Overtreatment of older patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus in primary care

Running title: Overtreatment in older type 2 diabetes patients

Hart Huberta E^{1,2} MD, PhD, Rutten Guy E¹ MD, PhD, Bontje Kyra N¹ Bsc, Vos Rimke C¹ PhD

¹ Julius Center of Health Sciences and Primary Care, Department of General Practice, Heidelberglaan 100, 3584 CX Utrecht, The Netherlands

² Leidsche Rijn Julius Health Centers, Eerste Oosterparklaan 78, 3544 AK Utrecht, The Netherlands

Abstract: 180 words

Main body of the text: 1796

Number of references: 8

Number of tables: 3 (of which one in supplementary appendix)

Number of figures: 1 (supplementary appendix)

Corresponding Author:

Name: H.E. Hart

Address: Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Str. 6.131, PO Box 85500, 3508 GA Utrecht, the Netherlands

Telephone number: +31(0)6 16950844

Fax number: +31 88 75 680 99

E-mail address: h.e.hart@umcutrecht.nl

Abstract

There are indications of overtreatment in older type 2 diabetes patients in both the US and Europe. We assessed the level of personalized diabetes treatment for older patients in primary care, focusing on overtreatment.

Based on Dutch guidelines individuals ≥ 70 years were classified into three HbA1c treatment target groups: 7% (53 mmol/mol), 7.5% (58 mmol/mol) and 8% (64 mmol/mol).

In our cohort of 1.002 patients ($n=319 \geq 70$ yrs), the 165 patients with target above 7% had more micro- and macrovascular complications, used more often ≥ 5 medicines and were more often frail compared to those with an HbA1c target $\leq 7\%$.

Of these 165 patients 64 (38.8%) were overtreated, i.e. 20% of all people ≥ 70 years. The majority of overtreated people were frail and used ≥ 5 medicines. Hypoglycemia occurred in 20.3% of these patients and almost 30% reported fall accidents.

Personalized treatment in older people with type 2 diabetes is no common practice. A substantial number of older people are overtreated, with likely harmful consequences. To prevent overtreatment, definition of lower HbA1C limits might be helpful.

50 **Introduction**

51 Beneficial effects of stringent HbA1c goals in older patients with long existing type 2
52 diabetes and vascular complications are not proven. On the contrary, older patients
53 are at higher risk of developing hypoglycemia because of reduced food intake and
54 wrong medication usage. Hypoglycemia is associated with adverse effects like low
55 health-related quality of life, development of dementia, cardiovascular disease, falls
56 and even increased mortality. Overall, the risk of harm associated with an HbA1c
57 target lower than the conventional 7% (53 mmol/mol) seems to outweigh the possible
58 benefits for adults of 70 years and older. The American Diabetes Association (ADA)
59 provides a framework for considering treatment goals for glycemia, with reasonable
60 HbA1c goals ranging from < 7.5% (58 mmol/mol) to < 8.5% (69 mmol/mol). ¹

61 In 2013, the Dutch College of General practitioners published guidelines, based on
62 results of the ACCORD, ADVANCE and VADT trials, with an algorithm to put
63 personalized hyperglycemia treatment into practice. With this algorithm, the
64 personalized HbA1c target can be determined based on the patient's age, the
65 intensity of diabetes treatment and the known diabetes duration. ² According to this
66 algorithm patients aged ≥ 70 years treated with a lifestyle advice only or with
67 metformin monotherapy should achieve an HbA1c target $\leq 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol).
68 Patients above 70 years who are using more blood glucose lowering agents than
69 metformin only and with a diabetes duration less than 10 years should achieve an
70 HbA1c $\leq 7.5\%$ (58 mmol/mol) and those with a diabetes duration above 10 years
71 have a target $\leq 8\%$ (64 mmol/mol). In the Netherlands, about 85% of people with type
72 2 diabetes are treated in the primary care setting. Most recent data (2013) from a
73 nationwide primary care database provide proportions of type 2 diabetes patients in

primary care < 70 years with an HbA1c < 7% (53 mmol/mol) and an HbA1c > 8.5% (69 mmol/mol).³ However, these percentages do not provide insight into the level of personalized hyperglycemia treatment. In the US and Europe there are indications of overtreatment in older type 2 diabetes patients, both in patients with and without pre-existing vascular complications.⁴⁻⁶ We aimed to assess the level of the personalized diabetes treatment for older patients in primary care, focusing on overtreatment.

