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Slide 2: Presentation Overview

- Collaborative care and social support
- Web 2.0 concepts
- “Diabetes Social Support” Study
- Organizing principles: issues, solutions, and user feedback
  - Technology
  - Social support
- Potential future directions for research and implementation

Slide 3: Chronic Care Model Framework

- Coordinate efforts of individuals to optimize chronic illness care and outcomes
  - Individuals include patient, community (friends, family), providers
  - Integration and coordination can be within or between groups (e.g., among patients, between a patient and friends/family)
- Collaborative care and decisionmaking
- Shared clinical goals
- Productive interactions
  - Interactions can be directed or reciprocal
  - Interactions can be between patients and peers

Slide 4: Web 2.0 Framework

- Technology-mediated social participation
- Social dimension(s) that define participation
  - Common interests or goals
  - “Connectedness” as a motivator for participation
  - Interactions intended to “add value” to participants
- Infrastructure (technology) to enable and mobilize participation
  - Technology defines the dimensions of the social network
  - Directed or reciprocal electronic interactions can occur within the virtual community

Slide 5: The Challenge

• Chronic diseases are prevalent, costly, and require extensive self-monitoring and self-management outside the traditional clinic setting
• Excellent evidence for the importance of self-monitoring and self-management in chronic diseases
• Excellent evidence for the importance of social support in motivating adherence to self-management
• Can Web 2.0 concepts be applied in a clinical setting to motivate instrumental and emotional social support in chronic care management?

Slide 6: Diabetes Social Support Pilot Study (1)

• Objective: To assess the usability of mobile ICT and value added of peer instrumental and emotional social support for SMBG
• Study Population: 15 adults with type 2 diabetes and baseline HbA1c >8.0% and their self-selected supporters (6 pairs from Kaiser Permanente Georgia and 9 pairs from Oakhurst Medical Center)
  o Average age of the diabetes patients was 49.3 years; 67.7% were female; 86.7% were African American.
• Study Protocol: An enrollment session, 3-month trial period, and a disenrollment session

Slide 7: Diabetes Social Support Pilot Study (2)

• Enabling technology:
  o Glucometer
  o Transmitter requiring a phone connection
  o Data center (receiving, logging, transmission services)
  o Cell phones (diabetes patient and paired supporter) with text message capability
• Social network: Dyad (patient–supporter)
• How to pull it all together into a model that will effectively direct attitudes and behaviors in the intended direction (improve SMBG frequency and results)?

Slide 8: Which Technology Components To Use? (1)

• Considerations:
  o Access and availability
  o Familiarity and ease of use
  o Relevant, tested functionality
• Decisions:
  o Cell phones:
    ▪ Nearly universal availability as primary or secondary phone service

Source: Eisenberg Center Conference Series 2010 Th Prospect for We 2.0 Technologies for Engagement, Communication and Dissemination in the Era of Patient-Centered Outcomes Research, Effective Health Care Program Web site (http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm)
- Access nearly unrestricted in terms of space or time
- Most users familiar with basic dialing and texting capabilities

**Slide 9: Which Technology Components To Use? (2)**

- Decisions:
  - GlucoMON® and Diabetech LLC
    - Transmitter compatible with most commonly used glucometers (compatible one provided if not)
    - Data bank to receive SMBG data
    - Existing programs to transmit SMBG results to: 1) primary care physicians (PCP) of adult diabetes patients, 2) parents of juveniles with type diabetes
  - Redirect transmission to PCP and/or parent to peer supporter to establish a simple peer-support network

**Slide 10: Which Technology Components To Use? (3)**

- Results
  - Usability ([www.usability.gov](http://www.usability.gov))
  - “Well, I thought it was great and easy…. [Y]ou just plug it in and it gives you the information and the information was sent to both of our phones.”
  - 11 of 15 (73%) of diabetes participants had connected components and completed one transmission within 5 days of enrollment
  - Those who connected shortly after the enrollment session tended to be frequent users
  - Followup and assistance was required after the enrollment session

**Slide 11: How To Organize Communication: Message Delivery (1)**

- Considerations:
  - Technological constraints
  - Participant financial burden
  - Participant psychological burden
  - System complexity and cost
- Decisions:
  - Text messages limited to 128 characters
  - Limit frequency of text messaging to patient and supporter participants to less than SMBG frequency
  - Many basic cell phone plans support text messaging but have a service charge ($0.20–$0.25) per message

Slide 12: How To Organize Communication: Message Delivery (2)

- Decisions:
  - Text messages would be limited to every 5 days and to a random time between 9 am and 9 pm
    - Frequency of text messages (5-day cycle) was a compromise between goal of minimizing participant burden and message content (which focused on trends and not details of SMBG)
    - Randomness was intended to mitigate consequences of message “predictability”
  - Results:
    - Participants found the frequency to be “about right” and neither annoying nor distracting

Slide 13: How To Organize Communication: Message Content (1)

- Considerations:
  - Relevance to application goals ("meaningful")
  - Structured (system—participant) versus unstructured (participant—participant) communication
  - Consistent with evidence or consensus based clinical practice
    - AD Guidelines
    - KPGA/OMC Clinical Practice Guidelines
  - Compliance with HIPAA requirements and IRB concerns
- Decisions:
  - Text-message content would acknowledge SMBG practice: frequency and results

Slide 14: How To Organize Communication: Message Content (2)

- Decisions:
  - Text-message content would summarize patterns/trends in recent SMBG history but avoid referencing actual SMBG results
    - 2 × 2 matrix of messages
      - Parallel messages for diabetes patient and supporter:
        - Patient: “You are monitoring your diabetes regularly. Your blood sugar levels remain high. You might contact your primary care team.”
        - Supporter: “I see that you are monitoring your blood sugar every day, but your blood sugar levels seem high. How can I help you?”

