

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Diabetes and cardiovascular disease risk screening model in community pharmacies in a developing primary healthcare system: feasibility study.

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031246
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-May-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Alzubaidi, Hamzah; University of Sharjah, College of Pharmacy , Pharmacy Practice & Pharmacotherapy Chandir, Subhash; Harvard Medical School Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai, Hasan, Sanah ; Ajman University of Science and Technology College of Pharmacy and Health Science McNamara, Kevin; Deakin University, Cox , Rachele; Harvard Medical School, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Krass, Ines; University of Sydney, Faculty of Pharmacy
Keywords:	Primary Health Care, Cardiovascular Diseases, Point-of-Care Testing, General diabetes < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, Pharmacy, Screening



 primary healthcare system: feasibility study. Authors: Hamzah Alzubaidi^{1*}, Subhash Chandir², Sanah Hasan³, Kevin Mc Namara^{4,5}, Rachele Cox^{6,} In *Corresponding author: Dr. Hamzah Alzubaidi BPharm (Hons), MPharm (Clinic), PhD 1. Sharjah Institute for Medical Research and College of Pharmacy, University of Sharjah PO Box 27272, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates Tel: +9716505-7424 E-mail: halzubaidi@sharjah.ac.ae Co-authors: 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City. UAE 	
 Authors: Hamzah Alzubaidi^{1*}, Subhash Chandir², Sanah Hasan³, Kevin Mc Namara^{4,5}, Rachele Cox⁶, Ii *Corresponding author: Dr. Hamzah Alzubaidi BPharm (Hons), MPharm (Clinic), PhD 1. Sharjah Institute for Medical Research and College of Pharmacy, University of Sharjah PO Box 27272, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates Tel: +9716505-7424 E-mail: halzubaidi@sharjah.ac.ae Co-authors: 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City. UAE 	
 *Corresponding author: Dr. Hamzah Alzubaidi BPharm (Hons), MPharm (Clinic), PhD 1. Sharjah Institute for Medical Research and College of Pharmacy, University of Sharjah PO Box 27272, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates Tel: +9716505-7424 E-mail: halzubaidi@sharjah.ac.ae Co-authors: 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City. UAE 	ies Krass ⁷
 University of Sharjah PO Box 27272, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates Tel: +9716505-7424 E-mail: halzubaidi@sharjah.ac.ae Co-authors: 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City. UAE 	
 PO Box 27272, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates Tel: +9716505-7424 E-mail: halzubaidi@sharjah.ac.ae Co-authors: 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE 	
 Tel: +9716505-7424 E-mail: halzubaidi@sharjah.ac.ae Co-authors: 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City. UAE 	
E-mail: halzubaidi@sharjah.ac.ae Co-authors: 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH 2. Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School 2. Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE	
 Co-authors: 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE 	
 2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE 	
 20 Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai 21 Harvard Medical School 22 Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE 	
 ²⁰ Epidemiologist, center of Global Health Delivery–Dubal ²¹ Harvard Medical School ²² Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE 	
 Building 14. Dubai Healthcare City. UAE 	
Building 14. Dubai HealthCare City. UAE	
23 DO Day 505276	
24 PU Box 505276	
25 Email: <u>Subhash_Chandir@hms.harvard.edu</u>	
3. Sanah Hasan PharmD, PhD	
29 Department of Clinical Sciences	
30 College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences	
31 Ajman University	
32 Email: <u>s.hasan@ajman.ac.ae</u> 33	
35	
 4. Dr. Kevin Mc Namara BSc (Pharm), MSc (Community Health), PhD 	
 School of Medicine, Deakin University, 75 Pigdons Rd, Waurn Ponds, Vic 3216 38 	
³⁹ Centre for Population Health Research,	
Deakin University,	
42 Burwood, Vic 3125	
43 Email: kevin.mcnamara@deakin.edu.au	
44	
45	
⁴⁶ ⁴⁷ 5. Rachele Cox MPH	
48 Research Assistant, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai	
⁴⁹ Harvard Medical School	
⁵⁰ Building 14 Dubai Healthcare City UAF	
51 PO Box 505276	
52 Fmail: Bachele. cox@hms.harvard.edu	
54	
55	
56 6 Jack Krass RBharm Din Hosp Bharm Grad Din Educ Studios (Health Ed), DhD	
57 School of Dharmacy	
58 School of Filamacy,	
60 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

Faculty of Medicine and Health

¹ University of Sydney

Camperdown, NSW 2006

4 Email: <u>ines.krass@sydney.edu.au</u>

22 March 2019

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

tor peer terien only

BMJ Open

Abstract:

Objectives: To develop an evidence-based community pharmacist-delivered screening model for diabetes and cardiovascular disease (CVD), and assess its feasibility to identify and refer patients with elevated risk.
Design: A feasibility study.
Setting: A purposive sample of 12 community pharmacies in three UAE cities.
Participants: Adults 40 years of age and above who have not been previously diagnosed with either diabetes or CVD.
Intervention: Pharmacist screening of adults visiting pharmacies involved history, demographics, anthropometric measurements, blood pressure, and point-of-care testing including HbA1c levels and lipid panel. Participants with a 10-year CVD risk ≥7.5%, HbA1c level ≥5.7% or American Diabetes Association risk score ≥5 points, were advised to visit their

physician.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: (1) Development of UAE pharmacist-delivered screening model, (2) the proportion of screened participants identified as having high CVD risk (ASCVD 10-year risk defined as \geq 7.5%), (3) the proportion of participants identified as having elevated blood glucose (high HbA1c level \geq 5.7% (38.8mmol/mol)) or high self-reported diabetes risk (ADA risk score \geq 5 points). Secondary outcomes: participants' satisfaction with the screening.

Results: The first UAE pharmacist-delivered screening model was developed and implemented. A total of 115 participants were screened, 17% had an elevated 10-year CVD risk, 21% and 11% had HbA1c levels consistent with prediabetes and diabetes respectively. Additionally, 41.8% and 67.5% of participants had elevated low-density lipoprotein and triglyceride levels respectively. Systolic blood pressure was elevated in 47% of participants, while 36.5% were overweight, and 44.3% were obese. At-risk individuals (61.7%) were referred to their physicians. 94.5% of participants were at least satisfied with their screening experience.

Conclusions: The community pharmacist-delivered screening of diabetes and CVD risk is feasible in the UAE. The model offers a platform to increase screening capacity within primary care and provides an opportunity for early detection and treatment of CVD and diabetes.

 Keyword: Diabetes, Cardiovascular Diseases, Screening, Pharmacy, Point-of-Care Testing, Primary Health Care

 22 March 2019
 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Use of a UAE expert panel to develop a culturally suitable model for pharmacist-delivered screening for diabetes and cardiovascular diseases risk.
- A majority of screened participants were found to be at high risk for diabetes or CVD strongly supporting an unmet need in the UAE.
- Pharmacist-delivered screening results were acted upon by physicians.
- Follow-up with physicians on referral outcomes of participants at-risk could not be determined due to the fragmented healthcare system. We relied on patient self-report data for this study.
- The purposive sampling of community pharmacies may limit the model's generalizability such that it may not be suitable for implementation in all community pharmacies in the UAE.

22 March 2019

BMJ Open

Introduction

Type 2 diabetes (T2DM) and cardiovascular disease (CVD) are leading contributors to the global burden of disease, albeit with distinct long-term trends.(1) Diabetes, a rapidly growing global epidemic, affects all countries, and is substantially caused by rapidly increasing rates of obesity over recent decades. (2) By 2040 T2DM will affect an estimated 642m people; 10.4% of the adult population, compared with 8.8% in 2015.(2-4) Age-standardized CVD trends are more geographically nuanced – generally, the incidence has declined markedly in highly developed countries over several decades, but this decline has now plateaued.(5) Likewise, some middle-income regions have experienced declines in CVD mortality, but in most regions of the developing world, a rapid increased incidence has recently prevailed.(5) Globally in 2015, an estimated 422.7 million prevalent cases of CVD, ischemic heart disease and stroke remained the leading causes of death.(6) A combination of an aging western society, and increasing CVD mortality rates in many developing regions, has resulted in increasing CVD-related deaths from 12.6 million in 1990 to 17.9 million in 2015.(6) Both CVD and diabetes represent major public health challenges in all countries. Globally, CVD affects 32.2% of all persons with T2DM.(7)

An estimated 45.8% (174.8 million) of adult diabetes cases worldwide are undiagnosed, ranging from 24.1% to 75.1% in different countries.(8) Overall, the prevention and delay of diabetes complications are facilitated by combining early detection of undiagnosed diabetes using population or opportunistic screening approaches with effective prevention interventions.(9-11)

In Arabic-speaking countries, prevalence of T2DM is at alarming levels with high morbidity and mortality rates.(12) Six Arabic-speaking countries (Kuwait, Lebanon, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Saudi Arabia, and Bahrain) lead the world in the prevalence of T2DM, affecting approximately one in five people.(13) There is an urgent need to increase capacity for the detection of diabetes and to reduce its burden in these Arabic-speaking countries. Previous research has identified negative health beliefs, poor health-seeking

22 March 2019

behaviors, and intentional delay in accessing available medical services are commonplace in Arabic-speaking communities, hence the need for proactive and opportunistic population screenings. (14-16)

The feasibility of pharmacist-delivered screening, for a variety of conditions including diabetes and CVD, is well supported by evidence.(17, 18) Such screening interventions identified at-risk individuals and increased rates of disease diagnosis, reduced disease risk factors, improved health behaviors, enhanced quality of care, and increased patient knowledge and awareness.(19) Community pharmacists have face-to-face contact with around 90% of the population annually and appear to interact regularly with those who have elevated risk of diabetes and CVD, or undiagnosed diabetes.(20) The potential, therefore, exists for pharmacists to improve access to health screening services and promote public health awareness.

In the UAE a substantial number of people with diabetes and a high prevalence of overweight and obesity are currently thought to remain undiagnosed.(21) There are around 2,500 licensed community pharmacies in UAE that are generally open seven days per week, easily accessible, and have an average working day of 13 hours (22, 23); this potentially makes pharmacies an effective setting to offer screening for diabetes and CVD within the primary care system. To our knowledge, no systematic diabetes and CVD screening programs exist in the primary care setting in the UAE, meaning these diseases continue to be undiagnosed precluding the opportunity to initiate early prevention and treatment.

The aim of this study was to test the feasibility of pharmacist-delivered diabetes and CVD risk screening model in the UAE. The specific objectives were to:

1. Develop locally-appropriate pharmacist-delivered diabetes and CVD risk screening model for the community pharmacies in UAE.

2. Evaluate the feasibility of implementing diabetes and CVD risk screening model in the selected community pharmacies in the UAE.

BMJ Open

Methods

Ethical approvals

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Sharjah, the Ministry of Health and Prevention in the UAE, and deemed Exempt by the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health Institutional Review Board.

