

## International exchange

# Diabetes in Europe: role and contribution of primary care – position paper of the European Forum for Primary Care

Manfred Maier MD

Chairman, Department of General Practice and Head, Center for Public Health, Medical University of Vienna, Austria

Astrid Knopp MD MPH

Medical Quality Assurance, Styrian Sickness Fund, Graz, Austria

Susanne Pusarnig MD

General Practitioner, Vienna, Austria

Imre Rurik MD

Head Physician, Primary Care Centre and Senior Lecturer, Department of Family Medicine, Semmelweis University, Budapest, Hungary

Domingo Orozco-Beltran MD PhD

Catheda of Family Medicine, Dpt. of Clinical Medicine, University Miguel Hernandez, Hospital de San Juan, Alicante, Spain

Hakan Yaman MD MS

Associate Professor, University of Akdeniz, Faculty of Medicine, Chairman Department of Family Medicine, Antalya, Turkey

Luk van Eygen MD MSc

General Practitioner, Belgium and Department of General Practice and Primary Health Care, Ghent University, Belgium

## Introduction

---

Diabetes is a chronic condition associated with multiple late complications, reduced life expectancy,<sup>1</sup> and a marked limitation in the quality of life.<sup>2</sup> Mortality among people with diabetes is about twice that in the normal population, and life expectancy is about 5–10 years shorter. The disease, its complications and late-onset consequences cause a dramatic burden for health systems.<sup>3–5</sup>

This position paper focuses on the pivotal role of primary care in the management of people with diabetes mellitus, and targets policymakers in the European Union and its member states. We argue the need for a concerted approach to define how programmes to manage diabetes mellitus should be designed, developed, implemented and evaluated to ensure the highest level of quality care delivery across the different European healthcare systems.

## Definition and classification of diabetes mellitus

---

Diabetes mellitus is a group of endocrine disorders characterised by hyperglycaemia as a consequence of disturbed secretion or function of insulin. Chronic hyperglycaemia in diabetic subjects is associated with long-term complications and decreased functioning of several organs and tissues, especially the heart and blood vessels, the eyes, kidneys and the nervous system.

The following four types of diabetes can be classified:<sup>6,7</sup>

- 1 *type 1 diabetes*: disordered insulin secretion due to destruction of the beta-cells in the pancreas with mostly absolute deficiency of insulin. A special form with slowly developing deficiency of insulin secretion is known as latent autoimmune diabetes of adults (LADA)

- 2 *type 2 diabetes*: disorder of insulin effects (insulin resistance) with relative deficiency of insulin (typically a disorder of glucose-dependent insulin secretion)
- 3 *other specific types of diabetes*: these are caused by diseases of the exocrine pancreas or other endocrine organs, or might develop due to pharmacological causes, genetic defects or syndromes or infections
- 4 *gestational diabetes*: this type develops for the first time during pregnancy as a disorder of glucose tolerance.

Diabetes mellitus is diagnosed primarily by measurements of elevated fasting glucose values on at least two different days in plasma or full blood. Quality assurance of tests is an absolute requirement. Devices designed for self-measurements by patients are not accepted to establish the diagnosis.<sup>6</sup> In suspected clinical situations and in case of contradictory results, the diagnosis is based on the oral glucose tolerance test. An impaired fasting glucose and an impaired glucose tolerance (together known as prediabetes) have been defined with their specific lower and upper limits and are considered the early forms in the development of diabetes.<sup>7</sup> The determination of glycosylated haemoglobin (HbA<sub>1c</sub>) alone is currently not suited for making the diagnosis and is used exclusively for monitoring long-term care and for aiding decisions on management.<sup>6,7</sup>

While type 1 diabetes, with its typical symptoms and acute onset, is usually diagnosed quite early, the diagnosis of type 2 diabetes is usually preceded by a longer symptom-free interval. However, insulin resistance and a disorder of insulin secretion does exist in these patients long before the disease becomes manifest, which very often already at this time leads to an increased risk of stroke, myocardial infarction and peripheral arterial disease.<sup>7</sup> Measures for prevention and early recognition of type 2 diabetes are therefore of prime importance.

## Epidemiology

Type 1 diabetes only accounts for 5–15% of all diabetic patients. Type 2 diabetes is the most common form of the disease and accounts for approximately 90% of all people suffering from diabetes. Usually, type 2 diabetes is diagnosed after the age of 35 years; however, over the last few years, there has been an increase in the prevalence of type 2 diabetes among adolescents.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, evidence suggests that there is a high proportion of people with undiagnosed diabetes.<sup>9,10</sup>

The impact of diabetes on health in Europe can hardly be underestimated. Unfortunately, sources of data on diabetes and data collection are different. In 2003, however, the International Diabetes Federation

estimated that about 48 million people in Europe suffer from diabetes. This corresponds to a prevalence of 7.8%, which is expected to rise to 9.1% by 2025. By 2025 the direct cost of diabetes is expected to represent between 7% and 13% of the total health expenditure.<sup>4</sup>