METHODS

Study design and setting

Data for this observational study (study period January 1st – December 31st 2016) were extracted from the electronic patient records in March 2017 in five primary care centers of the Leidsche Rijn Julius Health Centers. People were excluded when they were treated for their diabetes by a medical specialist (n=165), refused diabetes care (n=37) or did not show up for monitoring visits during the observation period (n=66), resulting in 1.002 patients with type 2 diabetes included in the study.

Data collection and variables

Patient characteristics, macrovascular- and microvascular complications and comorbidities were all retrieved from the electronic medical records in March 2017, as well as medication use. We defined polypharmacy as the prescription of at least five medications per patient. A person's frailty was determined by the validated Frailty Index (FI).⁷ In this study, patients with a FI score >0.2 were considered frail. Data on hypoglycemia, emergency room visits and fall accidents were manually retrieved from the electronic medical records in patients who were classified as overtreated. Hypoglycemia was considered present when patient's complaints due to a low blood glucose level had been recorded.

Personalized Hba1c targets: on target, overtreatment and undertreatment

According to the algorithm from the Dutch guidelines (Supplementary Appendix, Figure 1) older individuals, i.e. ≥ 70 years, could be classified in different subgroups with the accompanying HbA1c target. Based on the differential targets, we defined 'on target', 'overtreated' and 'undertreated' as follows: *If target $\leq 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol):* no lower limit available for overtreatment, on target if HbA1c $\leq 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol), undertreated if HbA1c $> 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol); *if target $\leq 7.5\%$ (58 mmol/mol):* overtreated if HbA1c $\leq 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol), on target if HbA1c $> 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol) but $\leq 7.5\%$ (58 mmol/mol), undertreated if HbA1c $> 7.5\%$ (58 mmol/mol); *if target $\leq 8\%$ (64 mmol/mol):* overtreated if HbA1c $\leq 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol), on target if HbA1c $> 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol) but $\leq 8\%$ (64 mmol/mol), undertreated if HbA1c $> 8\%$ (64 mmol/mol).

Statistical Analyzes

Patients on their personalized treatment targets were compared to those not on treatment target using Chi-square, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests (IBM SPSS statistics 24).

RESULTS

In the cohort the mean age was 62.8 (12.2) years, with 54.1% men and a median diabetes duration of 7.0 years (36.2% ≥ 10 years). The median HbA1c was 6.9% (52 mmol/mol), 20.3% of the patients had macrovascular complications and 38.2% had microvascular complications. Of the 1.002 patients, 319 (31.8%) patients were ≥ 70 years with 51.7% men and a median diabetes duration of 10 years. Their median HbA1c was 7.0% (53.3 mmol/mol), 30.1% had macrovascular complications and 50.8% had microvascular complications. One in five people ≥ 70 years used insulin

and almost 70% in this age category used at least five medications (Supplementary Table). Using the algorithm from the Dutch guidelines, 165 people could be classified in the subgroup with an HbA1c target $> 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol) (Figure 1, Suppl. Appendix). Their median HbA1c was 7.3% (56 mmol/mol, IQR 15) versus 6.8% (51 mmol/mol, IQR 12) in the group with an HbA1c target $\leq 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol) ($p < 0.05$). Those with an HbA1c target $> 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol) had more often microvascular (54.0 % vs 35.2%, $p < 0.05$) and macrovascular complications (33.3% vs 17.7%, $p < 0.05$). They used more often ≥ 5 medications (87.3% vs 53.2%, $p < 0.05$) and were more often frail (44.2% vs 13.9%, $p < 0.05$) than people with an HbA1c target $\leq 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol).

