + Health Professional + System Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care Medication adherence rate NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cykert, 2020&lt;sup&gt;161&lt;/sup&gt; (33047340) RCT Clinic NC</td>
<td>146826</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>65 years 46%</td>
<td>White 65%, Black 24% Cardiovascular disease NR</td>
<td>A cardiovascular dashboard that included lists of risk stratified adults and their unmet treatment opportunities 1 year</td>
<td>Patient + System Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Change in 10-Year ASCVD Risk score among all patients with a baseline score ≥10 percent from baseline to 3 months post intervention NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Study Setting</td>
<td>Chronic Condition</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cykert, 2019162 (30714689) Cykert, 2020163 (30928088) QI Hospital NC, SC</td>
<td>3798 65 years 45% White 69%, Black 31%</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>QI</td>
<td>Cancer NR</td>
<td>A real-time warning system derived from EHR, race-specific feedback to clinical teams on treatment completion rates, and a nurse navigator 5 years</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Equity of service Receipt of curative treatment (primary), effects on surgery, and use of radiation NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontil, 2018164 (30002140) IS Public Health System CA</td>
<td>16000 61 years 50% Hispanic 30%, Asian 29%, Black 20%, White 15%</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Hypertension, cardiovascular disease NR</td>
<td>Care coordination, data tracking 12 months</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care BP control (primary), and medication plan compliance NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, 2018165 (29313223) Observational-Cohort Clinic MA</td>
<td>12555 65 years 50% Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Hypertension, cardiovascular disease</td>
<td>IT alerts to identify patients missing care goals, care coordination 6 months</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Improved LDL, and BP NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiser, 2020166 (33105224) QI FQHC AZ</td>
<td>137 NR 100% Hispanic/Latino NR</td>
<td>Components included: 1) team engagement (team meetings); 2) patient engagement via a tool on cervical cancer screening that was provided in both English and Spanish (an adaptation of the Ottawa Personal Decision Guide); 3) a WWHP eligibility screening and enrollment tool for registration staff that included updated registration guidelines and a WWHP registration log in which to record all women enrolled in the program; 4) and the implementation of a case log for case management 60 days</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care; care utilization Team engagement; pap tests; enrollment, and staff stress Staff stress</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, 2021167 (35609161) Mixed-method Clinic CA</td>
<td>298921 Black 16.4%, white 90.1% Hypertension NR</td>
<td>Clinical decision support tool 4 years</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Care utilization Thiazide use (primary), BP NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Applicability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Sustainability (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders, 2022&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6348 NR NR</td>
<td>Coaching quality improvement 18 months Patient + System Provider/ Clinician Multiple</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcome Hypertension control NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinbock, 2022&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>110775 NR NR</td>
<td>ECHO Collaborative: virtual communities of practice to measurably increase viral suppression rates in populations disproportionately affected by HIV 12 months Patient + System NR</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Clinical outcome; process of care Viral suppression rates, and gaps in viral suppression rates NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver, 2019&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>192 44 years 44, 3% unknown gender Black 54%, White 32%, Hispanic 8%, unknown (unspecified) 5% Diabetes NR</td>
<td>Patient navigation 6 months Patient + System Patient Navigator</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes; process of care No shows, and HbA1c NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker-Smith, 2020&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18 health professionals/146 patients NR 100% Hispanic Cancer NR</td>
<td>Implementing concurrent educational and clinic referral strategies in a primary care clinic 3 months Health professional + System Provider/ Clinician</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Process of care; care utilization Knowledge, and screening initiation NR</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations
ASCVD = Atherosclerotic Cardiovascular Disease, BP = blood pressure, FQHC = federally qualified health center, HbA1c = Glycated hemoglobin, IS = implementation science, LDL = low-density lipoprotein, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification Number, QI = quality improvement, RCT = randomized controlled trial, IT = information technology.