Study design

The study was conducted in three phases: Phase 1 (formative phase) explored development of a suitable model for diabetes screening and CVD risk assessment in community pharmacies in the UAE, Phase 2 (implementation phase) assessed the feasibility of the screening model, and Phase 3 (evaluation phase) tested the impact of the screening model.

Phase 1: Formative Phase

A systematic approach was used to develop the intervention of diabetes and CVD screening.(24) The formative phase commenced with identifying needs for diabetes and CVD risk screening program. After identifying the suitability of community pharmacies for providing screening services, a literature review of pharmacist-delivered screening models was conducted to identify useful and effective approaches to screening. The Australian Cardiovascular Absolute Risk Screening Study (CARS) was considered an appropriate template model to inform the development of the first UAE pharmacy-based screening program.(25) Two local health professionals were consulted to determine the adaptation of CARS into the local context and acceptability of the proposed protocol prior to presenting the model to an expert panel. In absence of national guidelines and frameworks regarding risk assessment and management for diabetes and CVD in the UAE, an expert panel forum was tasked to develop a consensus on the proposed screening program. Prospective panelists were identified through extensive online search; evaluating experts' specialty, experience, and research involvement. Shortlisted experts, including two cardiologists, two endocrinologists, two senior clinical 22 March 2019 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/quidelines.xhtml

1	pharm	acists, were	invited to participate in the forum. The Delphi technique was used to help arrive at a							
2 3 ⊿	consensus on a specific question in one or more rounds - supportive documents were created to aid in voting									
5 6	and to	calculate the	e level of agreement. (26) The Delphi discussion focused on locally-appropriate methods for							
7 8 0	absolu	ite cardiovaso	cular and diabetes risk assessment, including: use of absolute CVD risk assessment and							
9 10 11	other	multi-factoria	al risk algorithm cut-offs; selection of screening tools; and risk factor thresholds for							
12 13	physic	ian referrals.	The following questions were discussed during the forum:							
14 15 16	1.	When shou	Id the participant's blood pressure measurement be taken? Moreover, what is the							
17 18		minimum tir	ne interval needed between taking the two blood pressure readings?							
19 20 21	2.	Which tool t	o use to calculate participants' absolute CVD risk?							
22 23	3.	Which meth	nod would be most suitable for calculating the participants' absolute CVD risk in the							
24 25 26		community	pharmacy setting?							
20 27 28	4.	Which self-r	reported tool to use to determine the participants' risk of having T2DM? What absolute							
29 30		CVD risk thre	eshold should be used when deciding to refer a participant to the physician?							
31 32 33	5.	What HbA1c	e level should be used to refer a participant to the physician?							
34 35	6.	Should at-ris	sk participants who are referred to physicians for further testing be contacted to ask about							
36 37 38		any lifestyle	modifications and outcomes of a visit to a physician? And should the physicians whom the							
39 39 40		referred par	ticipants visited be contacted?							
41 42 42	The so	creening mod	el planning involved the development of resources in supporting pharmacists-delivered							
43 44 45	screen	ning including	: training manual, data collection tools, and patient follow up documents. These were							
46 47	develo	oped through	a process of co-production in consultation with the international co-researchers who had							
48 49 50	previo	ous experience	e in pharmacist-delivered screening services. To ensure local context applicability, study							
51 52 53 54 55 56 57	mater	ials were sent	to three local community pharmacists for feedback and comments.							
58 59 60	22 Ma	rch 2019	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml							

BMJ Open

Phase 2: Implementation Phase

Community pharmacists were trained on the study protocol, and on how to: (1) approach potential participants, (2) use point-of-care testing devices, (3) handle refusals to participate, (4) collect data, (5) communicate risk assessment results to participants, (6) engage and refer at-risk individuals to physicians, (7) counsel participants on required lifestyle changes, and (8) respond to participants' questions.

Study setting and participants

A purposive sample of 12 community pharmacies in the three emirates of Dubai, Sharjah, and Ajman in the UAE was selected. The recruited sites represented both independent and chain pharmacies. Study pharmacists were offered a small monetary incentive (AED 23 (equivalent to USD 6)) per screening as appreciation of their time and offert

time and effort.

Recruitment of participants

Pharmacy-based advertising, including posters and flyers, were used to recruit participants. Individuals were mainly invited directly by the pharmacists to participate based on their judgment of the individual's age. Interested participants were pre-screened by the pharmacists to determine their eligibility. Eligible participants were given written patient information sheet and signed a consent form.

Inclusion criteria:

- Arabic or English speaking.
- Aged between 40 to 74 years. There is no international consensus on the age range for diabetes screening, however, 40 years is recommended in several guidelines and was therefore considered appropriate.

Exclusion criteria:

- Previous diagnosis of diabetes or CVD.
- Use of medications for treatment of diabetes, hypertension or any other CVD at the time of screening.
- Pregnancy.
- 22 March 2019

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- Terminal illness.
- Severe mental illness.

Data collection and risk factor assessment

To document the screening process, participating pharmacists completed brief paper-based records of each screening undertaken. This provided patient risk assessment data, documentation of patient counseling (e.g. lifestyle factors assessed, targets specified, and criteria for referral to a physician) and logistical information (e.g. time taken to conduct screening and counseling, number of visits required, reasons for deviating from suggested screening schedule).

After checking eligibility and obtaining consent, trained pharmacists screened participants with the following measurements:

- Anthropometric measurements: Weights, height and waist circumference were measured along with body mass index calculations.
- Point-of-care testing: Total cholesterol (TC), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL), low-density lipoprotein (LDL) plasma levels, and glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) level, were measured using a finger-prick point-of-care testing device (Roche Cobas b 101 POC dual system). Systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) were measured after participats rested for 5 minutes using the Omron 1A1B[®] automated Blood Pressure (BP) monitor. Pharmacists advised participants to seek immediate medical attention if SBP was ≥180 mmHg, or DBP ≥110 mmHg.
- CVD risk assessment: Projected 10-year atherosclerotic CVD risk was calculated for each participant. Diabetes risk assessment: In addition to HbA1c level, the American Diabetes Association (ADA) T2DM risk questionnaire was completed.
 - Patient History: Detailed socio-demographic information, brief medical history, family history of diabetes, smoking status, physical activity, and dietary behaviors. Patients referral and follow-up:
 Participants at high risk, defined as having any of the following: (1) 10-year ASCVD risk ≥ 7.5% (2)

1	HbA1c level \geq 5.7 (3) ADA T2DM risk questionnaire \geq 5 points, were advised to visit their physician. All
י ז	
3	participants identified, by pharmacists, as at high risk for either CVD or diabetes were given a referral
4	
5	letter summarizing pharmacy screening results to the physician for further testing. A rapid phone
6	
7	follow-up of all participants was conducted (within two weeks of screening) to determine participants'
8 9	
10	satisfaction and experience with the pharmacy screening service. Participants were asked about
11	substaction and experience with the pharmacy screening service. Furthelpants were asked about
12	perceived depth and clarity of pharmacist explanation of diabetes and CVD risk: their satisfaction with
13	perceived depth and clarity of pharmacist explanation of diabetes and CVD risk, their satisfaction with
14 15	the rick accomment and the quality of testing and advice instructions on the need for further
15 16	the fisk assessment and the quality of testing and advice, instructions on the need for further
17	and alter be a she state and the second address the fully second to πb and the second she with the terms of terms o
18	evaluation by a physician; and the perceived length of the screening. They were also asked about their
19	
20	opinion on community pharmacies as a venue of the screening service, whether screening should be
21	
22 23	routinely provided by community pharmacists, and their willingness to pay for future pharmacist-
23 24	
25	delivered screening.
26	
27	The follow-up also included questions about self-reported health status, frequency, and pattern of
28	
29	physician visits in the past year. Participants were asked if they had undergone an assessment of
30	
32	lifestyle that affects diabetes and/or CVD risk by any healthcare professional in the past year or

whether they were advised of the need to reduce their diabetes or CVD risk.

Outcomes

1. Development of UAE pharmacy-based screening model:

A consensus statement from the expert panel detailing the screening processes, cut off points/levels, and referral mechanisms to physicians, all suited to the community pharmacy context in UAE.

2. Feasibility assessment:

a) The proportion of screened participants identified as having high CVD risk (ASCVD 10-year risk defined as ≥7.5% - as determined by the expert panel, see section 3.1).

22 March 2019

- b) The proportion of participants identified as having elevated blood glucose (high A1c level >6.5% (48mmol/mol)) or high self-reported diabetes risk (T2DM risk questionnaire score ≥ 5 points as determined by the expert panel, see section 3.1).
- c) Participants' acceptability and satisfaction with the pharmacist-delivered screening.

Patient and Public Involvement: We did not involve patients or the public in our work

Data analysis

The data was entered into Microsoft Access and 10% of participant files were randomly selected for validation. Stata, release 14 (StataCorp, College Station, TX) was used for data analysis.(27) Normally distributed continuous variables were described using means and standard deviations (such as participants' age, visits to physicians and nutritional habits). Categorical variables were described using counts and frequencies (such as demographic data, BMI (grouped) and medical history). The Chi-squared test was used to test differences in risk factors by age and gender. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Consensus statement on screening intervention

The expert panel reached a consensus on the use of absolute risk assessment and other multi-factorial risk algorithm cut-offs, screening tools, and risk factor thresholds. Panel members unanimously agreed on: taking two seated measurements of BP after a five-minute rest and separated by two minutes. If the two systolic and diastolic BP readings differed by \geq 10 mmHg or \geq 6 mmHg respectively, a third measurement would be needed, and the two closest readings would be used to calculate mean BP. Regarding the calculation of 10-year atherosclerotic CVD risk score, the ACC/AHA pooled cohort equations CVD risk calculator should be used. Participants having a 10-year risk \geq 7.5% were classified as high risk and had to be referred to a physician for further testing. The official ASCVD Risk Estimator Plus smartphone application with off-line feature was deemed most feasible to perform the calculation. Other criteria that independently necessitated referral to a 22 March 2019 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

physician were an HbA1c level exceeding 5.7% (pre-diabetes) or a score above five points on the ADA questionnaire to measure the risk of T2DM.

Regarding the determination of uptake of referral and physician action on the results of the screening, the panelists suggested the impracticality of contacting physician's offices; instead it was agreed that uptake of referral and physician action would be best reported by participants themselves during follow-up calls. Clinical training manual and implementation resources were developed to ensure systematic approaches for the execution of pharmacist-delivered screening and to minimize variability amongst participating pharmacists. Data collection tools and consent forms were adapted from the CARS project. Figure 1 illustrates the final screening model.

Socio-demographic and health characteristics

From December 15, 2017 to May 8, 2018, 120 consenting participants were screened for CVD and T2DM from the population visiting the 12 participating community pharmacies. Five participants were excluded for not meeting study criteria. Socio-demographic and health characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Gender representation was almost equal with most participants having been born in Syria and Egypt. When participants were asked about their present state of health, 32% reported being 'excellent'. On average, participants visited a physician three times a year. 24% of participants reported having regular physicians, while 18.6% had regular clinic but visited different physicians, and 38.6% visited different clinics. In the past 12 months, only 6.4% reported undertaking a detailed examination of lifestyle factors by a health professional.