Diabetes has a dramatic impact on mortality, morbidity, daily functioning<sup>11</sup> and quality of life: diabetes patients have three to four times as much risk of dying from cardiovascular diseases. Diabetes is still the most common cause of blindness at a working age, one of the most common causes of kidney failure, and the most common cause of leg amputation.<sup>5,12</sup>

## Reasons for concern and central questions

There is ample evidence that the typical long-term relationship between patients with chronic conditions and their general practitioner (GP)/family physician, with multiple consultations and health checks over time offers a very good opportunity to assess risk factors or early suspicious symptoms and to identify patients with increased risk for developing diabetes or another chronic disease.<sup>13</sup> Although the quality of diabetes care in many healthcare systems is gradually improving, this holds for a part of the patient population only.<sup>14–19</sup> Furthermore, besides the high proportion of people with undiagnosed diabetes, there is still a wide variation in quality of care, with rates of recommended care processes being unacceptably low in some healthcare settings.<sup>19–24</sup>

*What are the reasons for that variation in the quality of care? What lessons can be learned? What are our recommendations in order to improve diabetes care in Europe?*

## Methodology and process

To improve diabetes care in Europe, the position paper in 2006 put forward arguments for the chronic care model as a conceptual basis,<sup>25–27</sup> and its foundation rooted in primary care has been underlined. The following general principles have been summarised:

- patients should be active and empowered partners in diabetes care
- diabetes care should be provided by an interdisciplinary team
- quality monitoring is a prerequisite for efficient diabetes management
- information and communication technology are crucial to facilitate integrated diabetes care
- prevention and early detection of diabetes require more attention.

Based on these conclusions, the current position paper aims to provide some more-specific recommendations. A survey was conducted in the autumn of 2007 via a network of participating GPs, experts and specialists in the field of diabetes. They were recruited via Wonca network organisations and their partners in the field of diabetes (see Box 1). Reports from 15 countries were received. A workshop was organised in Vienna in December 2007 with the following participants: Luk Van Eygen, Belgium; Domingo Orozco, Spain; Rurik Imre, Hungary; Hakan Yaman, Turkey; Susanne Pusarnig, Austria; Astrid Knopp, Austria; and Manfred Maier, Austria. At the workshop, the reports received from different countries were discussed and the draft version of the position paper was reviewed. As a result, the lessons learned and conclusions drawn were formulated and included in the position paper. Several calls for comments to the subsequent draft versions resulted in a lively discussion via the internet, and it was possible to include additional contributions or suggestions by colleagues (see Box 1) in the final version of this position paper.

### Box 1 Participating colleagues and their nationality

Austria (AT) – Astrid Knopp, Susanne Pusarnig, Manfred Maier  
 Belgium (BE) – Luk van Eygen, Patricia Sunaert, Johan Wens  
 Denmark (DK) – Torsten Lauritzen  
 Finland (FI) – Liisa Hiltunen  
 France (FR) – Patrick Chevallier, Jean-Pierre Lebeau  
 Germany (DE) – Harald Abholz, Erika Baum, Günther Egidi, Michael Kochen  
 Hungary (HU) – Imre Rurik  
 Lithuania (LT) – Leonas Valius  
 Netherlands (NL) – Henk van Dam, Frans van der Horst, Wim de Grauw, Guy Rutten  
 Rumania (RO) – Dan Pletea  
 Slovenia (SI) – Janko Kersnik  
 Spain (ES) – Domingo Orozco, Fernando Alvarez-Guisasola, Xavier Cos  
 Switzerland (CH) – Niklaus Egli, Christoph Hollenstein, Bruno Kissling  
 Turkey (TR) – Hakan Yaman  
 United Kingdom (UK) – Kamlesh Khunti

our survey (see Table 1). In addition, the scientific literature was searched accordingly. Some key issues are now summarised.

## National strategies for diabetes care

Based on available data many countries lack a national strategy for diabetes care. Such a strategy, however, apparently supports the quality of care provided and the outcome of diabetes care achieved.

As can be seen from Table 1, only seven countries have a *national strategy* for diabetes care in place. In Romania, a new comprehensive protocol for diabetes care was offered to doctors and patients in 2007. In Hungary, a programme exists, but it is hardly implemented,<sup>28</sup> and in six countries there is no national strategy at all. In the UK, a National Service Framework was published in 2001 with the aim of improving the quality of care of people with diabetes and of reducing variations in care.<sup>29</sup>

Furthermore, only Spain,<sup>30,31</sup> France, Slovenia, Lithuania and the Netherlands have implemented a *disease registry* for patients with the disease. Registers might be implemented only at the secondary level (Slovenia) or only in some regions (Denmark,<sup>32</sup> the Netherlands,<sup>33</sup> UK<sup>34</sup>), or only for patients taking part in a structured disease-management programme (Germany, Austria); in France, registration is incomplete, the same seems to be true for Romania.