Fifty three individuals were categorized in the subgroup with HbA1c target $\leq 7.5\%$ (58 mmol/mol) and 112 in the subgroup with target $\leq 8\%$ (64 mmol/mol). In the former subgroup 13 (24.5%) people were on target, 23 (43.4%) were overtreated and 17 (32.1%) undertreated. In the latter group these proportions were 36.6%, 36.6% and 26.8% respectively.

Table 1 shows the characteristics of people with HbA1c treatment target $\leq 7.5\%$ (58 mmol/mol) and whether they were on target, over- or undertreated. The achieved HbA1c values between these categories differed significantly, but other characteristics did not. More than 80% used sulphonylureas, 15 to 35% used insulin combined with oral blood glucose lowering agents. Almost all people used at least five medications, almost half of them had comorbidities and one in three were frail.

Table 2 provides similar data from the people with HbA1c treatment target $\leq 8\%$ (64 mmol/mol). Also in this category achieved HbA1c levels differed significantly between people on target, those who were over- and undertreated. Individuals who were 'on target' had significantly less microvascular complications compared to those who

were over- or undertreated (34.1% vs 63.4 % and 66.7%; $P < 0.05$). Surprisingly, people who were overtreated used less often insulin combined with oral medication compared to the other two categories (24.4% versus 43.9% and 63.3%, $p < 0.05$).

Overtreatment

Overall, 64 people received overtreatment, that means 38.8% of the 165 with an HbA1c target $> 7\%$ (53 mmol/mol). As stated above 23 (43.4%) of people with HbA1c target $\leq 7.5\%$ (58 mmol/mol) could be categorized as overtreated according to the evidence based guidelines. They had a median age of 72 years, a median diabetes duration of 5 years and a median HbA1c of 6.5% (48 mmol/mol). Five (21.7%) had an eGFR < 45 ml/min. Eight individuals who were overtreated (34.8%) were living alone and eight (34.8%) were frail. The majority of these overtreated patients used metformin (78.3%) and/ or sulphonylureas (87.0%). Four (17.4%) of them experienced hypoglycemia in the observation period, four had a fall accident and one patient had a hypoglycemia related emergency room visit.

Among the people with an HbA1c target $\leq 8\%$ (64 mmol/mol) more than one in three (36.6%) patients could be categorized as overtreated. They had a median age of 76 years, a median diabetes duration of 14 years and a median HbA1c of 6.5% (47 mmol/mol). Three (7.3%) had an eGFR < 45 ml/min. Half of the overtreated individuals could be considered frail and 13 (31.7%) lived alone. The majority used metformin (82.9%) and/or sulphonylureas (70.7%). In this group, more people used insulin compared to overtreated individuals with a target $\leq 7.5\%$ (31.7% vs. 8.7%). During the observation period 12 people (29.3%) reported fall accidents, 9 (22%) reported hypoglycemia and one patient had a hypoglycemia related emergency room visit.

174

175 **Discussion**

176 This study aimed to assess the level of personalized type 2 diabetes treatment for
177 older patients in primary care, focusing on overtreatment of these patients. From 319
178 people ≥ 70 years, more than one in two should have an HbA1c target $> 7\%$ (53
179 mmol/mol) according to the evidence-based guidelines. Many people who were
180 overtreated according to the guidelines had complications, comorbidities,
181 polypharmacy, can be considered frail and used medication that can cause
182 hypoglycemia.

183 Although the Dutch diabetes guidelines are very well implemented in primary care,
184 without financial incentives to drive HbA1c levels lower, de-intensifying treatment is
185 not yet common practice, whereas a great number of patients would benefit from it
186 ^{6,8}. Notably, although hypoglycemia and falls were reported and recorded for
187 overtreated people in our study, their treatment was not de-intensified. Whereas the
188 number of patients included in this study is small, the results give a clear signal that
189 overtreatment in older type 2 diabetes patients is a real problem.