Cardiovascular disease and diabetes risk

Of the screened participants, 17.1% had elevated 10-year atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk (Table 2). Males were at significantly higher risk than females (P < 0.001), and risk increased significantly with age (P < 0.001). Point-of-care testing showed 21.1% of participants had HbA1c levels consistent with prediabetes, and 11% had levels indicative of diabetes. Older participants were significantly more likely to have HbA1c levels

22 March 2019

indicative of prediabetes or diabetes (P = 0.034). However, no significant differences were found between male and female participants (Table 2).

Approximately, 14.4% of participants had HDL levels considered protective against CVD ($\geq 60 \text{ mg/dL}$), and 37.8% had low HDL levels (<40 mg/dL). Female participants had significantly higher HDL levels than males (24.1% vs 3.7%) (P < 0.001). Additionally, 26.7%, 41.7%, and 67.5% of the participants had above optimal total cholesterol, LDL, and triglyceride levels respectively with no significant differences among gender or age.

SBP was elevated in 44.1% of the participants. Males had significantly higher SBP levels than females (P = 0.019), but age was not significantly associated with increased SBP. Around 45.1% of participants had elevated DBP. More than one third (36.5%) of the participants were overweight, and 44.3% were obese (Table 2).

Uptake of referral

A total of 71 (61.7%) at-risk individuals were referred to their physicians for further testing; 37 participants (52.1%) completed the second follow-up survey to determine uptake of referral (Table 3). Only nine of these participants (24.3%) had visited their physician following the screening, 29.7% had not visited their physician yet but intended to do so. Conversely, 43.2% did not visit their physician and made no such plans (Table 3). Five participants told their physicians about the pharmacy screening results; 4 of the 5 cases reported that physicians took the results seriously. Physicians ordered follow-up tests for 77.7% of the participants, including

total cholesterol and blood sugar levels (57.1% each), HDL levels and BP (42.8% each).

When asked about lifestyle changes that participants adopted following the screening, 63.1% reported improved diet, 57.8% attempted to lose weight, and 40% started new medications since the screening (Table 3).

Participants' experiences, feedback, and satisfaction with the screening service

All participants were contacted by telephone to determine their experiences and satisfaction with the pharmacy screening service (Table 4). A total of 75 participants completed the follow-up survey (65.2%). In

1	68% of the cases, the pharmacist-initiated the conversation about the screening service. Other participants
2 3 4	reported learning about the service from personal acquaintances (17.3%), and social media (10.7%).
5 6	Almost all participants reported that the pharmacists' explanation of their risk of developing diabetes or CVD
/ 8 9	were either 'very clear' or 'clear enough' and that pharmacists explained the various lifestyle causes of
10 11	increased CVD or diabetes risk 'very comprehensively' or 'discussed several issues'.
12 13 14	At the conclusion of the screening, 94.5% of participants reported that pharmacists made sure participants
15 16	understood all key points, and 89.3% indicated that pharmacists provided participants with a written
17 18 19	screening report.
20 21	Most participants (94.5%) reported either being "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the risk assessment
22 23 24	undertaken by the pharmacists and the quality of the pharmacists' advice.
25 26	Eighty-six percent of participants thought pharmacies are good venues for conducting screening tests, and
27 28 20	86.6% thought pharmacists should routinely provide CVD and diabetes risk screening. Most participants
30 31	(82.7%) indicated they would be willing to pay for pharmacist-delivered screening services should it be
32 33 34	provided in the future (Table 3).
35 36	Discussion
37 38 39	This study is the first in an Arabic-speaking country (UAE) to assess the feasibility and performance of an
40 41 42	evidence-based pharmacist-delivered screening program for T2DM and CVD. The screening model, adapted
43 44	from the CARS model with the advice of local experts, was successfully implemented in community
45 46 47	pharmacies and resulted in the identification and referral of at-risk individuals.(25)
48 49	The proportion of screened participants identified with high diabetes or CVD risk in this study was higher
50 51 52	compared to reported rates in the international pharmacy screening literature. This could be partially
53 54	explained by the higher prevalence of diabetes and CVD in the UAE.(21, 28) High referral rate (61.7%) in this
55 56 57	study is consistent with the recent trend towards higher rates of referral.(18) Without systematic diabetes
58	and CVD screening programs in the primary care of the UAE, lack of universal healthcare coverage, all in
59 60	22 March 2019 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

tandem with poor health-seeking behavior and the delay in access to medical services these conditions will continue to be undiagnosed. The potential, therefore, exists for community pharmacists who have regular contact with the population to improve access to health screening services and promote public health awareness.

Several pharmacy and pharmacist-levels factors at selected pharmacies contributed to the success of implementing pharmacist-delivered screening, these include: (i) the necessary infrastructure (such as sufficient/appropriate space) to accommodate the screening service, (ii) motivation of pharmacist to learn about and perform the screening, (iii) high volume and greater variability in clientele.

The purposive sampling of community pharmacies and the exploratory implementation study design might have limited the generalizability of study results. However, equally, it could be argued that the somewhat driven community pharmacists in this study would have been representative of the expected pharmacists in future program roll-out. The study was designed to demonstrate the feasibility of pharmacist-delivered screening and to understand how implementation support and processes might have been optimized to enable such health service. Follow-up with physicians on pharmacist-delivered screening was not carried out as per the expert panel advice; due to: the complexity of access to physician services and different health coverage/schemes, lack of integration and communication between services provided at the government and private institutions, the current lack of integration of pharmacy services with other health care services, and the scattered primary care structure in the country. Such lack of follow-up with physicians is not uncommon in studies exploring early stages of pharmacy-based screening given the complexity of the primary care setting. The short follow-up period was perhaps inadequate to capture all further diagnostic and management activities as a result of pharmacist-delivered screening. Future studies should attempt establishing linakages between community pharmacy and physicians in primary care, creating structured referal pathways and emphasis on interprofessional coordination between pharmacists and physician.

BMJ Open

Conclusions

It is feasible for community pharmacists to screen and refer individuals for diabetes and CVD risks in the UAE. The successful implementation of the screening model in community pharmacy, in terms of identifying at-risk individuals and advising them to visit their physicians for further evaluation, offers a new platform to increase screening capacity within the primary care setting, and represents a key opportunity for the early detection and intervention to tackle the increasing burden of both diseases. However, pathways for the integration of the pharmacist-delivered screening service with physicians in primary care are yet to be explored.

Acknowledgment:

The authors sinverly thank study participants for their time, and participating pharmacists and pharmacies including Bin Sina Group, Makkah Group, and Al Seha Wal Jamal Group. Special thanks for the field team of brilliant pharmacists: Mr. Ward Saidawi, Ms. Safa Al Awad, Ms. Amna Othman, and Ms. Lujain Aloum for their exceptional efforts in data collection/management and post-implementation support. Authors are grateful for valuable input of Professor Rifat Atun, School of Public Health, Haravrd University.

Funding

This research was supported by two research grants: (1) the research cooperative grant from Center for Global Health Delivery-Dubai, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University (agreement No. 027562-746845-0302), (2) operational grant from the University of Sharjah.

Author contribution:

HA designed the study, supervised data collection process, assisted with data analysis, wrote, reviewed and edited the entire manuscript. SC and RC analyzed data, reviewed and edited manuscript. SH wrote parts of manuscript. KM and IK assisted with designing of the study, reviewed the methods and data analysis contributed to the discussion.

References

1 2 Forouzanfar MH, Afshin A, Alexander LT, Anderson HR, Bhutta ZA, Biryukov S, et al. Global, regional, and 1. 3 national comparative risk assessment of 79 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters 4 5 of risks, 1990–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. The Lancet. 6 2016;388(10053):1659-724. 7 2. Unnikrishnan R, Pradeepa R, Joshi SR, Mohan V. Type 2 Diabetes: Demystifying the Global Epidemic. Diabetes. 8 2017;66(6):1432-42. 9 3. Guariguata L, Whiting DR, Hambleton I, Beagley J, Linnenkamp U, Shaw JE. Global estimates of diabetes 10 prevalence for 2013 and projections for 2035. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2014;103(2):137-49. 11 Ogurtsova K, da Rocha Fernandes JD, Huang Y, Linnenkamp U, Guariguata L, Cho NH, et al. IDF Diabetes Atlas: 4. 12 Global estimates for the prevalence of diabetes for 2015 and 2040. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice. 13 2017;128:40-50. 14 15 Roth GA, Johnson C, Abajobir A, Abd-Allah F, Ferede Abera S, Abyu G, et al. Global, Regional, and National 5. 16 Burden of Cardiovascular Diseases for 10 Causes, 1990 to 2015. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. May 17 2017;23715. 18 6. Roth GA, Johnson C, Abajobir A, Abd-Allah F, Abera SF, Abyu G, et al. Global, Regional, and National Burden of 19 Cardiovascular Diseases for 10 Causes, 1990 to 2015. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2017;70(1):1-25. 20 Einarson TR, Acs A, Ludwig C, Panton UH. Prevalence of cardiovascular disease in type 2 diabetes: a systematic 7. 21 literature review of scientific evidence from across the world in 2007-2017. Cardiovascular diabetology. 2018;17(1):83-. 22 Beagley J, Guariguata L, Weil C, Motala AA. Global estimates of undiagnosed diabetes in adults. Diabetes Res 23 8. 24 Clin Pract. 2014;103(2):150-60. 25 9. The 10-Year Cost-Effectiveness of Lifestyle Intervention or Metformin for Diabetes Prevention. An intent-to-treat 26 analysis of the DPP/DPPOS. 2012;35(4):723-30. 27 10. Lindström J, Ilanne-Parikka P, Peltonen M, Aunola S, Eriksson JG, Hemiö K, et al. Sustained reduction in the 28 incidence of type 2 diabetes by lifestyle intervention: follow-up of the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study. The Lancet. 29 2006;368(9548):1673-9. 30 Siu AL, Force obotUSPST. Screening for Abnormal Blood Glucose and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: U.S. Preventive 11. 31 Services Task Force Recommendation StatementScreening for Abnormal Blood Glucose and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. 32 Annals of Internal Medicine. 2015;163(11):861-8. 33 34 Abuyassin B, Laher I. Diabetes epidemic sweeping the Arab world. World Journal of Diabetes. 2016;7(8):165-74. 12. 35 13. Badran M, Laher I. Type II diabetes mellitus in Arabic-speaking countries. International Journal of Endocrinology. 36 2012:Article ID 902873. 37 14. Alzubaidi H, Mc Narmara K, Kilmartin GM, Kilmartin JF, Marriott J. The relationships between illness and 38 treatment perceptions with adherence to diabetes self-care: A comparison between Arabic-speaking migrants and 39 Caucasian English-speaking patients. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice. 2015;110(2):208-17. 40 Alzubaidi H, Mc Namara K, Browning C, Marriott J. Barriers and enablers to healthcare access and use among 15. 41 Arabic-speaking and Caucasian English-speaking patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a qualitative comparative study. 42 43 BMJ Open. 2015;5(11). 44 16. Alzubaidi H, Mc Mamara K, Chapman C, Stevenson V, Marriott J. Medicine-taking experiences and associated 45 factors: comparison between Arabic-speaking and Caucasian English-speaking patients with Type 2 diabetes. Diabet 46 Med. 2015;32(12):1625-33. 47 Ayorinde AA, Porteous T, Sharma P. Screening for major diseases in community pharmacies: a systematic 17. 48 review. International Journal of Pharmacy Practice. 2013;21(6):349-61. 49 Willis A, Rivers P, Gray LJ, Davies M, Khunti K. The effectiveness of screening for diabetes and cardiovascular 18. 50 disease risk factors in a community pharmacy setting. PLoS One. 2014;9(4):e91157. 51 52 19. San-Juan-Rodriguez A, Newman TV, Hernandez I, Swart ECS, Klein-Fedyshin M, Shrank WH, et al. Impact of 53 community pharmacist-provided preventive services on clinical, utilization, and economic outcomes: An umbrella 54 review. Preventive Medicine. 2018;115:145-55. 55 20. Namara KPM, Dunbar JA, Philpot B, Marriott JL, Reddy P, Janus ED. Potential of pharmacists to help reduce the 56 burden of poorly managed cardiovascular risk. Australian Journal of Rural Health. 2012;20(2):67-73. 57 58 59 22 March 2019