Slide 15: How To Organize Communication: Message Content (3)

- Decisions:
Supporters would be instructed and encouraged to follow OARS motivational coaching techniques in their interactions with diabetes patients. Diabetes patients might benefit in self-assessments by using OARS motivational coaching techniques.

**Results:**
- Text messages to supporters prompted interactions that might not otherwise have occurred.
- “It got my whole family involved. My granddaughter would see the latest text message and call me to say, ‘Granny, your blood sugar was high’.”

**Slide 16: How To Organize Communication: Message Content (4)**

**Results:**
- Some mixed reactions to message content that we assumed would be motivational:
  - “[The messages] normally started out positive and then show that you care and say ‘good job.’ A couple of times I said, ‘I know I didn't do well this week’ but … you praise[d] me for what I did do.”
- Whether brief instruction in OARS techniques of motivational coaching added value was questionable:
  - “We are so comfortable with each other…we’ve known each other for so long…we’re like sisters. She was very comfortable talking to me, and I was very comfortable talking to her.”

**Slide 17: How To Organize the Community (1)**

**Considerations:**
- Application goal — MOTIVATE SMBG by mobilizing emotional and instrumental support
- Which individuals enter the network can have a significant positive or negative effect on health behaviors and attitudes

**Entry rules**
- Random
- Nominated, by whom (participant, moderator)

**Exit rules**

**Slide 18: How To Organize the Community (2)**

**Decisions:**
- Self-selected peer (close friend or family member) whose support and opinion was valued by the diabetes patient
- Unmoderated interactions between diabetes patient and supporter

Source: Eisenberg Center Conference Series 2010 Th Prospect for We 2.0 Technologies for Engagement, Communication and Dissemination in the Era of Patient-Centered Outcomes Research, Effective Health Care Program Web site (http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm)
• Exception: Review of specified high and low SMBG values to trigger research team interventions

• Results:
  o Greater attention to importance of SMBG by diabetes patients
    ▪ “I checked [my blood sugars] more because I knew that someone was holding me accountable and I knew you were monitoring it...sending it in...I wanted to finish what I started and make sure I am giving myself an opportunity to improve my blood sugar and my husband was helping too.”

Slide 19: How To Organize the Community (3)

• Results:
  o Improved emotional and instrumental social support:
    ▪ “I wasn’t much of a supporter until we got this device. I was out of sight. I was out of sight. [I]t was avoidance on my part.... Since we got this device...I’ve learned more about her diabetic condition and her daily needs...I’m understanding it more...because this became a focal point for all of us.”
    ▪ “It was really good because I really didn’t know what my mother was going through or like different food that she was eating, because I don’t have diabetes and I am used to eating whatever.”

Slide 20: Other Web 2.0 Pilot Studies Under Consideration

• Diabetes Prevention Program via multimedia interactive Web site
  o Structured, instructional sessions on lifestyle (progress monitored by diabetes educator)
  o E-mailing diabetes educator
  o Moderated topical discussions by diabetes educator

• Postpartum Weight Management via Webinar format
  o Virtual group visits with moderated discussions by nurse, nutritionist

• Diabetes Social Support randomized controlled trial
  o Three study groups (1 control + 2 intervention)
  o Intervention study groups with and without peer supporters

Slide 21: Summary (1)

• Integrating mobile ICT into chronic disease management by using Web 2.0 concepts does appear to be a means for engaging adults in effective self-management strategies and for disseminating those strategies into the community

• Our pilot study identified a number of issues that must be considered and resolved in developing such applications

Source: Eisenberg Center Conference Series 2010 Th Prospect for We 2.0 Technologies for Engagement, Communication and Dissemination in the Era of Patient-Centered Outcomes Research, Effective Health Care Program Web site (http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm)
Moderating role of technology for engagement, communication, and dissemination of effective practices by mobilizing social support for self-management of chronic disease

Slide 22: Summary (2)

- Accessible technology already exists that can be integrated into systems to engage patients in chronic disease self-management, but:
  - The costs and effort to integrate these components into a specific application can be substantial
  - The low entry and maintenance costs for participants are not necessarily low from the delivery-system perspective
  - We often believe that these innovative technologies may solve the challenges of addressing the needs of patients who consistently do not adhere to treatment
  - Delivery systems need to consider if ICT or Web 2.0 interventions will be effective for patients who are nonadherent to treatment or will merely be a substitute for otherwise effective traditional strategies for patients who are routinely adherent
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