### Transition of Care

#### Table D.12. Characteristics of included studies: transition of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (PMID) Study Setting Study Location (State)</th>
<th>Sample Size Age (Mean) Sex (% Female) Race/Ethnicity Chronic Condition Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Intervention Description Duration Intervention Target Intervention Delivery</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Outcome Category Outcomes Harms</th>
<th>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</th>
<th>Community Involvement (Yes/No) Applicability (Yes/No) Sustainability (Yes/No) Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, 2019172 (31270786) Pre-post Nonprofit system TN</td>
<td>2235 59 years 58.6% Non-Hispanic Black 70%, other (unspecified) Hispanic 10%, Non-Hispanic White 20% Hypertension, diabetes, asthma, mental health, and other CC NR</td>
<td>SafeMed care transition model: emphasizes early identification and patient engagement in the hospital followed by intensive community-based follow-up for a minimum of 45 days after hospital discharge post-hospital care transition, care coordination and compliance with care plan 2 years Patient + System Hospital/community providers</td>
<td>Pre-post</td>
<td>Care utilization Avoidable hospital admission Primary care physician visits, hospitalization, ED visits, 30-day readmissions, and medical expenditure NR</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>No NR NR Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman, 2020173 (31541606) RCT Clinic NY</td>
<td>495 NR 57% Black 70%, Hispanic 30% Hypertension NR</td>
<td>Health coaching in home care 12 months Patient Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Standard/usual care</td>
<td>Clinical outcomes Systolic blood pressure NR</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No NR NR Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (PMID)</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Intervention Description</td>
<td>Comparison Description</td>
<td>Outcome Category</td>
<td>Effect Code for Primary Outcome</td>
<td>Community Involvement (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon, 201974 (30472318) RCT Hospital DC</td>
<td>223 dyads 50 years 42% African American HIV NR</td>
<td>Two sessions using the FACE advanced care planning 3 months Patient Provider/Clinician</td>
<td>Head-to-Head</td>
<td>Care utilization Advance directive completion and documentation in medical record NR</td>
<td>Positive NR NR Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: CC = chronic condition, ED = Emergency department, NR = not reported, PMID = PubMed Identification, RCT = randomized controlled trial
References for Appendix D