Page 19 of 26

BMJ Open

21. Sulaiman N, Elbadawi S, Hussein A, Abusnana S, Madani A, Mairghani M, et al. Prevalence of overweight and obesity in United Arab Emirates Expatriates: the UAE National Diabetes and Lifestyle Study. Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome. 2017;9(1):88.

Alzubaidi H, Saidawi W, Mc Namara K. Pharmacist views and pharmacy capacity to deliver professional services 22. in the United Arab Emirates. International journal of clinical pharmacy. 2018.

Hasan S, Sulieman H, Chapman C, Stewart K, Kong DCM. Community pharmacy in the United Arab Emirates: 23. characteristics and workforce issues. International Journal of Pharmacy Practice. 2011;19(6):392-9.

Green LW. Toward Cost-Benefit Evaluations of Health Education: Some Concepts, Methods, and Examples. 24. Health Education Monographs. 1974;2(1 suppl):34-64.

25. Mc Namaraa K, Krass I, Peterson GM, AL.Zubaidi H, Grenfell R, Freedman B, et al. Implementing screening interventions in community pharmacy to promote interprofessional coordination of primary care – A mixed methods evaluation. Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy 2019; In Press

26. McMillan SS, King M, Tully MP. How to use the nominal group and Delphi techniques. International journal of clinical pharmacy. 2016;38(3):655-62.

StataCorp. 2015. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14. College Station TSL. 27.

ν. software: k. abetes Prevalence in 28. Al Busaidi N, Shanmugam P, Manoharan D. Diabetes in the Middle East: Government Health Care Policies and Strategies that Address the Growing Diabetes Prevalence in the Middle East. Current Diabetes Reports. 2019;19(8).

22 March 2019

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Table 1: Demographic and health characteristics (N-115)

Cha	racteristic	n (%)
Gender	Female	60	(52.1
Age(yrs)	Mean ± SD	47.23	±7.3
Nationality	Syria	32	(27.8
	Egypt	23	(20.0
	India	11	(9.5
	Jordan	7	(6.0
	Pakistan	7	(6.0
	Other	35	(30.4
Education	Not educated	2	(1.7
	Primary/middle school	15	(13.0
	High school	37	(36.2
	University	50	(43.4
Marital status	Married	103	、 (89.5
	Single	8	(6.9
	Divorced	3	(2.6
	Widowed	1	(0.8
Employment	Full-time	67	(63.2
	Part-time	6	(5.6
	Home duties	25	(23.5
	Other	17	(14.7
Self-reported health status*	Excellent	24	(32.0
	Good	41	(54.6
	Average	10	(13.3
Number of visits to a physician in the past yes	ar* Mean ± SD	3.05	±4.
Patterns of physician use	Have a regular physician	18	(24.0
	Have a regular clinic but often see different physicians	14	(18.6
	Visit different physician clinics	29	(38.6
	Rarely or never visit a physician	14	(18.6
Source of advice to reduce risk of diabetes	and	13	(17.5
CVD risk in the past 12 months (apart f	rom A physician		
pharmacy screening visit)*			
	A dietitian	1	(1.3
	A specialist physician	5	(6.7
	A pharmacist	2	(2.7
	Others practitioners	9	(12.1
	A family member	7	(9.4
Examination of lifestyle factors that affect dia	betes and CVD risk by a health professional during	7	(6.4
the past 12 months*			-

22 March 2019

57 58

59

60

BMJ Open

Characterist	ic n(%)				Gen	der					Age	(Years)			
		Tota	I (N=115)	Femal	e (n=61)	Mal	e (n=54)	p-value	40-4	9 (n=84)	50-5	9 (n=25)	≥	60 (n=6)	p-value
HbA1c	Normal	74	(67.8)	45	(77.5)	29	(56.8)	0.064	58	(73.4)	14	(56.0)	2	(40.0)	0.034*
	Prediabetes	23	(21.1)	8	(13.7)	15	(29.4)		15	(18.9)	5	(20.0)	3	(60.0)	
	Diabetes	12	(11.0)	5	(8.6)	7	(13.7)		6	(7.5)	6	(24.0)	0	(0.0)	
ADA score ≥5	High risk	51	(44.7)	18	(30.0)	33	(61.1)	0.001*	29	(34.9)	16	(64.0)	6	(100.0)	0.001*
10-year ASCVD risk	High risk	19	(17.1)	2	(3.5)	17	(31.4)	<0.001**	6	(7.3)	8	(34.7)	5	(83.3)	<0.001**
Total	Optimal	82	(73.2)	43	(74.1)	39	(72.2)	0.738	62	(74.7)	15	(65.2)	5	(83.3)	0.252
cholesterol	Borderline high	18	(16.0)	8	(13.7)	10	(18.5)		15	(18.0)	3	(13.0)	0	(0.0)	
evel	High	12	(10.7)	7	(12.0)	5	(9.2)		6	(7.2)	5	(21.7)	1	(16.6)	
LDL level	Optimal	64	(58.1)	35	(61.4)	29	(54.7)	0.594	49	(59.7)	11	(50.0)	4	(66.6)	0.954
	Above optimal	29	(26.3)	14	(24.5)	15	(28.3)		22	(26.8)	6	(27.2)	1	(16.6)	
	Borderline high	12	(10.9)	6	(10.5)	6	(11.3)		8	(9.7)	3	(13.6)	1	(16.6)	
	High	3	(2.7)	2	(3.5)	1	(1.8)		2	(2.4)	1	(4.5)	0	(0.0)	
	Very high	2	(1.8)	0	(0.0)	2	(3.7)		1	(1.2)	1	(4.5)	0	(0.0)	
HDL level	Protective	16	(14.4)	14	(24.1)	2	(3.7)	<0.001**	10	(12.2)	5	(21.7)	1	(16.6)	0.492
	against CVD														
	Borderline	53	(47.7)	36	(62.0)	17	(32.0)		41	(50.0)	8	(34.7)	4	(66.6)	
	Major CVD risk	42	(37.8)	8	(13.7)	34	(64.1)		31	(37.8)	10	(43.4)	1	(16.6)	
	factor														
Triglyceride	Optimal	36	(32.4)	25	(43.1)	11	(20.7)	0.055	28	(34.1)	6	(26.0)	2	(33.3)	0.093
evel	Borderline high	24	(21.6)	10	(17.2)	14	(24.1)		22	(26.8)	2	(8.7)	0	(0.0)	
	High	50	(45.0)	22	(37.9)	28	(52.8)		32	(39.0)	14	(60.8)	4	(66.6)	
	Very high	1	(0.9)	1	(1.7)	0	(0.0)		0	(0.0)	1	(4.3)	0	(0.0)	
Systolic BP	Normal	58	(55.7)	37	(68.5)	21	(42.0)	0.019*	47	(60.2)	10	(47.6)	1	(20.0)	0.265
evel	Pre-	35	(33.6)	14	(25.6)	21	(42.0)		25	(32.0)	7	(33.3)	3	(60.0)	
	hypertension														
	Hypertension	11	(10.5)	3	(5.5)	8	(16.0)		6	(7.6)	4	(19.0)	1	(20.0)	
Diastolic BP	Normal	57	(54.8)	32	(59.2)	25	(50.0)	0.613	44	(56.4)	11	(52.3)	2	(40.0)	0.669
level	Pre-	33	(31.7)	15	(27.7)	18	(36.0)		23	(29.4)	7	(33.3)	3	(60.0)	
	hypertension														
	Hypertension	14	(13.4)	7	(12.9)	7	(14.0)		11	(14.1)	3	(14.2)	0	(0.0)	
Body mass	Normal	22	(19.1)	13	(21.6)	9	(16.3)	0.501	17	(20.2)	4	(16.0)	1	(16.6)	0.653
index	Overweight	42	(36.5)	19	(31.6)	23	(41.8)		33	(39.2)	8	(32.0)	1	(16.6)	
	Ohese	51	(11 3)	28	(16.6)	23	(41.8)		34	(40.4)	13	(52.0)	4	(66 6)	

n

1 2			
3 4	2	*Statistically significant p<0.05 **Statistically Significant	p<0.0001
5	3	Table 3: Outcomes of at-risk participants' ref	erral (n=37)
6 7 8 9		Participants completed uptake of referral follo Participants visited a doctor to discuss pharma	ow-up acist-delivered screening results
10			Visited doctor straight away
11 12			Discussed results at routine visit
12		Participants who did not visit a doctor	
14			Haven't visited doctor yet but intend to
15			Didn't think it was necessary
16 17			Haven't visited doctor yet and made no plans
18		Physician knew about pharmacy screening	Defensel letter eiven to the destar
19			Referral letter given to the doctor
20			Total doctor about pharmacy screening seriously
21		Follow-up tests were ordered by the physician	boetor deated the results of pharmacy screening schously
23			Blood pressure
24			Total cholesterol
25			HDL cholesterol
26 27			Blood sugar level
28			Waist
29			Weight
30		Lifestule changes since screening	Uther
31 32		Litestyle changes since screening	Attempted to lose weight
33			Improved diet
34			Started new medications
35	4		
30 37	5		
38	5		
39 40	6		
41	7		
42 43	8		
43 44	0		
45 46	9		
46 47	10		
48 ⊿0	11		
	12		
51 52	12		
52 53	13		
54 55	14		
56	15		
57			
58 59			Page 22 of 23
60		For peer review only - http://bn	njopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