Similarly, only Finland, Slovenia, Turkey,<sup>35</sup> Lithuania and the Netherlands<sup>36</sup> have some form of *screening programme* in place. In Austria, Belgium and the UK, there is opportunistic screening;<sup>6</sup> in all other countries, apparently, there is no national screening programme for people at risk for developing diabetes or for people so far undiagnosed with the disease.

## Care providers

If the responsibility for the management of diabetes care is not allocated to a predefined level of care or a predefined group of health professionals, outcome appears to be unsatisfactory. A well-developed primary healthcare system, where people with diabetes type 2 are managed, appears to be a good foundation for better outcomes. Vocational training and status for GPs, however, are different across Europe, and specific training in diabetes care for GPs has only recently been introduced in some countries.

## Experiences and practices

Background information from 15 European countries that was relevant for diabetes care – most of it unpublished in the scientific literature – could be collected by

**Table 1** Background information collected by the survey

	AT	CH	RO	FR	FI	UK	ES	SI	TR	HU	BE	DE	LT	DK	NL
Prevalence (%)	5 <sup>a</sup>	4	1.8	2.1	9.6	3.7	10	3-4	3.4-7.2	5	3.3	>6.9	2-4.2	3.8	3.8
Status of PC															
• Gate keeping	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2009	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
• List system		(Voluntary)		(Voluntary)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2009	Yes	Part	Part	Yes	Yes	Yes
Structured programme/DMP	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Occasional	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Date of implementation	2007				2003		2004	1995		1997	1988	2004	2006	2007	1989
• Coordinated by	GP/Int.				Int/nurses	GP	GP/Int.	GP/Int.	GP	GP	Specialist	GP/specialist	GP	GP	GP
• Financial incentives	Yes				No	Yes	Variable	No		None	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
National disease registry	No	No	(Yes)	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	DMP	Yes	Yes	Yes
National guidelines	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Date of implementation	2005		2005	1999	1997	2004	2000	2007	2003	2005	2005	2002	2002	1991	1989
• Developed by	Inter-disciplinary		GPs	Inter-disciplinary	Multi-disciplinary	Multi-disciplinary	GPs	Specialist	MOH/inter-disciplinary	Specialists	GPs/specialists	Specialists	MOH	GPs	GPs/specialists
• Evidence based	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	(Yes)	Yes	Part	Yes	Yes	No	Part	Yes	Yes
• Updated					High	High	?	High	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Adherence	?		?	Low	High	High	?	High	Unknown	Moderate	Unknown	Unknown	Moderate	Moderate	Good

Table 1 Continued

Specific training for (participating) GPs <sup>b</sup>	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sporadically	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Patient empowerment	Yes	Yes	(Yes)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not in PHC	Yes	Yes	?	No	?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Outcome of diabetes care	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Yes	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known	Known	Known
• Data	–	–	–	Partly	Yes	Some	–	–	–	Not known	Some	Some	Some	Some	Yes	Yes	Yes
• Guesses	Unsatisfactory	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	–	Unsatisfactory	Acceptable?	Not known	Unsatisfactory	Not known	Acceptable	Acceptable	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Good	Good
Quality monitoring in PC	No	No	?	Yes	Yes	Part.	No	No	No	No	No, in secondary care	No	Within DMP	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Research at primary care level	Little	Little	Little	Some	Few	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Some	Little	Some	Yes	Yes	Yes
National strategy	No	No	(Yes)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

<sup>a</sup> Prescription data, undetected cases estimated

<sup>b</sup> Specialty training to become a GP or specific training for GPs participating in a programme  
MOH: Ministry of Health; DMP: disease management program; PC: primary care; Part: partially; Int: internists  
Country abbreviations see Box 1

Across the nations surveyed, *medical care* for people with diabetes is provided by both GPs and specialists. Although the majority of people with type 2 diabetes are managed in primary care by GPs in France, Finland, Belgium, Spain, Lithuania, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria and the Netherlands, responsibility for patients is not always clearly defined. In the Netherlands, shared diabetes care has been implemented to a large extent with well-defined guidelines for referral from primary care to hospital-based care. GPs, specialists/diabetologists and diabetes nurses work together in regional networks. In the UK, the majority of people are cared for in primary care;<sup>37</sup> however, there has recently been a shift in reducing the proportion of people being cared for in secondary care, and instead new intermediate care models are now being implemented in a community setting.<sup>38</sup> In all other countries, patients are cared for primarily by specialists at specified institutions or at the secondary level in a hospital.

Even among countries that have implemented a *structured programme* for the care of people with diabetes, clear allocation of responsibility for the co-ordination of care exists only in Hungary, Lithuania, Denmark, the Netherlands and the UK. In all other countries with a structured care programme, responsibility for co-ordinating care and managing patients seems to be left to market forces between GPs and internists.