# Appendix E. Existing Evidence Reviews

Table E.1. Characteristics of evidence reviews on strategies to reduce racial and ethnic disparities and improve health outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</th>
<th>Individual Studies (K)</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Intervention(s)</th>
<th>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</th>
<th>Harms Applicability Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, 2022¹</td>
<td>To examine the existing literature for studies that have centered or substantively included Black and Hispanic diabetes patients in clinical trials to assess the effectiveness of telehealth interventions in improving glycemic control.</td>
<td>K=10 N range:17-637 African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino Diabetes NR</td>
<td>HbA1c</td>
<td>Telehealth interventions (telephone calls, text messages, web-based portals, virtual visits)</td>
<td>Telehealth interventions showed positive benefit in improving glycemic control among Black and Hispanic diabetes patients.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Inception - March 2021 USA Multiple RCT Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</th>
<th>Individual Studies (K)</th>
<th>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</th>
<th>US Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chronic Condition(s)</th>
<th>Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Intervention(s)</th>
<th>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeRosa, 2022 2001 - 2017 USA NR Multiple Yes</td>
<td>1. What decision navigation interventions, services, or programs are used to support the decision-making of racial and ethnic minority adults diagnosed with breast or prostate cancer? 2. Can decision navigation interventions and decision-making support improve overall survival and quality of life (QoL) among racial and ethnic minority adults with breast or prostate cancer? 3. Are health disparities or inequalities discussed among different racial and ethnic minority adults diagnosed with breast or prostate cancer who receive decision-support interventions or services?</td>
<td>K=10 N range:15-195 African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian Breast cancer, prostate cancer NR</td>
<td>QoL</td>
<td>Decision-making support interventions (decision aids, trained personnel, delivery models and frameworks, and educational materials)</td>
<td>Decision-making support interventions show positive benefit in improving patient-reported factors among racial and ethnic minorities.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K) Total Review Sample Size (N Range) US Race/Ethnicity Chronic Condition(s) Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms Applicability Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enyioha, 2020&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; Inception - 2020 105-USA NR RCT Yes</td>
<td>To provide a review of the evidence for mHealth and web-based interventions for diabetes and obesity in African American and Hispanic patients.</td>
<td>K=7 N range: 18-371 African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino Diabetes NR</td>
<td>BMI, weight change, waist circumference, HbA1C</td>
<td>M-Health and web-based interventions</td>
<td>Three studies reported positive benefits for weight loss. One study reported a positive benefit for glycemic control.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, 2022&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt; January 2015 - December 2020 USA NR NR No</td>
<td>To understand how studies have used electronic telecommunication technology to increase awareness, uptake, adherence, and persistence in PrEP care among Black and Hispanic/Latino persons and how it can reduce social structural barriers that contribute to disparities in HIV infection.</td>
<td>K=10 N range: 25-398 African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino HIV NR</td>
<td>Patient awareness, uptake, adherence, persistence</td>
<td>Telecommunication interventions (eHealth, telehealth, mHealth)</td>
<td>Telecommunication interventions showed mixed results.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms Applicability Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eze, 2022&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt; January 2016 - August 2021 USA NR Multiple No</td>
<td>1. In what ways do bias and discrimination influence outcomes of musculoskeletal pain management? 2. What interventions have been examined to reduce bias and discrimination in the management of musculoskeletal pain?</td>
<td>K=13  N range: NR  African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino Musculoskeletal conditions NR</td>
<td>Discrimination on pain and disability  Racial and/or ethnic concordance or discordance  Provider bias</td>
<td>Clinician education and perspective-taking, patient decision tools, and community outreach tools</td>
<td>Overall, interventions show positive benefit in reducing bias, discrimination and disparities in musculoskeletal pain outcomes. Mixed results were seen in provider-patient racial and/or ethnic concordance on pain outcomes.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, 2022&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt; Inception - November 2021 USA Community healthcare setting Multiple No</td>
<td>To improve one or more aspects of the PrEP care continuum among MSM in the US, by summarizing included studies and their socioecological mechanistic levels, implementation modalities (peer/couple-based, technology-assisted, social network, etc.), and which aspects of the PrEP cascade (e.g., initiation, uptake, and adherence) they targeted.</td>
<td>K=42  N range: NR  African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino HIV NR</td>
<td>PrEP uptake, adherence</td>
<td>PrEP regimen interventions, technology-assisted interventions, personalized interventions, peer-based interventions, couples-based interventions, social network interventions, community targeted interventions, healthcare/institution targeted interventions, multilevel interventions</td>
<td>PrEP regimen interventions show positive benefit. Technology-assisted interventions show positive benefit. Peer-based interventions show mixed results. Community-level interventions show positive benefit. Healthcare/institution-level interventions show mixed results. Multilevel interventions show positive benefit.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K) Total Review Sample Size (N Range) US Race/Ethnicity Chronic Condition(s) Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms Applicability Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aidoo-Frompong, 2021&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt; September 2019 - January 2020 USA NR Multiple No</td>
<td>To answer the research questions:  What are the cultural factors contributing to the high incidence of HIV among African immigrants? What are the contextually relevant approaches that have been used in HIV prevention efforts targeting this population?</td>