	Experience and feedback on pharmacist-delivered sc	reening
	- Person who initiated the conversation	Another participant in the project
	about screening between participant and	Pharmacist
	pharmacist	Pharmacy staff
		Acquaintance
		Social media
	- Clarity of pharmacist's explanation of risk	Very clear
	of developing diabetes and CVD	Clear enough
		Some narts clear
		Generally unclear
	- Depth of pharmacist's exploration of	Very comprehensive
	nossible lifestyle causes of increased	
	diabetes and CVD risks	Discussed only one issue
	- Steps undertaken following screening	Discussed only one issue
	- Steps undertaken following screening	The pharmacist provided you with a written report of your results
		The pharmacist provided you with a written report of your results
		The pharmacist clearly stated when the physician follow we was require
	Quality of the testing serviced put in	Excellent
	- Quality of the testing carried out in	
	pnarmacy	Above average
		Average
		Slightly below average
	 Perceived length of the diabetes and CVD 	Much too long
	risk screening process	A little long
		About right
		A little short
	Satisfaction with the pharmacist-delivered screening	
	 Satisfaction with health risk assessment 	Very satisfied
		Satisfied
		Average
		Dissatisfied
	 Satisfaction with the quality of advice 	Very satisfied
	provided in the pharmacy	Satisfied
		Average
		Dissatisfied
	Willingness to pay for the future pharmacist-delivere - Yes	ed screening service
	 Acceptable amount to be paid 	≤50 AED (≤ USD 13.6*)
		51-100 AED (USD 13.6-27.2*)
		101-150 AED (USD 27.2-48.8*)
		>150 AED (> USD 48.8*)
	- Reasons for unwillingness to pay for future	Cannot afford it
	pharmacist-delivered screening service	Does not think it is worth it
		Thinks it should be free
		Other
17		
- 1		
18		
19		
		Page 73 of 73



 BMJ Open

Title and abstract Introduction Background/rationale Objectives	1	 (a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported 	1 and 3 3
Introduction Background/rationale Objectives	2	(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
Introduction Background/rationale Objectives	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	
Background/rationale Objectives	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	
Objectives	-	Explain the second and rationale for the investigation senis reported	5 and 6
	3	State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses	7
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	10
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up Case-control study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls Cross-sectional study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants.	
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed Case-control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	13
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	11 and 12
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	13
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	13
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	13
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	

		Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results	J		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	15
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	14
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	15
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	
Outcome data	15*	Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	16-18
Main results	16	(<i>a</i>) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	17
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	18
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	18
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	18
Other information	I		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	20

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Diabetes and cardiovascular disease risk screening model in community pharmacies in a developing primary healthcare system: feasibility study.

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031246.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Alzubaidi, Hamzah; University of Sharjah, College of Pharmacy , Pharmacy Practice & Pharmacotherapy Chandir, Subhash; Harvard Medical School Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai, Hasan, Sanah ; Ajman University of Science and Technology College of Pharmacy and Health Science McNamara, Kevin; Deakin University, Cox , Rachele; Harvard Medical School, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Krass, Ines; University of Sydney, Faculty of Pharmacy
Primary Subject Heading :	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Diabetes and endocrinology, Cardiovascular medicine
Keywords:	Primary Health Care, Cardiovascular Diseases, Point-of-Care Testing, General diabetes < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, Pharmacy, Screening

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

1 1	Title: Diabetes and cardiovascular disease risk screening model in community pharmacies in a developing
2 32 4	primary healthcare system: feasibility study.
53 6	Authors: Hamzah Alzubaidi ¹ *, Subhash Chandir ² , Sanah Hasan ³ , Kevin Mc Namara ^{4,5} , Rachele Cox ^{6,} Ines Krass ⁷
7 84 95 10 14	* Corresponding author: Dr. Hamzah Alzubaidi BPharm (Hons), MPharm (Clinic), PhD 1. Sharjah Institute for Medical Research and College of Pharmacy, University of Sharjah
12 13	Tel: +9716505-7424
14 10	E-mail: <u>halzubaidi@sharjah.ac.ae</u>
¶∳ 17	<u>Co-authors:</u>
18 13 20 24	2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School
1 23 23 10 24	Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE PO Box 505276
123 1288	Email: <u>Subhash_Chandir@hms.harvard.edu</u>
19 20 29 30 30 30 30 31	3. Sanah Hasan PharmD, PhD Department of Clinical Sciences College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences Aiman University
23	Email: <u>s.hasan@ajman.ac.ae</u>
26 27 28	4. Dr. Kevin Mc Namara BSc (Pharm), MSc (Community Health), PhD School of Medicine, Deakin University, 75 Pigdons Rd, Waurn Ponds, Vic 3216
29 40 349 342	Centre for Population Health Research, Deakin University, Burwood, Vic 3125
312 313 315 45 45 45 45 45 45	Email: <u>kevin.mcnamara@deakin.edu.au</u>
40 345 245	5. Rachele Cox MPH
<i>3</i> 48 349	Research Assistant, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School
58 51 52 52	Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE PO Box 505276
49 41 42	Email: <u>Rachele_cox@hms.harvard.edu</u>
457 458 459	6. Ines Krass BPharm Dip Hosp Pharm, Grad Dip Educ Studies (Health Ed), PhD School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Medicine and Health
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- 47 27 University of Sydney
- Camperdown, NSW 2006
- 8 Email: ines.krass@sydney.edu.au

for peer terier only

51 Abstract:

Objectives: To develop an evidence-based community pharmacist-delivered screening model for diabetes and cardiovascular disease (CVD), and assess its feasibility to identify and refer patients with elevated risk.

Design: A feasibility study.

Setting: A purposive sample of 12 community pharmacies in three cities in the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

Participants: Adults 40 years of age and above who have not been previously diagnosed with either diabetes or CVD.

Intervention: Pharmacist screening of adults visiting pharmacies involved history, demographics, anthropometric measurements, blood pressure, and point-of-care testing including HbA1c levels and lipid panel. Participants with a 10-year CVD risk \geq 7.5%, HbA1c level \geq 5.7% or American Diabetes Association risk score \geq 5 points, were advised to visit their physician.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: (1) Development of UAE pharmacist-delivered screening model, (2) the proportion of screened participants identified as having high CVD risk (ASCVD 10-year risk defined as \geq 7.5%), (3) the proportion of participants identified as having elevated blood glucose (high HbA1c level \geq 5.7% (38.8mmol/mol)) or high self-reported diabetes risk (ADA risk score \geq 5 points). Secondary outcomes: participants' satisfaction with the screening.

Results: The first UAE pharmacist-delivered screening model was developed and implemented. A total of 115 participants were screened, and 92.3% of the entire screening process was completed during a single visit to pharmacy. The mean duration of the complete screening process was 27 minutes. At-risk individuals (57.4%) were referred to their physicians for futher testing, 94.5% of participants were at least satisfied with their screening experience.

Conclusions: The community pharmacist-delivered screening of diabetes and CVD risk is feasible in the UAE. The model offers a platform to increase screening capacity within primary care and provides an opportunity for early detection and treatment. However, pathways for the integration of the pharmacist-delivered screening service with physicians in primary care are yet to be explored.

Keyword: Diabetes, Cardiovascular Diseases, Screening, Pharmacy, Point-of-Care Testing, Primary Health Care

75 Strengths and limitations of this study

- An expert panel was used to adapt an international screening and develop the first contextually-tailored pharmacy screening model for diabetes and cardiovascular diseases risk in UAE.
- Lipid panel and glycated hemoglobin level were measured using a finger-prick point-of-care testing device (Roche Cobas b 101 POC dual system).
- Follow-up with physicians on referral outcomes of participants at-risk could not be determined due to the fragmented healthcare system. We relied on patient self-report data.
- Patient recruitment heavily relied on a direct invitation from pharmacists
- Follow-up times with screened participants were short and may not have encompassed all results regarding follow-up with physicians.

BMJ Open

96 Introduction

97 Type 2 diabetes (T2DM) and cardiovascular disease (CVD) are leading contributors to the global burden of 4 58 disease, albeit with distinct long-term trends.(1) Diabetes, a rapidly growing global epidemic, affects all 7 **9**9 countries, and is substantially caused by rapidly increasing rates of obesity over recent decades. (2) By 2040 9 100 T2DM will affect an estimated 642m people; 10.4% of the adult population, compared with 8.8% in 2015.(2-4) 12 1913 Age-standardized CVD trends are more geographically nuanced – generally, the incidence has declined 14 10**2** 16 markedly in highly developed countries over several decades, but this decline has now plateaued.(5) Likewise, 17 193 some middle-income regions have experienced declines in CVD mortality, but in most regions of the 19 1024 developing world, a rapid increased incidence has recently prevailed.(5) Globally in 2015, there were an 21 1Q3 estimated 422.7 million prevalent cases of CVD, and ischemic heart disease and stroke remained the leading 24 106 causes of death.(6) A combination of an aging western society, and increasing CVD mortality rates in many 26 1077 developing regions, has resulted in increasing CVD-related deaths from 12.6 million in 1990 to 17.9 million in 29 108 2015.(6) Both CVD and diabetes represent major public health challenges in all countries. Globally, CVD affects 31 109 33 32.2% of all persons with T2DM.(7)

An estimated 45.8% (174.8 million) of adult diabetes cases worldwide are undiagnosed, ranging from 24.1% to An estimated 45.8% (174.8 million) of adult diabetes cases worldwide are undiagnosed, ranging from 24.1% to 75.1% in different countries.(8) Overall, the prevention and delay of diabetes complications are facilitated by combining early detection of undiagnosed diabetes using population or opportunistic screening approaches with effective prevention interventions.(9-11)

In Arabic-speaking countries, prevalence of T2DM is at alarming levels with high morbidity and mortality rates.(12) Six Arabic-speaking countries (Kuwait, Lebanon, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Saudi Arabia, and Bahrain) lead the world in the prevalence of T2DM, affecting approximately one in five people.(13) There is an urgent need to increase capacity for the detection of diabetes and to reduce its burden in these Arabic-speaking countries. Previous research has identified negative health beliefs, poor health-seeking

56 57 58

1 behaviors, and intentional delay in accessing available medical services are commonplace in Arabic-speaking communities, hence the need for proactive and opportunistic population screenings. (14-16) **2**1 6 The feasibility of pharmacist-delivered screening, for a variety of conditions including diabetes and CVD, is well supported by evidence.(17, 18) Such screening interventions identified at-risk individuals and increased rates of disease diagnosis, reduced disease risk factors, improved health behaviors, enhanced quality of care, and increased patient knowledge and awareness.(19) Community pharmacists have face-to-face contact with around 90% of the population annually and appear to interact regularly with those who have elevated risk of diabetes and CVD, or undiagnosed diabetes.(20) The potential, therefore, exists for pharmacists to improve access to health screening services and promote public health awareness. 128 23 In the UAE a substantial number of people with diabetes and a high prevalence of overweight and obesity are 129 currently thought to remain undiagnosed. (21) There are around 2,500 licensed community pharmacies in UAE *3*0 28 that are generally open seven days per week, easily accessible, and have an average working day of 13 hours 130 (22, 23); this potentially makes pharmacies an effective setting to offer screening for diabetes and CVD within the primary care system. To our knowledge, no systematic diabetes and CVD screening programs exist in the primary care setting in the UAE, meaning these diseases continue to be undiagnosed precluding the opportunity to initiate early prevention and treatment. 40 The aim of this study was to test the feasibility of pharmacist-delivered diabetes and CVD risk screening model in the UAE. The specific objectives were to: **34** 45 1. Develop locally-appropriate pharmacist-delivered diabetes and CVD risk screening model for the 1348 community pharmacies in UAE. 2. Evaluate the feasibility of implementing diabetes and CVD risk screening model in the selected

149 community pharmacies in the UAE.