*Vocational training* to become a specialist in primary care, or specific training of GPs to care for patients with diabetes differs across Europe. Specific training in some way or another exists in the majority of countries: in Spain specialty training for general practice was already introduced in 1982; in other countries specific training for GPs to improve the care of people with diabetes has been introduced during the last few years, mostly in relation to a structured programme for screening or care (Austria, Germany,<sup>39,40</sup> UK<sup>38</sup>).

## Patient involvement and support for self-management

In order to improve care and outcome of people with diabetes, active participation of well-informed patients, their commitment, their sense of responsibility and their motivation for adequate self-management appear to be necessary. Based on their long-lasting relationship with their patients and on the knowledge of their individual psychosocial background, GPs are in a perfect position to support and foster patient involvement.

While providers are experts in the medical field of diabetes, people with diabetes themselves are experts in the field of living with diabetes.<sup>41</sup> It seems logical to make use of that expertise and activate it to improve care and outcome. As GPs are in a very good position to understand that decisions made by individual patients – especially outside of hospitals in the community setting<sup>42</sup> – are influenced more by their own personal beliefs of diabetes than by medical concepts, joint agreements between patients and co-ordinating physicians on diagnostic procedures and treatment options are necessary. Thereby, individual risks and patients' preferences have to be taken into account,<sup>43</sup> owing to the patient centeredness of primary care.<sup>44</sup> This implies active patient participation and commitment – i.e. *patient-empowerment*. Although these strategies have been implemented already, they have so far proven to be effective on a rather small scale only.<sup>45–47</sup>

Apparently, the potential of patient empowerment has been recognised recently. In 10 out of 15 countries some form of patient empowerment such as a structured education programme has been implemented, and the need for picking up responsibility for one's own health has been emphasised (see Table 1).

## Quality of care provided

Though diabetes guidelines exist in almost all countries across Europe, the level of adherence to these guidelines is unknown or unsatisfactory. The quality of care provided is unknown or unsatisfactory in most countries, mainly due to the lack of reliable data.

Overall, very little is known about the quality of care provided to people with diabetes in Europe. In particular, *reliable and valid data*, which can be used for assessment and evaluation of outcomes, are not available in most countries. An exception is the Netherlands; based on available data (see Table 2) it can be concluded that the outcome of care is known and can be judged to be good.<sup>21,33,48–51</sup> Also in the UK, the quality of care was good;<sup>52</sup> however, it has improved further since the introduction of a pay for performance contract in 2004.<sup>53</sup> In all other countries the outcome is believed to be either unsatisfactory,<sup>54,55</sup> or possibly acceptable.

Surprisingly, *national guidelines*, believed to be a prerequisite for quality care, exist in all but two countries (Switzerland and Germany). These have been implemented dating back as early as 1989 (Netherlands); the majority of guidelines are said to be evidence based and are updated more or less regularly. Ministries of health, specialists, GPs or an interdisciplinary group of

**Table 2** Results of routine diabetes care in general practices without support of special diabetes services achieved in a good structured primary healthcare system

Outcome	Study 1 (1999) <sup>48</sup> <i>n</i> = 594	Study 2 (2000) <sup>49</sup> <i>n</i> = 1641	Study 3 (2000) <sup>50</sup> <i>n</i> = 1084	Study 4 (2003) <sup>33</sup> <i>n</i> = 1640	Study 5 (2004) <sup>21</sup> <i>n</i> = 7893	Study 6 (2005) <sup>51</sup> <i>n</i> = 309
HbA <sub>1c</sub> (%)	7.1 (1.5)	7.1 (1.7)	7.5 (1.3)	7.1 (1.1)	7.0 (1.3)	7.0
RR systolic (mmHg)	150 (20)	148 (21)	162 (26)	146 (19)	149 (21)	138
RR diastolic (mmHg)	82 (9)	84 (11)	87 (12)	83 (9)	83 (11)	76
Cholesterol (mmol/l)	5.4 (1.1)	5.8 (1.2)	5.7 (1.1)	5.2 (1.0)	5.2 (1.1)	–
BMI	29.2 (5.1)	28.7 (5.2)	28.9 (4.8)	29.4 (5.5)	–	29.0

BMI: body mass index; RR: blood pressure  
Standard deviation is given in parentheses

professionals are mainly responsible for the development of these guidelines. From the available data it seems clear that the development of guidelines by the ministry or by specialists does not support adherence among primary care physicians. In contrast, adherence to guidelines that have been developed by GPs and specialists together appears to be better.<sup>33</sup>

## Context of care provision

The context of where and how diabetes care is provided appears to be important. A framework with gate keeping, a list system for patients, and structured programmes accompanied by financial incentives seems to be supportive for adherence and good outcomes.

Finland, Spain, Slovenia, Lithuania, Denmark, the UK and the Netherlands have healthcare systems with *gatekeeping* and a patient list in place (see Table 1). In countries like Germany, Belgium, Hungary or France, gatekeeping is either voluntary or implemented at the regional level only.