<td>K=17 N range: 14-1060 African American/Black HIV NR</td>
<td>Engagement in prevention behaviors</td>
<td>HIV testing, flexible scheduling, involvement of community leaders in intervention planning and implementation</td>
<td>Flexible scheduling show positive improvement in engagement.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifford, 2021&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt; Inception to March 2018 USA, Australia, Peru Multiple Yes</td>
<td>1. identify methodological approaches that have been used in cancer survivorship research. 2. Describe components of cancer survivorship interventions and the reported evidence on their relevance to Indigenous communities. 3. Examine outcomes of the interventions.</td>
<td>K=27 (21 US studies) N range: 24-401 American Indians/Alaska Natives (Indigenous Peoples)* Cancer NR</td>
<td>Screening, physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual outcomes</td>
<td>Community meetings, patient navigation, visual and performing arts, printed, online, or audio materials, healthcare provider education, support groups, telehealth</td>
<td>NR - Did not assess effectiveness.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>Study Design(s)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</td>
<td>US Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition(s)</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoong, 2021</td>
<td>USA, Spain, Australia, Germany, South Korea, United Kingdom, China, Chile</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>To describe the impact of mHealth interventions on blood pressure outcomes in populations with disparities in digital health use.</td>
<td>K=29 (16 US studies)</td>
<td>N range: 14-1182</td>
<td>African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino Asian (Korean American), Other*</td>
<td>Hypertension NR</td>
<td>Blood pressure, medication adherence, engagement, satisfaction</td>
<td>Mobile health strategies (text messaging, mobile applications)</td>
<td>Mobile health strategies show positive benefit in blood pressure, engagement and satisfaction. Mixed results seen in medication adherence.</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi, 2021</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Yes RCT</td>
<td>To evaluate the methods of cultural tailoring used in lifestyle interventions for T2D prevention or management for populations of Black African ancestry and to examine the effectiveness of such interventions on glycemic control.</td>
<td>K=16</td>
<td>N range: 46-604</td>
<td>African American/Black Diabetes NR</td>
<td>HbA1C</td>
<td>Culturally tailored/adapted lifestyle interventions for African American/Black communities</td>
<td>Culturally tailored/adapted lifestyle interventions show positive benefit for HbA1C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali, 2020↑</td>
<td>1) describe characteristics of community-based lifestyle interventions which have assessed changes in T2DM glucose and insulin indicators among ethnic South Asian Americans (SAAs) 2) evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions in improving T2DM glucose and insulin indicators.</td>
<td>K=8  N range: 9-2726 Asian (South Asian Americans) Diabetes NR</td>
<td>HbA1C</td>
<td>Community-based lifestyle interventions</td>
<td>Community-based lifestyle interventions show mixed results in HbA1C.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu, 2020↑</td>
<td>To examine the evidence for collaborative care for racial/ethnic minority adults in the United States in improving depression measures.</td>
<td>K=19  N range: 45-7010 Hispanic/Latino, African American/Black, Asian, American Indians/Alaska Native Mental health NR</td>
<td>Depression-related outcomes</td>
<td>Collaborative care models</td>
<td>Collaborative care models show positive benefit in improving depression for racial/ethnic minority patients.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</td>
<td>US Race/Ethnicity Chronic Condition(s)</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, 2019^13</td>
<td>To address what types of cancer screening interventions that target racial minority adults age 40 years or older are effective in increasing cancer screening uptake rates?</td>
<td>K=26</td>
<td>N range: 28-9575</td>
<td>African American/Black, Asian, Hispanic/Latino, American Indians/Alaska Native</td>
<td>Breast, cervical, colorectal, prostate cancer NR</td>
<td>Screening uptake</td>
<td>Community health workers, culturally tailored educational materials, peer testimony to increase cancer screening</td>
<td>The majority of interventions had positive benefit in cancer screening uptake.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luque, 2019^14</td>
<td>To identify and assess the rigor of recent effectiveness studies to test mammography screening educational interventions focused on U.S. Hispanic women.</td>
<td>K=5</td>
<td>N range: 371-1968</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>Breast cancer NR</td>
<td>Screening adherence</td>
<td>Interpersonal cancer education Promotora-led</td>
<td>Interpersonal cancer education interventions show low to moderate positive benefit in screening adherence.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Search Date</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>Study Design(s)</td>
<td>ROB</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</td>
<td>US Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition(s)</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, 2020</td>
<td>January 1996 - July 2019 USA Multiple Multiple No</td>
<td>To evaluate the effectiveness of patient navigation services in increasing colorectal, breast, and cervical cancer screening rates in populations adversely affected by disparities by conducting a meta-analysis of studies conducted in clinical practice settings in the USA.</td>
<td>K=37</td>
<td>N range: NR</td>
<td>African American/Black, Asian (Filipino American), Hispanic/Latino Colorectal, breast, cervical cancer NR</td>
<td>Screening adherence</td>
<td>Patient navigation</td>
<td>Patient navigation interventions showed positive benefit for screening adherence.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull, 2020</td>
<td>January 2006 - February 2019 USA, Netherlands, Canada, UK, Australia, France, Israel NR Multiple Yes</td>
<td>To investigate the differences in the effectiveness of web-based behavioral change interventions for the self-care of high burden chronic health conditions (e.g., asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease [COPD], diabetes, and osteoarthritis) across socioeconomic and cultural groups.</td>
<td>K=18 (9 US studies)</td>
<td>N range: NR</td>
<td>NR Asthma, COPD, diabetes NR</td>
<td>Health, behavior, and Psychosocial outcomes</td>
<td>Web-based health interventions</td>
<td>Did not assess effectiveness.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>Study Design(s)</td>
<td>ROB</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</td>