190 Some limitations should be taken into account. First, no data were available of people
191 who were treated by specialists. Their treatment can be seen as more complex and
192 on the one hand they are less likely to reach their HbA1c target but on the other hand
193 many of them are likely to benefit from a less strict HbA1c target. Also people
194 refusing regular diabetes care could not be included. With these two categories of
195 patients included, the proportion of people receiving overtreatment would have been
196 different.

197 To conclude, almost 40% of older adults with type 2 diabetes and an evidence
198 based HbA1c target above 7% were overtreated, representing about 20% of all

199 adults ≥ 70 years. Also according to the ADA and EASD guidelines they should have
200 been treated less intensively. Naturally, if a well-informed patient prefers to continue
201 his or her medication, a shared decision could be to do so. From a medical point of
202 view such a patient might be called overtreated, but in a person-centered diabetes
203 care this is acceptable.

204 Care professionals should leave the 'one size fits all' approach and realize the
205 possible benefits of de-intensifying blood glucose lowering treatment. To prevent
206 overtreatment, a lower HbA1c limit in the guidelines might be helpful. Diabetes quality
207 indicators should not be based on population based mean values, because means
208 will overlook under- and overtreatment completely.

209

210

211

212 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

213

214 **Authors contributions**

215 HEH designed the study, collected data, wrote the manuscript and takes the
216 responsibility for the manuscript, GEHM designed the study and reviewed the
217 manuscript, KNB collected and analyzed data, and wrote the first version of the
218 manuscript, RCV designed the study, analyzed the data and reviewed the
219 manuscript.

220 **Financial disclosure**

221 No funding was received for this study. This study was conducted as part of a
222 scientific internship during the last year of medical school of KNB.

223 **Ethics**

224 Ethical approval was not obtained since this was an observational study with routine
225 care patient data, anonymously provided.

226 **Conflict of interest**

227 The authors state that they have no conflict of interest

228

REFERENCES

1. American Diabetes Association. 11. Older Adults. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40(Suppl 1):S99-S104. doi:10.2337/dc17-S014.
2. Rutten G, De Grauw W, Nijpels G, et al. NHG-Standaard Diabetes mellitus type 2 (derde herziening) | NHG. *Huisarts Wet* 2013;56(10):512-525.
3. Klomp M E. InEen - Rapport Transparante Ketenzorg. 2013.
4. Lipska K., Ross J., Miao Y, Shah N., Lee S., Steinman MA. Potential Overtreatment of Diabetes Mellitus in Older Adults With Tight Glycemic Control. *JAMA Intern. Med.* 2015;175(3):356-362. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.7345.Potential.
5. Müller N, Khunti K, Kuss O, et al. Is there evidence of potential overtreatment of glycaemia in elderly people with type 2 diabetes? Data from the GUIDANCE study. *Acta Diabetol.* 2017;54(2):209-214. doi:10.1007/s00592-016-0939-9.
6. Sussman JB, Kerr EA, Saini SD, et al. Rates of Deintensification of Blood Pressure and Glycemic Medication Treatment Based on Levels of Control and Life Expectancy in Older Patients With Diabetes Mellitus. *JAMA Intern. Med.* 2015;175(12):1942-1949. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.5110.
7. Drubbel I, de Wit NJ, Bleijenberg N, Eijkemans RJ, Schuurmans MJ, Numans ME. Prediction of adverse health outcomes in older people using a frailty index based on routine primary care data. *Journals Gerontol. Ser. A-Biological Sci. Med. Sci.* 2013;68(3):301-308. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/gerona/gls161.
8. Caverly TJ, Fagerlin A, Zikmund-Fisher BJ, et al. Appropriate Prescribing for Patients With Diabetes at High Risk for Hypoglycemia: National Survey of

253 Veterans Affairs Health Care Professionals. *JAMA Intern. Med.*
254 2015;175(12):1994-6. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.5950.
255