Most countries provide care for people with diabetes at the *community level*, or are at least encouraging community-based care (Turkey). In Romania, Slovenia, Turkey and Hungary, care at least in part is provided at specialised clinics or institutions, for example in Romania it is provided for diabetic patients on insulin therapy.

During the last 10–15 years, ten countries have implemented some form of structured programme for the care of diabetic patients.<sup>39,56</sup> Seven of them

have supported implementation or continuation of the programme by *financial incentives* for the care provider, the patient or both.<sup>57</sup> Among them are the Netherlands and UK with good outcomes in diabetes care (Braken, personal communication),<sup>21,33,48–52</sup> or countries that have good data,<sup>53</sup> or have moderate to good adherence to guidelines.<sup>33</sup>

## Monitoring, feedback and research

Many countries lack quality monitoring or systematic research of the diabetes care provided. This may cause insufficient information and feedback at the political level.

Among the 15 countries surveyed, only Finland, the UK and the Netherlands have a *quality monitoring* system in place at the primary care level. Other countries have implemented quality monitoring either at the regional level or in secondary care, or within a structured disease-management programme.<sup>39,55</sup>

The majority of countries show some *research activities* at the primary care level. In Europe, however, only the UK, Denmark and the Netherlands have a strong international research record;<sup>51,57</sup> so far, little or no research is done in Austria, Switzerland, Romania or France. It is not the aim of this paper to identify the reasons for this difference in research activities. It is common knowledge, however, that an appropriate infrastructure and funding situation for research would help to bridge the gap between process and outcome of health services provided and health policy.<sup>58,59</sup>

## Lessons learned

From the country reports provided (see Tables 1 and 2), and from the literature it can be concluded:

- 1 care of people with diabetes is differently organised across Europe. The level and degree of organisation varies widely and apparently depends on both the status of the healthcare system and the level of professional involvement
- 2 official data on the prevalence of diabetes vary widely (1.8–10%); sources of data and data collection are different. As a consequence, prevalence or incidence data are hardly comparable
- 3 in almost all countries, diabetes is believed to be underdiagnosed and the prevalence of type 2 diabetes is believed to be underestimated
- 4 in most countries, the quality of care is unknown but perceived to be unsatisfactory
- 5 in most countries, the acceptance/adherence to guidelines is unknown and seems to be unsatisfactory. The development of guidelines alone or their simple availability does not necessarily improve quality of care for patients with diabetes
- 6 countries that have a monitoring system and are registering patients with diabetes have a better quality of care than countries without such a register
- 7 countries with a tradition of research in primary care have much better information and data on quality of diabetes care than countries without that tradition.

*Positive highlights* of this survey have also been identified; in many countries:

- there is a trend towards disease-management programmes/structured programmes for care of people with diabetes
- specific guidelines for managing people with diabetes have been developed with primary care input in most countries
- there is a trend towards patient empowerment, emphasising patient-centred medical care
- specific training to become a GP or to train GPs specifically for the care of people with diabetes is developing in some countries
- there is a trend to recognise GPs as co-ordinators of structured care programmes.

Some *negative highlights* were also found; in many countries:

- there is a lack of reliable epidemiological data
- there is a lack of data for outcome measures or of data on the quality of care
- there is a lack of research at the level of primary care
- adherence to guidelines is not known

- structured screening or prevention programmes are scarce.

It should be kept in mind that data about adherence to guidelines and about the quality of care from the hospital-based diabetes care across almost all European countries also hardly exist.

## Recommendations

Based on the information and data collected or available, the current position paper extends the evidence summarised in 2006,<sup>25</sup> and provides further recommendations to improve the quality of care for diabetic patients.

### General recommendation

To improve the quality of diabetes care and to develop a sound and sustainable evidence base for decisions in health policy regarding diabetes care, we strongly recommend:

- to recognise the importance of a well-developed primary care workforce in this endeavour
- to promote and strengthen primary care by:
  - increasing education and training
  - providing a supportive environment for care provision and research at the primary care level including the allocation of research funds
  - developing methods for collection of routine data and monitoring
  - positioning primary care at the centre of health-care systems in Europe.

### Specific recommendations

- 1 An interdisciplinary team of professionals should agree on common goals and on a national strategy for the care of patients with diabetes.
- 2 Initiatives aiming to improve the quality of care must be evidence based and should be developed by an interdisciplinary team including all parties involved, in order to facilitate implementation and adherence.
- 3 Programmes should be implemented, conducted, co-ordinated, adapted to individual patients and evaluated at the community level by trained primary care physicians (and their teams).
- 4 Systematic education or training should be offered to care providers and patients.
- 5 Comprehensive registers for patients with diabetes should be established and maintained as a standardised source of reliable information.

- 6 Implementation of initiatives to improve the quality of care and outcome should be supported by incentives for providers and patients.