<td>US Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition(s)</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Walters, 2020<sup>17</sup>  
Inception - May 2019  
USA, Australia, Iran, China, Japan, Taiwan, Niger, Germany, Denmark  
NR  
Multiple  
Yes | To establish whether controlled health literacy interventions, in adults, are effective for improving health literacy. Two secondary aims, using the studies identified for the primary aim, are to explore whether 1) health literacy interventions lead to a change in health behaviors and 2) which of the eligible studies were conducted with cardiovascular patients and examine the outcomes in this population. | K=22 (8 US studies)  
N range: NR  
NR  
Cardiovascular conditions  
NR | Health literacy, behavioral outcomes | Health literacy interventions | NR  
NR  
NR | NR  
NR  
NR |
| Han, 2019<sup>18</sup>  
2000-2017  
USA  
Community health centers  
No | To synthesize the evidence on Community health center (CHC) based interventions. | K=27  
N range: 14-10,000  
Hispanic/Latino, African American/Black, American Indians/Alaska Natives, Other  
Diabetes  
NR | HbA1C, knowledge, medication management, physical activity,  
CHC based interventions (one-on-one education sessions, group education sessions, telecommunicati ons) | CHC based interventions overall show positive benefit in HbA1c, but mixed effects were seen across studies. | NR  
NR  
NR | NR  
NR  
NR |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</th>
<th>Individual Studies (K) Total Review Sample Size (N Range) US Race/Ethnicity Chronic Condition(s) Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Intervention(s)</th>
<th>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</th>
<th>Harms Applicability Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riley, 2019&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt; 2003-2017 USA Multiple Multiple Yes</td>
<td>To conduct a systematic review to establish the evidence base for patient- and family-level interventions to promote ICS adherence among adult black/African Americans.</td>
<td>K=5 N range: 17-333 African American/Black Asthma NR</td>
<td>Medication adherence, asthma control, health care utilization, quality of life, knowledge, self-efficacy</td>
<td>Patient advocacy, problem solving, computer-based motivational interviewing, self-efficacy, education</td>
<td>Interventions show mixed effects in medication adherence.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiz-Perez, 2019&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt; Inception - December 2016 USA Multiple Yes</td>
<td>To identify and characterize the interventions that aimed to improve cancer treatment and followup care in socially disadvantaged groups.</td>
<td>K=36 N range: 18-3521 NR Cancer NR</td>
<td>Quality of life psychosocial factors, knowledge</td>
<td>Organizational changes, education of patients, counseling education of professionals</td>
<td>Interventions show mixed effects.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush, 2018&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt; 1998-2011 USA NR Multiple Yes</td>
<td>To systematically evaluate the efficacy of patient navigation in improving timely and appropriate diagnosis and treatment of disease in medically underserved populations.</td>
<td>K=16 N range: NR NR Cancer NR</td>
<td>Interval from diagnosis to treatment</td>
<td>Patient navigation</td>
<td>The majority of studies show patient navigation has positive benefit in shortening intervals from diagnosis and treatment.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Search Date</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>ROB</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland, 201822</td>
<td>January 1997 - March 2017 USA NR Yes</td>
<td>To report the results of a meta-analysis conducted on the effects of clinical trials in breast cancer screening for African American women between 1997 and 2017.</td>
<td>K=14</td>
<td>N range: 81-1358 African American/Black Cancer NR</td>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>Llay health advisors, tailored counseling, on-site screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham 201823</td>
<td>1997-2015 USA Multiple Multiple Yes</td>
<td>To examine the impact of Diabetes self-management education (DSME) on HbA1c and QoL in African Americans compared to usual care.</td>
<td>K=14</td>
<td>N range: 41-727 African American/Black Diabetes NR</td>
<td>HbA1C, QoL</td>
<td>DSME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K) Total Review Sample Size (N Range) US Race/Ethnicity Chronic Condition(s) Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms Applicability Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, 2018</td>
<td>To determine how implementation strategies and contextual factors influenced the uptake of interventions to increase Fecal Immunochemical Tests (FIT) and Fecal Occult Blood Testing (FOBT) for Colorectal Cancer (CRC) in rural and low-income populations in the United States.</td>
<td>K=27 N range: 1-13 sites Hispanic/Latino, African American/Black, Asian Colorectal Cancer NR</td>
<td>Fecal Immunochemical Tests (FIT) and Fecal Occult Blood Testing (FOBT)</td>
<td>Patient education, client reminders, social media, in-clinic or mailed distribution of FIT/FOBT</td>
<td>Multicomponent interventions can effectively increase fecal testing for CRC across diverse rural and low-income communities</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K) Total Review Sample Size (N Range) US Race/Ethnicity Chronic Condition(s) Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms Applicability Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo, 201825 2005-2016 USA NR Multiple Yes</td>
<td>To assess what is known about increasing access to and participation in cardiovascular disease (CVD) prevention and control programs among Filipino Americans.</td>
<td>K=7 N range: &lt;100-255 Asian (Filipino American) Cardiovascular disease, diabetes NR</td>
<td>CVD knowledge, behavioral, and participant satisfaction, behavioral outcomes, participant satisfaction</td>
<td>Culturally tailored diabetes prevention virtual sessions for education, coaching, and support; Tailored CVD risk reduction with in-person education, coaching, and support sessions; Stanford’s Chronic Disease Self-Management Program</td>
<td>All interventions included in this review were reported to be effective, however, all studies were reported to be of low quality.</td>
<td>NR NR NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>Study Design(s)</td>
<td>ROB</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee-Tauler, 2018&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To identify interventions to improve the initiation of mental health care among racial-ethnic minority groups.</td>
<td>K=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>Study Design(s)</td>
<td>ROB</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terens, 201827</td>
<td>January 2005-May 2016</td>
<td>North America, UK, Australia, Asia Primary care</td>
<td>QI Yes</td>