44

Page 7 of 27

BMJ Open

² ³ Ethical approvals

Methods

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Sharjah, the Ministry of Health and Prevention in the UAE, and deemed Exempt by the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health Institutional Review Board.

Study design

The study was conducted in three phases: Phase 1 (formative phase) explored development of a suitable model for diabetes screening and CVD risk assessment in community pharmacies in the UAE, Phase 2 (implementation phase) assessed the feasibility of the screening model, and Phase 3 (evaluation phase) tested the impact of the screening model.

Phase 1: Formative Phase

A systematic approach was used to develop the intervention of diabetes and CVD screening. (24) The formative phase commenced with identifying needs for diabetes and CVD risk screening program. After identifying the suitability of community pharmacies for providing screening services, a literature review of pharmacistdelivered screening models was conducted to identify useful and effective approaches to screening. The Australian Cardiovascular Absolute Risk Screening Study (CARS) was considered an appropriate template model to inform the development of the first UAE pharmacy-based screening program. (25) Two local health professionals were consulted to determine the adaptation of CARS into the local context and acceptability of the proposed protocol prior to presenting the model to an expert panel. In the absence of national guidelines and frameworks regarding risk assessment and management for diabetes and CVD in the UAE, an expert panel forum was tasked to develop a consensus on the proposed screening program. Prospective panelists were identified through extensive online search; evaluating experts' specialty, experience, and research involvement. Shortlisted experts, including two cardiologists, two endocrinologists, two senior clinical pharmacists, were invited to participate in the forum. The Delphi technique was used to help arrive at a
166	consei	nsus on a specific question in one or more rounds - supportive documents were created to aid in voting				
2 1637 4	and to	calculate the level of agreement. (26) The Delphi discussion focused on locally-appropriate methods for				
1 <i>6</i> 8 6	absolu	ite cardiovascular and diabetes risk assessment, including: use of absolute CVD risk assessment and				
1689 0	other	multi-factorial risk algorithm cut-offs; selection of screening tools; and risk factor thresholds for				
1 70 11	physic	ian referrals. The following questions were discussed during the forum:				
	1.	When should the participant's blood pressure measurement be taken? Moreover, what is the				
14 17133 16		minimum time interval needed between taking the two blood pressure readings?				
173	2.	Which tool to use to calculate participants' absolute CVD risk?				
19 1 2749 21	3.	Which method would be most suitable for calculating the participants' absolute CVD risk in the				
1 73 23		community pharmacy setting?				
24 1769 26	4.	Which self-reported tool to use to determine the participants' risk of having T2DM? What absolute				
1 77 28		CVD risk threshold should be used when deciding to refer a participant to a physician?				
1 <u>29</u> 1 <u>78</u> 3 1	5.	At what HbA1c level should a participant be referred to a physician?				
37 1 739 33	6.	Should at-risk participants who are referred to physicians for further testing be contacted to ask about				
		any lifestyle modifications and outcomes of a visit to a physician? And should the physicians whom the				
36 1 81 38		referred participants visited be contacted?				
182 40	The so	creening model planning involved the development of resources in supporting pharmacists-delivered				
41 184 <u>3</u> 43	screer	ing including: training manual, data collection tools, and patient follow up documents. These were				
1 8 4 45	developed through a process of co-production in consultation with the international co-researchers who had					
46 1845∕ 48	previo	us experience in pharmacist-delivered screening services. To ensure local context applicability, study				
18 1 8 50	materials were sent to three local community pharmacists for feedback and comments.					
1851 1852	Phase 2: Implementation Phase					
1 88 55	Community pharmacists were trained through a face-to-face workshop that lasted for three hours on the					
189	study	protocol, and on how to: (1) approach potential participants, (2) use point-of-care testing devices, (3)				
58 1 950 60	handle	e refusals to participate, (4) collect data, (5) communicate risk assessment results to participants, (6) For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml				

9

16 198

19 190

21 200 23

24 2015

26 2**97** 28

293 293

31 2034

33 2q3

36 206

38 207

41 2048

43 2019 45

46 2 ⊾0

50 2 <u>5</u>1 2 <u>5</u>2

53 2 53

60

BMJ Open

191 engage and refer at-risk individuals to physicians, (7) counsel participants on required lifestyle changes, and 2 1932 (8) respond to participants' questions.

1**9**3 Study setting and participants

194 A purposive sample of 12 community pharmacies (with necessary infrastructre) in the three emirates of Dubai, 199 Sharjah, and Ajman in the UAE was selected. The recruited sites represented chain pharmacies. Study 11 1963 pharmacists were offered a small monetary incentive (AED 23 (equivalent to USD 6)) per screening in 14 appreciation of their time and effort. 193

Recruitment of participants

Pharmacy-based advertising, including posters and flyers, were used to recruit participants. Individuals were mainly invited directly by the pharmacists to participate based on their judgment of the individual's age. Interested voluntary participants were pre-screened by the pharmacists to determine their eligibility. Eligible participants were given written patient information sheet and they signed a consent form.

Inclusion criteria:

- Arabic or English speaking.
- Aged between 40 to 74 years. There is no international consensus on the age range for diabetes screening, however, 40 years is recommended in several guidelines and was therefore considered appropriate.

Exclusion criteria:

- Previous diagnosis of diabetes or CVD.
- Use of medications for treatment of diabetes, hypertension or any other CVD at the time of screening.
- Pregnancy.
- Terminal illness.
- Severe mental illness.

216 Data collection and risk factor assessment

2 j_j7

2 k9

20

23

24

223

26

*2*7

29

23g

31

*3*4 *3*45

*3*8

238

To document the screening process, participating pharmacists completed brief paper-based records of each screening undertaken. This provided patient risk assessment data, documentation of patient counseling (e.g. lifestyle factors assessed, targets specified, and criteria for referral to a physician) and logistical information (e.g. time taken to conduct screening and counseling, number of visits required, reasons for deviating from suggested screening schedule).

After checking eligibility and obtaining consent, trained pharmacists screened participants with the following measurements:

- Anthropometric measurements: Weight, height and waist circumference were measured along with body mass index calculations.
- Point-of-care testing: Total cholesterol (TC), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL), low-density lipoprotein (LDL) plasma levels, and glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) level, were measured using a finger-prick point-of-care testing device (Roche Cobas b 101 POC dual system). Systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) were measured after participants rested for 5 minutes using the Omron 1A1B[®] automated Blood Pressure (BP) monitor. Pharmacists advised participants to seek immediate medical attention if SBP was ≥180 mmHg, or DBP ≥110 mmHg. Pharmacists also reminded at-risk individuals that point-of-care tests may not have the same sensitivity and specificity of laboratory based equipment and hence the need to refer to the medical practice for confirmation.
 - CVD risk assessment: Projected 10-year atherosclerotic CVD risk was calculated for each participant.
 Diabetes risk assessment: In addition to HbA1c level, the American Diabetes Association (ADA) T2DM risk questionnaire was completed.
- Patient History: Detailed socio-demographic information, brief medical history, family history of diabetes, smoking status, physical activity, and dietary behaviors. Patients referral and follow-up:
 Participants at high risk, defined as having any of the following: (1) 10-year ASCVD risk ≥ 7.5% (2)

 240_{1} HbA1c level \geq 5.7 (3) ADA T2DM risk questionnaire \geq 5 points, were advised to visit their physician. All participants identified, by pharmacists, as at high risk for either CVD or diabetes were given a referral 6 letter summarizing pharmacy screening results to the physician for further testing. A rapid phone follow-up of all participants was conducted (within two weeks of screening) by a member of the research team to determine participants' satisfaction and experience with the pharmacy screening service. Participants were asked about perceived depth and clarity of pharmacist explanation of **46** diabetes and CVD risk; their satisfaction with the risk assessment and the quality of testing and advice; instructions on the need for further evaluation by a physician; and the perceived length of the screening. They were also asked about their opinion on community pharmacies as a venue of the 249 23 screening service, whether screening should be routinely provided by community pharmacists, and 250 their willingness to pay for future pharmacist-delivered screening.

The follow-up also included questions about self-reported health status, frequency, and pattern of physician visits in the past year. Participants were asked if they had undergone an assessment of lifestyle that affects diabetes and/or CVD risk by any healthcare professional in the past year or whether they were advised of the need to reduce their diabetes or CVD risk. The research team members identified themselves as such to the participants and informed them that their responses will not be communicated to the pharmacists who performed the screening.

Outcomes

*3*7

533

35

2.548 2.548

549

1. Development of UAE pharmacy-based screening model:

A consensus statement from the expert panel detailing the screening processes, cut off points/levels, and referral mechanisms to physicians, all suited to the community pharmacy context in UAE.

2. Feasibility assessment:

 a) The proportion of screened participants identified as having high CVD risk (ASCVD 10-year risk defined as ≥7.5% - as determined by the expert panel, see section 3.1).

- b) The proportion of participants identified as having elevated blood glucose (high A1c level >6.5% (48mmol/mol)) or high self-reported diabetes risk (T2DM risk questionnaire score ≥ 5 points as determined by the expert panel, see section 3.1).
 - c) Participants' acceptability and satisfaction with the pharmacist-delivered screening.