## Conclusions

The different stages of developments in the organisation of diabetes care in Europe illustrate the transition process European health systems are going through. They were designed in the middle of the 20th century to deal mainly with acute diseases, but due to the progress of medicine and the ageing of the European population, the focus has shifted towards chronic disease management. Diabetes care is one of the fields where the implementation of these changes has progressed furthest so far. Important choices have to be made, which affect not just diabetes care, but also the overall healthcare organisation. In 2006 we strongly pleaded for a diabetes care model rooted in primary care.<sup>25</sup> Primary care offers holistic, comprehensive and continuing care to the diabetes patient in a personalised and efficient way.<sup>60</sup> Evidence has clearly shown that well-structured primary care can provide high-quality diabetes care.<sup>13,21,33,36,48–50,52,54,61</sup>

It is clear that at present many healthcare and primary care systems in Europe have been unable to take up this task. In addition to global payment systems, patients' listing and a gatekeeper role for the GP,<sup>25</sup> we recommend:

- development of strategies and national guidelines by all players involved
- provision of incentives to improve adherence to such guidelines in primary care
- co-ordination of structured programmes at the community level and adaptation to individual patients by a well-developed primary care workforce
- registration of patients
- education of patients and training of professionals and regular evaluation of such programmes through health services research projects.

So far, there is no evidence available to recommend population-based screening programmes. Therefore, screening programmes for impaired glucose tolerance among high-risk individuals, which are considered in some countries,<sup>62</sup> should be a focus for research before implementing them on a population level.

These proposed reforms will not only have their impact on diabetes care, but will strengthen the position of primary care within each healthcare system and make the future implementation of other disease-management programmes for chronic conditions in primary care easier. *We strongly believe, therefore, that*

*the lessons learned and recommendations listed for the disease entity 'diabetes mellitus' most likely will be very similar for other chronic conditions as well.*

Therefore, the debate on the diabetes care organisation, its consensual development and harmonisation, its efficient implementation and systematic evaluation at the national level reflects the fundamental choices the European healthcare systems, professionals and consumers have to make at the beginning of the 21st century in the face of the demographic developments.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Contributing authors: Günther Egidi, Wim de Grauw, Guy Rutten, Patricia Sunaert, Johan Wens, Torsten Lauritzen, Liisa Hiltunen, Patrick Chevallier, Jean-Pierre Lebeau, Günther Egidi, Leonas Valius, Frans van der Horst, Henk van Dam, Dan Pletea, Fernando Alvarez-Guisasola, Xavier Cos, Janko Kersnik, Christoph Hollenstein and Kamlesh Khunti.

Peer group: Bruno Kissling, Harald Abholz, Erika Baum, Michael Kochen and Niklaus Egli.

Thanks also to Diederik Aarendonk.

## REFERENCES

- 1 de Grauw WJ, van de Lisdonk EH, van den Hoogen HJ and van Weel C. Cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in type 2 diabetic patients: a 22-year historical cohort study in Dutch general practice. *Diabetic Medicine* 1995;12:117–22.
- 2 de Grauw WJ, van de Lisdonk EH, Behr RR *et al.* The impact of type 2 diabetes mellitus on daily functioning. *Family Practice* 1999;16:133–9.
- 3 Silink M. United Nations Resolution 61/225 – what does it mean to the diabetes world? *International Journal of Clinical Practice Supplement* 2007;157:5–8.
- 4 International Diabetes Federation. *Diabetes Atlas*. IDF: Brussels, 2006.
- 5 World Health Organization. *European Health Report 2002*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Publications, European Series, 2002.
- 6 (ÖDG) ÖD-G. Diabetes Mellitus – Leitlinien für die Praxis. *Acta Medica Austriaca* 2005;31:155–84.
- 7 American Diabetes Association. Standards of medical care in diabetes – 2008. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31(suppl 1):S12–54.
- 8 Fagot-Campagna A, Saaddine JB, Flegal KM, Beckles GL. Diabetes, impaired fasting glucose, and elevated HbA<sub>1c</sub> in U.S. adolescents: the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. *Diabetes Care* 2001; 24:834–7.
- 9 American Diabetes Association. *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes*, 2005;28:S4–36.
- 10 Wong KC and Wang Z. Prevalence of type 2 diabetes mellitus of Chinese populations in Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. *Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice* 2006;73:126–34.