<td>To review trials of quality improvement (QI) interventions aimed to reduce health inequities among people with diabetes in primary care and to explore the extent to which experimental studies addressed and reported equity issues.</td>
<td>K=58 (47 US Studies) N range: 50-4138</td>
<td>African-American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian (Korean Americans)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed, 2017&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt; 1995-2016 USA, Canada, India, UK Multiple RCT Yes</td>
<td>To synthesize evidence from randomized controlled trials for asthma self-management in South Asian and Black populations from different sociocultural contexts and identify barriers and facilitators to implementing self-management.</td>
<td>K=16 (9 US studies) N range: 28-523 Asian (South Asian) and African American/Black populations* Asthma NR</td>
<td>Days absent from school, asthma knowledge, asthma self-care, self-efficacy, self-management, medical visits, hospital visits</td>
<td>Patient education (Education sessions; education-booklet; community education session; education videos)</td>
<td>Interventions in South Asian and African American minoritized communities were less effective than interventions delivered in indigenous populations in South Asia, though the latter trials were at higher risk of bias.</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellhouse, 2017&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt; 2000-2017 US, Mexico, Belgium Primary care RCT Yes</td>
<td>To assess the effectiveness of community-based health worker (CBHW) interventions for early detection of cancer. Secondary aims were to consider the extent that interventions were based on theory, and potential moderators including behavior change techniques (BCTs).</td>
<td>K=33 (3 US studies) N range: NR African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian* Cancer NR</td>
<td>Screening adherence</td>
<td>CBHW facilitation to healthcare engagement</td>
<td>BHW interventions are an effective resource for increasing uptake of all 3 types of cancer screening in ethnic minoritized groups in US studies: (n=30), other countries: (n=3).</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>Study Design(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</td>
<td>US Race/Ethnicity Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collado, 2016</td>
<td>1) determine the types of depression treatments that have been evaluated in depressed Latino adults and identify effective forms of psychotherapy, 2) rate the quality of RCT and open label trials (OLT), 3) evaluate the type and extent of cultural modifications made to the extant treatments, 4) delineate limitations and future directions in treatment outcome research in this population.</td>
<td>K= 36</td>
<td>N range: 6-1801</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino Major depressive disorder NR</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author (Year)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Individual Studies (K)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intervention(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Harms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Ehrlich, 2016**<sup>33</sup>  
USA, UK, Australia, Canada  
Multiple  
Yes | To answer the research question: “Can self-management programs that have been adapted or modified still be effective for ethnic minority and Indigenous populations?” | K= 23 (10 US studies)  
N range: 20-1486  
African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian*  
Diabetes, cardiovascular disease, hypertension, asthma  
NR | HBA1c, blood pressure, lipids, diet, physical activity, alcohol and tobacco consumption, monitoring and compliance behaviors, knowledge, skills, self-efficacy, and/or attitude | Culturally responsive self-management interventions that included involvement of peers in web-based support groups, as peer educators and coaches, peer-professional discussion groups, facilitated storytelling, recording peer stories about their self-management journey, or by engaging community health workers | Overall, interventions resulted in more positive health outcomes than usual care, but findings were inconsistent. | NR | NR | NR |
| **Genoff, 2016**<sup>34</sup>  
Inception to 2015  
USA  
Multiple  
Yes | To systematically review the literature on the impact of patient navigators on cancer screening for limited English proficient (LEP) patients. | K=15  
N range: 21-87,916  
African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian (Chinese)  
Cancer  
NR | CRC screening, colonoscopy completion, FOBT  
Patient navigator programs with language services | Study is limited by the variability in study designs and limited reporting on patient navigator interventions, which reduces the ability to draw conclusions on the full effect of patient navigators. | NR | NR | NR |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Search Date</th>
<th>Study Location(s)</th>
<th>Study Setting(s)</th>
<th>Study Design(s)</th>
<th>ROB</th>
<th>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</th>
<th>Individual Studies (K)</th>
<th>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</th>
<th>US Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chronic Condition(s)</th>
<th>Intersectional Features</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
<th>Intervention(s)</th>
<th>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leske, 2016&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2000-2015</td>
<td>USA, Australia, Canada, New Zealand</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To systematically review the evidence-base for the effectiveness of culturally unadapted, culturally adapted and culture-based interventions for Indigenous adults with mental or substance use disorders.</td>
<td>K=16 (7 US studies)</td>
<td>N range: 11-939</td>
<td>American Indians/Alaska Natives*</td>
<td>Mental health disorders, substance abuse disorder</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Remission, symptoms, quality of life, functioning, number of interventions delivered</td>
<td>Psychotherapy; Medical management and supportive advice; Community based 12 step substance abuse programs; Cognitive behavioral therapy; motivational interviewing; sweat lodge ceremonies. Drumming circles; talking circles; White Bison 12 Steps program</td>
<td>Inconclusive evidence regarding interventions due to a small and methodologically weak evidence-base.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Search Date</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>Study Design(s)</td>
<td>ROB</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</td>
<td>US Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Chronic Condition(s)</td>
<td>Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms Applicability Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan, 2016³⁶ 2004-2013 USA Multiple RCT Yes</td>