Patient and Public Involvement: We did not involve patients or the public in our work

Data analysis

The data was entered into Microsoft Access and 10% of participant files were randomly selected for validation. Stata, release 14 (StataCorp, College Station, TX) was used for data analysis.(27) Normally distributed continuous variables were described using means and standard deviations (such as participants' age, visits to physicians and nutritional habits). Categorical variables were described using counts and frequencies (such as demographic data, BMI (grouped) and medical history). The Chi-squared test was used to test differences in risk factors by age and gender. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Consensus statement on screening intervention

The expert panel reached a consensus on the use of absolute risk assessment and other multi-factorial risk algorithm cut-offs, screening tools, and risk factor thresholds. Panel members unanimously agreed on: taking two seated measurements of BP after a five-minute rest and separated by two minutes. If the two systolic and diastolic BP readings differed by ≥ 10 mmHg or ≥ 6 mmHg respectively, a third measurement would be needed, and the two closest readings would be used to calculate mean BP. Regarding the calculation of 10-year atherosclerotic CVD risk score, the ACC/AHA pooled cohort equations CVD risk calculator should be used. Participants having a 10-year risk $\geq 7.5\%$ were classified as high risk and had to be referred to a physician for further testing. The official ASCVD Risk Estimator Plus smartphone application with off-line feature was deemed most feasible to perform the calculation. Other criteria that independently necessitated referral to a

9

21 296 23

24 2923

26 298

28 238 238

31 300

33 3gf

36 302

38 303 40

41

46 30,6

48 3649

50

BMJ Open

287 physician were an HbA1c level exceeding 5.7% (pre-diabetes) or a score above five points on the ADA 288 questionnaire to measure the risk of T2DM.

2§9 Regarding the determination of uptake of referral and physician action on the results of the screening, the 230 panelists identified the impracticality of contacting physician's offices; instead it was agreed that uptake of 29P referral and physician action would be best reported by participants themselves during follow-up calls. Clinical 11 293 training manual and implementation resources were developed to ensure systematic approaches for the 14 29**3** 16 execution of pharmacist-delivered screening and to minimize variability amongst participating pharmacists. 294 Data collection tools and consent forms were adapted from the CARS project. Figure 1 illustrates the final 19 2925 screening model.

Socio-demographic and health characteristics

From December 15, 2017 to May 8, 2018, 120 consenting participants were screened for CVD and T2DM from the population visiting the 12 participating community pharmacies (which had sufficient/appropriate space to accommodate the screening service, and had high volume and greater variability in clientele). Five participants were excluded for not meeting study criteria. Socio-demographic and health characteristics of the 115 screened particiapnts are summarized in Table 1. Gender representation was almost equal with most participants having been born in Syria and Egypt. When participants were asked about their present state of health, 32% reported being 'excellent'. On average, participants visited a physician three times a year. 24% of participants reported having regular physicians, while 18.6% had regular clinic but visited different physicians, and 38.6% visited different clinics. In the past 12 months, only 6.4% reported undertaking a detailed examination of lifestyle factors by a health professional.

Implementation fidelity

3Q3 Of the screened participants, 57.4% were identified as high-risk for diabetes and/or CVD. After each screening 53 369 encounter, pharmacists completed a checklist that documented the screening process (Table 2). Most 55 3 ξ6 participants (91.7%) were screened immediately following their recruitment and the signing of informed 58 3 5 Ø consent, and the remainder were given appointments for a later time on the day of recruitment or a later For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.x 60

date. In the majority of cases (92.3%), the entire screening process was completed during a single visit to the pharmacy.

3 ₱4 6 A total of 12 participants did not undergo a complete assessment as per the screening protocol. A full lipid 3 ¦5 profile was no obtained in four cases, and four other participants did not obtain an HbA1c measurement. 9 310 Furthermore, pharmacists did not perform a waist circumference measurement for three participants and 11 3 L 73 blood pressure measurement for one participant. Pharmacists documented the reasons for incomplete 14 318 assessments for these 10 participants: a technical error in the POC device prevented the measurement in nine 16 31¹7 18 cases, and the participant objected to the measurement in one case. Assessments of diabetes risk as per the 19 320 ADA questionnaire, dietary habits, and physical activity habits were completed for all participants. One 21 327 23 average, assessment and testing took 27±9.4 minutes.

In all cases where pharmacists documented post-assessment counseling, pharmacists explained the meaning of participants' ASCVD and ADA questionnaire risk scores and the targets for suboptimal blood test results. HbA1c test results were explained to 96.3% of participants. Regarding lifestyle behaviors, the pharmacists documented counseling 85.8% and 81.1% of participants about healthy diet and physical activity, respectively. Finally, pharmacists reported informing 87.9% of participants of the need for confirmatory testing at the physician's office. Pharmacists reported that post-assessment counseling lasted 11.6±6.5 minutes on average.

Uptake of referral

A total of 71 (61.7%) at-risk individuals were referred to their physicians for further testing; 37 participants (52.1%) completed the second follow-up survey to determine uptake of referral (Table 3). Only nine of these participants (24.3%) had visited their physician following the screening, 29.7% had not visited their physician (Table 3). Only nine of these participants (24.3%) had visited their physician following the screening, 29.7% had not visited their physician yet but intended to do so. Conversely, 43.2% did not visit their physician and made no such plans (Table 3). Five participants told their physicians about the pharmacy screening results; 4 of the 5 cases reported that

physicians took the results seriously. Physicians ordered follow-up tests for 77.7% of the participants, including total cholesterol and blood sugar levels (57.1% each), HDL levels and BP (42.8% each).

4

Page 15 of 27 **BMJ** Open 336 When asked about lifestyle changes that participants adopted following the screening, 63.1% reported 2 3337 improved diet, 57.8% attempted to lose weight, and 40% started new medications since the screening (Table 4 3**3**8 3). 339 339 Participants' experiences, feedback, and satisfaction with the screening service 9 340 All participants were contacted by telephone to determine their experiences and satisfaction with the 11 34<u>7</u> pharmacy screening service (Table 4). A total of 75 participants completed the follow-up survey (65.2%). In 14 343 68% of the cases, the pharmacist-initiated the conversation about the screening service. Other participants 16 343 reported learning about the service from personal acquaintances (17.3%), and social media (10.7%). 19 344 Almost all participants reported that the pharmacists' explanation of their risk of developing diabetes or CVD 21 343 23 were either 'very clear' or 'clear enough' and that pharmacists explained the various lifestyle causes of 24 34<u>6</u> increased CVD or diabetes risk 'very comprehensively' or 'discussed several issues'. 26 347 28 At the conclusion of the screening, 94.5% of participants reported that pharmacists made sure participants 348 348 understood all key points, and 89.3% indicated that pharmacists provided participants with a written 31 349 screening report. 33 33g Most participants (94.5%) reported either being "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the risk assessment 36 351 undertaken by the pharmacists and the quality of the pharmacists' advice. 38 3*3*2 40 Eighty-six percent of participants thought pharmacies are good venues for conducting screening tests, and 41 3**543** 86.6% thought pharmacists should routinely provide CVD and diabetes risk screening. Most participants 43 3**54** 45 (82.7%) indicated they would be willing to pay for pharmacist-delivered screening services should it be 46 3545 provided in the future (Table 3). 48 49 350 Discussion 51

This study is the first in an Arabic-speaking country (UAE) to assess the feasibility and performance of an evidence-based pharmacist-delivered screening program for T2DM and CVD. The screening model, adapted

52

57 58 59

60

359 from the CARS model with the advice of local experts, was successfully implemented in community 360 pharmacies and resulted in the identification and referral of at-risk individuals. (25)

4

9

26 370 28

3730 3730

31 372

33 373

36

3@1 6 The proportion of screened participants identified with high diabetes or CVD risk in this study was higher 3682 compared to reported rates in the international pharmacy screening literature. This could be partially 369 explained by the higher prevalence of diabetes and CVD in the UAE.(21, 28) High referral rate (61.7%) in this 11 36<u>4</u>3 study is consistent with the recent trend towards higher rates of referral.(18) Without systematic diabetes 14 36**5** and CVD screening programs in the primary care of the UAE, lack of universal healthcare coverage, all in 16 366 tandem with poor health-seeking behavior and the delay in access to medical services these conditions will 19 360 continue to be undiagnosed. The potential, therefore, exists for community pharmacists who have regular 21 368 23 contact with the population to improve access to health screening services and promote public health 24 3**6**9 awareness.

Several pharmacy and pharmacist-levels factors at selected pharmacies contributed to the success of implementing pharmacist-delivered screening, these include: (i) the necessary infrastructure (such as sufficient/appropriate space) to accommodate the screening service, (ii) motivation of pharmacist to learn about and perform the screening, (iii) high volume and greater variability in clientele.

37347 The purposive sampling of community pharmacies and the exploratory implementation study design might 38 3**75** 40 have limited the generalizability of study results. However, equally, it could be argued that the somewhat 41 driven community pharmacists in this study would have been representative of the expected pharmacists in 3746 43 3717 45 future program roll-out. The study was designed to demonstrate the feasibility of pharmacist-delivered 46 3748 screening and to understand how implementation support and processes might have been optimized to 48 3749 enable such a health service. Follow-up with physicians on pharmacist-delivered screening was not carried out 50 3§g as per the expert panel advice; due to: the complexity of access to physician services ad different health 53 384 coverage/schemes, lack of integration and communication between services provided at the government and 55 382 private institutions, the current lack of integration of pharmacy services with other health care services, and 58

58 4**0**8

60

BMJ Open

384 studies exploring early stages of pharmacy-based screening given the complexity of the primary care setting. 385 To optimize the health impacts of a screening service a more effective referral pathway will need to be 4 3**§**6 established in futher discussions between pharmacists and physicians. Better uptake of screening may have 3&7 3&7 been achieved with training of other staff of the pharmacy to aid in recruitment. A focused advertising 9 388 campaign, including advertorials in local media may also have boosted uptake. A better follow-up rate may 11 383 have been achieved if the pharmacist him/herself followed up screened participants several weeks after the 14 390 referral was given. In this follow-up, the pharmacist could check if at-risk screened individuals had taken up 16 397 18 the referral or prompt them to act upon it if they had yet done so. It may also have been helpful to send a 19 3920 copy of the referral directly to the referred individual's nominated physician.

393 23 Participant selection was heavily based on pharmacist perception of their age. Until screening becomes known 24 3924 and accepted as a community pharmacy service in UAE, the most likely pathway to uptake of screening in 26 3**9**3 community pharmacy in the UAE is by direct invitation from a pharmacist. It is also likely to yield more 28 329 326 individuals at high risk and in need of further testing and diagnosis. This has also been the case in other 31 3**97** screening trials (Krass et al 2007, CARS trial). Once such service becomes established it is likely that consumers 33 338 338 may request it themselves in response to advertising, posters in the pharmacy etc. The research team, at 36 399 planning phase, wanted to document proportion of patients approached, proportion consented and record 38 400 40 reason(s) for people refusal to screen, however, pharmacists reported that this would be an added work and 41 404<u>b</u> preferred not to collect such data. The short follow-up period with the patients was perhaps inadequate to 43 4**02** 45 capture all further diagnostic and management activities as a result of pharmacist-delivered screening. This 46 4043 feasibility study was continued into a larger scale sensitivity phase to evaluate the effectiveness of pharmacist-48 4**64**4 50 delivered screening in identifying the proportion of screened participants identified as having high diabetes 4Q3 and/or CVD risk in the UAE. Additional future studies should evaluate strategies to establish closer links 53 4**56** between community pharmacy and physicians in primary care, creating structured referral pathways and 55 4**§**7 emphasis on interprofessional coordination between pharmacists and physician.