- 11 Weijman I, Ros WJ, Rutten GE *et al.* Fatigue in employees with diabetes: its relation with work characteristics and diabetes related burden. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 2003;60(suppl 1):i93–8.
- 12 Muller IS, de Grauw WJ, van Gerwen WH *et al.* Foot ulceration and lower limb amputation in type 2 diabetic patients in Dutch primary health care. *Diabetes Care* 2002;25:570–4.
- 13 Starfield B. New paradigms for quality in primary care. *British Journal of General Practice* 2001;51:303–9.
- 14 Shaughnessy AF and Slawson DC. Blowing the whistle on review articles. *BMJ* 2004;328:E280–2.
- 15 Winocour PH. Effective diabetes care: a need for realistic targets. *BMJ* 2002;324:1577–80.
- 16 Hirsch IB. The burden of diabetes (care). *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:1613–14.
- 17 Goyder EC, McNally PG, Drucquer M, Spiers N and Botha JL. Shifting of care for diabetes from secondary to primary care, 1990–5: review of general practices. *BMJ* 1998;316:1505–6.
- 18 Virally M, Blickle JF, Girard J *et al.* Type 2 diabetes mellitus: epidemiology, pathophysiology, unmet needs and therapeutical perspectives. *Diabetes and Metabolism* 2007;33:231–44.
- 19 Khunti K, Ganguli S and Lowy A. Inequalities in provision of systematic care for patients with diabetes. *Family Practice* 2001;18:27–32.
- 20 Khunti K, Ganguli S, Baker R and Lowy A. Features of primary care associated with variations in process and outcome of care of people with diabetes. *British Journal of General Practice* 2001;51:356–60.
- 21 Cleveringa FG, Gorter KJ, van den Donk M, Pijman PL and Rutten GE. Task delegation and computerized decision support reduce coronary heart disease risk factors in type 2 diabetes patients in primary care. *Diabetes Technology and Therapeutics* 2007;9:473–81.
- 22 McBean AM, Jung K and Virnig BA. Improved care and outcomes among elderly medicare managed care beneficiaries with diabetes. *American Journal of Managed Care* 2005;11:213–22.
- 23 Jencks SF, Huff ED and Cuedon T. Change in the quality of care delivered to Medicare beneficiaries, 1998–1999 to 2000–2001. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 2003;289:305–12.
- 24 Saaddine JB, Engelgau MM, Beckles GL *et al.* A diabetes report card for the United States: quality of care in the 1990s. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2002;136:565–74.
- 25 Van Eygen L SP, Borgermans L and Feyen L and De Maeseneer J (eds). *The Management of Chronic Care Conditions in Europe with Special Reference to Diabetes: the pivotal role of primary care. Position Paper 2006.* European Forum for Primary Care, 2006.
- 26 Bodenheimer T, Wagner EH and Grumbach K. Improving primary care for patients with chronic illness. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 2002;288(14):1775–9.
- 27 Bodenheimer T, Wagner EH and Grumbach K. Improving primary care for patients with chronic illness: the chronic care model, Part 2. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 2002;288:1909–14.
- 28 Rurik I. Primary care diabetes in Hungary. *Primary Care Diabetes* 2007;1:177–9.
- 29 Department of Health. *National Service Framework for Diabetes: standards.* London: Department of Health, 2001.
- 30 Valdes S, Botas P, Delgado E, Alvarez F and Cadorniga FD. Population-based incidence of type 2 diabetes in northern Spain: the Asturias Study. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2258–63.
- 31 Valdes S, Rojo-Martinez G and Soriguer F. Evolution of prevalence of type 2 diabetes in adult Spanish population. *Medicina Clinica* 2007;129:352–5.
- 32 Jorgensen LG, Petersen PH, Heickendorff L *et al.* Glycemic control in diabetes in three Danish counties. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine* 2005;43:1366–72.
- 33 Gorter K, van Bruggen R, Stolk R *et al.* Overall quality of diabetes care in a defined geographic region: different sides of the same story. *British Journal of General Practice* 2008;58(550):339–45.
- 34 Edwards R, Burns JA, McElduff P, Young RJ and New JP. Variations in process and outcomes of diabetes care by socio-economic status in Salford, UK. *Diabetologia* 2003;46:750–9.
- 35 Satman I, Yilmaz T, Sengul A *et al.* Population-based study of diabetes and risk characteristics in Turkey: results of the Turkish diabetes epidemiology study (TURDEP). *Diabetes Care* 2002;25:1551–6.
- 36 Janssen P, Gorter K, Stolk R and Rutten G. Low yield of population-based screening for Type 2 diabetes in the Netherlands: the ADDITION Netherlands study. *Family Practice* 2007;24:555–61.
- 37 Khunti K and Ganguli S. Who looks after people with diabetes: primary or secondary care? *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 2000;93:183–6.
- 38 Nocon A, Rhodes PJ, Wright JP *et al.* Specialist general practitioners and diabetes clinics in primary care: a qualitative and descriptive evaluation. *Diabetic Medicine* 2004;21:32–8.
- 39 Dunkelberg S, Noack A, Sperber S *et al.* Disease Management Program for diabetes mellitus type 2: cooperation or resistance of the general practitioner. *Gesundheitswesen* 2006;68:26–31.
- 40 [http://diabetes.therapie-aktiv.at/esvapps/page/page.jsp?p\\_menuid=64393&p\\_pageid=232&p\\_id=4](http://diabetes.therapie-aktiv.at/esvapps/page/page.jsp?p_menuid=64393&p_pageid=232&p_id=4) (accessed 9 April 2008).
- 41 Funnel MM and Anderson RM. Patient empowerment. In: Snoek F and Skinner T (eds) *Psychology in Diabetes Care.* Wiley, 2005.
- 42 Stimson G WB. *Going to see the Doctor. Consultation process in general practice.* London/Boston: Routledge and Kegan, 1975.
- 43 Hansen LJ, Olivarius Nde F, Siersma V, Drivsholm T and Andersen JS. Individualised treatment goals in diabetes care. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care* 2004;22:71–7.
- 44 Wonca Europe. *The European definition of general practice/family medicine.* [www.woncaeurope.org](http://www.woncaeurope.org), 2002.
- 45 Van Dam H, Van der Horst F, Metsers I, Crebolder H and Van den Borne H. Obstacles in the management of type 2 diabetes: the perspectives of patients and experts. In: H van Dam (ed) *Studies and Reflections on Type 2 Diabetes Care in General Practice.* Personal Communication (Thesis Maastricht 2005).