<td>1) What types of Decision-Making using decision aid (DA) interventions are being tested within minority populations, 2) what conditions do these tested interventions address, and 3) what DA interventions have changed decision quality, patient–doctor communication, and clinical decision outcomes within minority populations?</td>
<td>K=18 N range: 17-693 African American/Black, Asian, Hispanic/Latino Prostate, colorectal (CRC), and breast cancer chronic kidney disease, osteoarthritis NR</td>
<td>Decision quality, communicatio, clinical decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Decision-Making using decision aids</td>
<td>DAs have been effective in improving patient–doctor communication and decision quality outcomes in minoritized populations and could help address health disparities. Of the 15 studies that reported on clinical decisions, eight demonstrated significant changes in decisions with DAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tao 2016³⁷ 1980-2013 USA, UK Primary care Multiple Yes</td>
<td>To compare the different types of reimbursement system in relation to socioeconomic and racial inequalities in access, utilization and quality of care</td>
<td>K=22 (6 US studies) N range: NR African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and American Indians/Alaska Natives* Diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease NR</td>
<td>Process measures, disease-specific outcomes (HbA1c, total cholesterol and mean systolic blood pressure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provider pay-for-performance</td>
<td>Little scientific evidence supporting an association between reimbursement system and socioeconomic or racial inequity in access, utilization and quality of primary care.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Search Date</td>
<td>Study Location(s)</td>
<td>Study Setting(s)</td>
<td>ROB</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K) Total Review Sample Size (N Range) US Race/Ethnicity Chronic Condition(s) Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms Applicability Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, 2015&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt; 1990-2014 USA, Canada, Australia, England, Netherlands Community-based Multiple Yes</td>
<td>To assess effects of community coalition-driven interventions in improving health status or reducing health disparities among racial and ethnic minority populations.</td>
<td>K=58 (52 US studies) N range: 640 (average) African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Other, American Indian/Alaska Natives * Cancer, HIV, diabetes NR</td>
<td>Quality of life measures, incidence rates, measures of symptoms and functionality, physical activity, smoking status, alcohol consumption, dietary change</td>
<td>Local community coalitions</td>
<td>Findings are inconsistent and the evidence base is weak as a result of inadequate reporting and insufficient studies with rigorous design.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author (Year)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Individual Studies (K)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Study Location(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Study Setting(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Harms Applicability Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril, 2015$^{15}$</td>
<td>To examine the magnitude of the impact of Community-engagement (CE) on health and health inequalities among disadvantaged populations, which methodological approaches maximize the effectiveness of CE, and components of CE that are acceptable, feasible, and effective when used among disadvantaged populations.</td>
<td>K=24 (17 US studies)</td>
<td>N range: 23-3986 Hispanic/Latino, African American/Black, American Indian/Alaska Natives - Navajo Indians* Cardiovascular disease, depression, cancer, asthma, mental health disorders NR</td>
<td>USA, Canada, Bangladesh, Africa, China, the United Kingdom, Iran, India Multiple Multiple Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Improvement s in health behaviors, public health planning, health service access, health literacy</td>
<td>Community-engagement based interventions (community advisory boards, coalitions, health workers, cultural integration)</td>
<td>The findings suggest that CE models can lead to improved health if designed properly and implemented through effective community consultation. One-quarter of the studies reported positive impacts of CE on health outcomes, including reduction in obesity, improvement in mental well-being and quality of life.,</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, 2015$^{15}$</td>
<td>To evaluate the effectiveness of diabetes self-management education (DSME) interventions delivered in conjunction with primary care among Hispanic adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM).</td>
<td>K=13</td>
<td>N range: 131-585 Hispanic/Latino Diabetes NR</td>
<td>USA Multiple RCT Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A1C, HbA1c, reduction, self-management, BMI, glycemic control</td>
<td>DSME in conjunction with primary care is effective in improving glycemic control in Hispanic adults with T2DM.</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Purpose of Systematic Review (Study Author Reported)</td>
<td>Individual Studies (K)</td>
<td>Total Review Sample Size (N Range)</td>
<td>US Race/Ethnicity Chronic Condition(s) Intersectional Features</td>
<td>Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Intervention(s)</td>
<td>Systematic Review Findings (Effectiveness of Interventions)</td>
<td>Harms</td>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pesantes, 2015  
Inception to February 2015  
USA  
Multiple RCT  
Yes | To synthesize the evidence about interventions to enhance resiliency in managing hypertension or type 2 diabetes in vulnerable populations and to assess the efficacy of these interventions on clinical outcomes | K=17  
N range: NR  
African American/Black, Asian (Chinese Americans), Hispanic/Latino  
Hypertension, diabetes  
NR | Changes in blood pressure, changes in HbA1c | Resiliency-oriented interventions in prevention and self-management, coping skills | Outcomes were not fully conclusive. There was some evidence that resilience interventions had a positive effect on HbA1c levels, but not blood pressure | NR  
NR  
NR |
| Salas, 2015  
Inception to 2014  
USA  
Multiple  
Multiple  
Yes | A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of non-pharmacological cancer pain interventions in cancer populations with social disparities of income, ethnicity, or gender. | K=26  
N range: 67-99  
African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino  
Cancer  
NR | Pain, FACT-B, CES-D, PTGI, health status survey | Non-pharmacological cancer pain interventions (education, coaching, and online support groups); culturally sensitive online cancer support in Spanish | No significant differences in pain reduction between intervention and control groups or between ethnic minorities and their counterparts | NR  
NR  
NR |

*The review also included study populations from other countries.

**Abbreviations:** A1C = glycated hemoglobin test; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory — II; CES-D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale; CIDI = Composite International Diagnostic Interview; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; CRC = Colorectal Cancer; DBP = diastolic blood pressure; DSME = diabetes self-management education; EUC = Enhanced usual care; FOBT = Fecal Occult Blood Test; FACT-B = Functional Analysis of Cancer Therapy; HbA1c = hemoglobin A1C; HIT = health information technology; HRSD/HAM-D = Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression; HIV = human immunodeficiency virus; HSCL-20 = Hopkins Symptom Checklist-20; ICS = inhaled corticosteroid; MADRS = Montgomery–Åsberg Depression Rating Scale; MSM = men who have sex with men; NA = not available; NR = not reported; PMID = PubMed Identification Number; PrEP = pre-exposure prophylaxis; PTGI = Personal growth (posttraumatic growth inventory); RCT = randomized controlled trials; QUIDS-SR = Quick Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology-Self-Report; SBP = systolic blood pressure; SDC-20 = Symptom Checklist Depression Scale; STI = sexually transmitted infection; T2D = type 2 diabetes
Existing Evidence Reviews: Focus on American Indian/Alaska Native Population

Multi-Country Systematic Reviews

Leske, 2016\textsuperscript{35}:
6/16 studies are US
\begin{itemize}
\item Reese, 2014 - 2\% Native American
\item O’Malley, 2008 - 67\% American Indian/Alaska Native
\item Tonigan, 2013 - 47\% American Indian
\item Villanueva, 2007 - 100\% Native American
\item Woodall, 2007 - 75\% Native American
\item Dickerson et al., 2014 - 100\% Native American
\end{itemize}

Gifford, 2021\textsuperscript{8}:
21/27 studies are US
\begin{itemize}
\item Burhansstipanov, 2012
\item Burhansstipanov, 2014
\item Krebs, 2013
\item Dignan, 2005
\item Dockery, 2018
\item Doorenbos, 2010
\item Guadagnolo & Boylan, 2011
\item Guadagnolo & Cina, 2011
\item Petereit, 2008
\item Petereit, 2011
\item Hill, 2010
\item Hodge, 2012
\item Hodge, 2016
\item Mokuau, 2008
\item Mokuau, 2012
\item Pruthi, 2013
\item Cueva, 2010
\item Cueva, 2005
\item Elliott, 1999
\item Sanderson, 2010
\item Warson, 2012
\end{itemize}

Note: Gifford provided a summary statement: Participants’ United States Indigenous ethnicity included Native American (n=13; 50\%), Alaska Native (n=3; 12\%), a combination of Native American and Alaska Native (n=2; 8\%), Native Hawaiian (n=2; 8\%).

Ehrlich, 2016\textsuperscript{33}:
1/23 studies are US
• Sinclair, 2013 - 100% Native Hawaiians and Pacific People

U.S. Systematic Reviews

Hu, 2020\textsuperscript{12}:
2/19 studies included Indigenous populations
  • Davis, 2011 - 3\% American Indian/Alaska Native
  • Bowen, 2020 - 17\% American Indian/Alaska Native

Liu, 2019\textsuperscript{13}:
  • 1/15 studies included Indigenous populations
  • Mueller, 2017 - 100\% American Indian/Alaska Native

Han, 2019\textsuperscript{18}:
3/27 studies included Indigenous populations
  • Gregg, 2007 - 2.3\% Native American
  • Scott, 2006 - 1.3\% Native American
  • Sinclair, 2013 - 100\% Native Hawaiians and Pacific People

Heitkemper, 2017\textsuperscript{30}:
1/13 studies included Indigenous
  • Lorig, 2010 - 100\% American Indian/Alaska Native

Tao, 2016\textsuperscript{37}:
1/22 studies makes a reference to Native populations. The study reports, “Given the demographics of the Bronx population, there were insufficient numbers of persons of American Indian/Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander race, and they were excluded from analyses.”
References for Appendix E