- 46 Vermeire EHH, Rätsep A, Levasseur G *et al.* Obstacles to adherence in living with type-2 diabetes: an international qualitative study using meta-ethnography (Eurobstacle). *Primary Care Diabetes* 2007;1:25–33.
- 47 Anderson B and Funnell M. *The Art of Empowerment. Stories and strategies for diabetes educations.* 2nd edn., American Diabetes Association, 2005.
- 48 de Grauw WJ, van Gerwen WH, van de Lisdonk EH *et al.* Outcomes of audit-enhanced monitoring of patients with type 2 diabetes. *Journal of Family Practice* 2002; 51:459–64.
- 49 Goudswaard AN, Stolk RP, Zuithoff P and Rutten GE. Patient characteristics do not predict poor glycaemic control in type 2 diabetes patients treated in primary care. *European Journal of Epidemiology* 2004;19:541–5.
- 50 Horst-Schrivers ANA, van der Ubink-Veltmaat LJ, Horst ICC, van der Bilo HJG and Lambert J. Matige bloeddrukregulatie bij patiënten met diabetes mellitus type 2 in de eerste en tweede lijn. *Ned Tijdschr Geneesk* 2004;148: 570–4.
- 51 Seddon ME, Marshall MN, Campbell SM and Roland MO. Systematic review of studies of quality of clinical care in general practice in the UK, Australia and New Zealand. *Quality in Health Care* 2001;10:152–8.
- 52 Khunti K, Gadsby R, Millett C, Majeed A and Davies M. Quality of diabetes care in the UK: comparison of published quality-of-care reports with results of the Quality and Outcomes Framework for Diabetes. *Diabetic Medicine* 2007;24:1436–41.
- 53 Orozco-Beltran D, Gil-Guillen VF, Quirce F *et al.* Control of diabetes and cardiovascular risk factors in patients with type 2 diabetes in primary care. The gap between guidelines and reality in Spain. *International Journal of Clinical Practice* 2007;61:909–15.
- 54 Varroud-Vial M, Charpentier G, Vaur L *et al.* Effects of clinical audit on the quality of care in patients with type 2 diabetes: results of the DIABEST pilot study. *Diabetes and Metabolism* 2001;27:666–74.
- 55 [http://diabetes.therapie-aktiv.at/esvapps/page/page.jsp?p\\_pageid=232&p\\_menuid=64351&p\\_id=1](http://diabetes.therapie-aktiv.at/esvapps/page/page.jsp?p_pageid=232&p_menuid=64351&p_id=1) (accessed 9 April 2008).
- 56 [www.diabetespas.be](http://www.diabetespas.be) (accessed 9 April 2008).
- 57 Mendis K and Solangaarachchi I. PubMed perspective of family medicine research: where does it stand? *Family Practice* 2005;22:570–5.
- 58 De Maeseneer JM, van Driel ML, Green LA and van Weel C. The need for research in primary care. *The Lancet* 2003;362:1314–19.
- 59 Rutten G and Munro N. Promoting research in primary care. *Primary Care Diabetes* 2007;1:1–2.
- 60 Bensing JM, Tromp F, van Dulmen S *et al.* Shifts in doctor–patient communication between 1986 and 2002: a study of videotaped general practice consultations with hypertension patients. *BMC Family Practice* 2006;7:62.
- 61 Griffin S and Kinmonth AL. Diabetes care: the effectiveness of systems for routine surveillance for people with diabetes (Cochrane Review). *The Cochrane Library, Issue 2.* Oxford: Update Software, 2000.
- 62 Klein Woolthuis EP, de Grauw WJ, van Gerwen WH *et al.* Identifying people at risk for undiagnosed type 2 diabetes using the GP's electronic medical record. *Family Practice* 2007;24:230–6.

#### ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE

Manfred Maier, Medical University of Vienna, Währingerstrasse 13a, 1090 Vienna, Austria. Email: [manfred.maier@meduniwien.ac.at](mailto:manfred.maier@meduniwien.ac.at)