409 **Conclusions**

416

19 4<u>þ</u>ð

24 4 <u>b</u>g

26 4*2*0 28

36 4**24**

38 423 40

41 4**2**46

43

60

It is feasible for community pharmacists to screen and refer individuals for diabetes and CVD risks in the UAE. The successful implementation of the screening model in community pharmacy, in terms of identifying at-risk individuals and advising them to visit their physicians for further evaluation, offers a new platform to increase screening capacity within the primary care setting, and represents a key opportunity for the early detection and intervention to tackle the increasing burden of both diseases. However, pathways for the integration of the pharmacist-delivered screening service with physicians in primary care are yet to be explored.

Acknowledgment: The authors sinverly thank study participants for their time, and participating pharmacists and pharmacies including Bin Sina Group, Makkah Group, and Al Seha Wal Jamal Group. Special thanks for the field team of brilliant pharmacists: Mr. Ward Saidawi, Ms. Safa Al Awad, Ms. Amna Othman, and Ms. Lujain Aloum for their exceptional efforts in data collection/management and post-implementation support. Authors are grateful for valuable input of Professor Rifat Atun, School of Public Health, Haravrd University.

Funding: This research was supported by two research grants: (1) the research cooperative grant from Center
 for Global Health Delivery-Dubai, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University (agreement No. 027562-746845 0302), (2) operational grant from the University of Sharjah.

Competing interests: There are no competing interests for any author

Data sharing statement: Statistical code books are available upon reasonable request from corresponding author.

Author contribution: HA designed the study, supervised data collection process, assisted with data analysis,
 wrote, reviewed and edited the entire manuscript. SC and RC analyzed data, reviewed and edited manuscript.
 SH wrote parts of manuscript. KM and IK assisted with designing of the study, reviewed the methods and data
 analysis contributed to the discussion, and reviewed all drafts.

60

434	References

435 Forouzanfar MH, Afshin A, Alexander LT, Anderson HR, Bhutta ZA, Biryukov S, et al. Global, regional, and 1. 4346 national comparative risk assessment of 79 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters 4367 of risks, 1990–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. The Lancet. 4**3**8 2016;388(10053):1659-724.

4**3**9 Unnikrishnan R, Pradeepa R, Joshi SR, Mohan V. Type 2 Diabetes: Demystifying the Global Epidemic. Diabetes. 4**4**0 2017;66(6):1432-42.

3. Guariguata L, Whiting DR, Hambleton I, Beagley J, Linnenkamp U, Shaw JE. Global estimates of diabetes prevalence for 2013 and projections for 2035. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2014;103(2):137-49.

441 442 443 443 Ogurtsova K, da Rocha Fernandes JD, Huang Y, Linnenkamp U, Guariguata L, Cho NH, et al. IDF Diabetes Atlas: 4 Global estimates for the prevalence of diabetes for 2015 and 2040. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice. 4**4**5 2017:128:40-50.

4**46** Roth GA, Johnson C, Abajobir A, Abd-Allah F, Ferede Abera S, Abyu G, et al. Global, Regional, and National 5. 44ø Burden of Cardiovascular Diseases for 10 Causes, 1990 to 2015. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. May 448 2017;23715.

449 450 451 451 Roth GA, Johnson C, Abajobir A, Abd-Allah F, Abera SF, Abyu G, et al. Global, Regional, and National Burden of 6. Cardiovascular Diseases for 10 Causes, 1990 to 2015. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2017;70(1):1-25.

Einarson TR, Acs A, Ludwig C, Panton UH. Prevalence of cardiovascular disease in type 2 diabetes: a systematic 7. literature review of scientific evidence from across the world in 2007-2017. Cardiovascular diabetology. 2018;17(1):83-.

4<u>5</u>3 8. Beagley J, Guariguata L, Weil C, Motala AA. Global estimates of undiagnosed diabetes in adults. Diabetes Res 4524 Clin Pract. 2014;103(2):150-60.

4**35** 9. The 10-Year Cost-Effectiveness of Lifestyle Intervention or Metformin for Diabetes Prevention. An intent-to-treat 4**36** analysis of the DPP/DPPOS. 2012;35(4):723-30.

437 458 458 459 459 10. Lindström J, Ilanne-Parikka P, Peltonen M, Aunola S, Eriksson JG, Hemiö K, et al. Sustained reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes by lifestyle intervention: follow-up of the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study. The Lancet. 2006;368(9548):1673-9.

11. Siu AL, Force obotUSPST. Screening for Abnormal Blood Glucose and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: U.S. Preventive 4**6**1 Services Task Force Recommendation StatementScreening for Abnormal Blood Glucose and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. 463 Annals of Internal Medicine. 2015;163(11):861-8.

4**63** Abuyassin B, Laher I. Diabetes epidemic sweeping the Arab world. World Journal of Diabetes. 2016;7(8):165-74. 12.

4**64** 13. Badran M, Laher I. Type II diabetes mellitus in Arabic-speaking countries. International Journal of Endocrinology. 2012:Article ID 902873.

4*65* 466 467 467 468 14. Alzubaidi H, Mc Narmara K, Kilmartin GM, Kilmartin JF, Marriott J. The relationships between illness and treatment perceptions with adherence to diabetes self-care: A comparison between Arabic-speaking migrants and Caucasian English-speaking patients. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice. 2015;110(2):208-17.

469 Alzubaidi H, Mc Namara K, Browning C, Marriott J. Barriers and enablers to healthcare access and use among 15. 47402 Arabic-speaking and Caucasian English-speaking patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a qualitative comparative study. 47413 BMJ Open. 2015;5(11).

47424 16. Alzubaidi H, Mc Mamara K, Chapman C, Stevenson V, Marriott J. Medicine-taking experiences and associated factors: comparison between Arabic-speaking and Caucasian English-speaking patients with Type 2 diabetes. Diabet Med. 2015;32(12):1625-33.

Ayorinde AA, Porteous T, Sharma P. Screening for major diseases in community pharmacies: a systematic 17. review. International Journal of Pharmacy Practice. 2013;21(6):349-61.

18. Willis A, Rivers P, Gray LJ, Davies M, Khunti K. The effectiveness of screening for diabetes and cardiovascular 4758 disease risk factors in a community pharmacy setting. PLoS One. 2014;9(4):e91157.

47592 19. San-Juan-Rodriguez A, Newman TV, Hernandez I, Swart ECS, Klein-Fedyshin M, Shrank WH, et al. Impact of 4**80** community pharmacist-provided preventive services on clinical, utilization, and economic outcomes: An umbrella 4**§1** review. Preventive Medicine. 2018;115:145-55.

482 20. Namara KPM, Dunbar JA, Philpot B, Marriott JL, Reddy P, Janus ED. Potential of pharmacists to help reduce the 483 burden of poorly managed cardiovascular risk. Australian Journal of Rural Health. 2012;20(2):67-73.

21. Sulaiman N, Elbadawi S, Hussein A, Abusnana S, Madani A, Mairghani M, et al. Prevalence of overweight and 485 486 487 488 488 obesity in United Arab Emirates Expatriates: the UAE National Diabetes and Lifestyle Study. Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome. 2017;9(1):88.

Alzubaidi H, Saidawi W, Mc Namara K. Pharmacist views and pharmacy capacity to deliver professional services 22. in the United Arab Emirates. International journal of clinical pharmacy. 2018.

Hasan S, Sulieman H, Chapman C, Stewart K, Kong DCM. Community pharmacy in the United Arab Emirates: 23. **9**0 characteristics and workforce issues. International Journal of Pharmacy Practice. 2011;19(6):392-9.

%1 Green LW. Toward Cost-Benefit Evaluations of Health Education: Some Concepts, Methods, and Examples. 24. **9**2 Health Education Monographs. 1974;2(1 suppl):34-64.

494 494 495 495 495 495 25. Mc Namaraa K, Krass I, Peterson GM, AL.Zubaidi H, Grenfell R, Freedman B, et al. Implementing screening interventions in community pharmacy to promote interprofessional coordination of primary care – A mixed methods evaluation. Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy 2019; In Press

26. McMillan SS, King M, Tully MP. How to use the nominal group and Delphi techniques. International journal of clinical pharmacy. 2016;38(3):655-62.

StataCorp. 2015. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14. College Station TSL. 27.

tou. Software: Relea. Solates Prevalence in the 28. Al Busaidi N, Shanmugam P, Manoharan D. Diabetes in the Middle East: Government Health Care Policies and Strategies that Address the Growing Diabetes Prevalence in the Middle East. Current Diabetes Reports. 2019;19(8). 20

Table 1: Demographic and health characteristics (N=115)

Character	istic	n ((%)
Gender	Female	60	(52.1)
Age(yrs)	Mean ± SD	47.23	±7.3
Nationality	Syria	32	(27.8)
	Egypt	23	(20.0)
	India	11	(9.5)
	Jordan	7	(6.0)
	Pakistan	7	(6.0)
	Other	35	(30.4)
Education	Not educated	2	(1.7)
	Primary/middle school	15	(13.0)
	High school	37	(36.2)
	University	50	(43.4)
Marital status	Married	103	(89.5)
	Single	8	(6.9)
	Divorced	3	(2.6)
	Widowed	1	(0.8)
Employment	Full-time	67	(63.2)
	Part-time	6	(5.6)
	Home duties	25	(23.5)
	Other	17	(14.7)
Self-reported health status*	Excellent	24	(32.0)
	Good	41	(54.6)
	Average	10	(13.3)
Number of visits to a physician in the past year*	Mean ± SD	3.05	±4.1
Patterns of physician use	Have a regular physician	18	(24.0)
	Have a regular clinic but often see different	14	(18.6)
	physicians		
	Visit different physician clinics	29	(38.6)
	Rarely or never visit a physician	14	(18.6)
Source of advice to reduce risk of diabetes and		13	(17.5)
CVD risk in the past 12 months (apart from	A physician		
pharmacy screening visit)*			
	A dietitian	1	(1.3)
	A specialist physician	5	(6.7)
	A pharmacist	2	(2.7)
	Others practitioners	9	(12.1)
	A family member	7	(9.4)
Examination of lifestyle factors that affect diabetes	and CVD risk by a health professional during	7	(6.4)

2 3 4	515	Table 3: Outcomes of at-risk participants' ref	erral (n=37)			
5		Participants completed untake of referral follo	Participants completed untake of referral follow up			
6 7		Participants visited a doctor to discuss pharma	acist-delivered screening results			
, 8		Visited doctor straight away				
9			Made some changes and went to doctor later			
10			Discussed results at routine visit			
11		Participants who did not visit a doctor				
12 13			Haven't visited doctor yet but intend to			
14			Didn't think it was necessary			
15			Haven't visited doctor yet and made no plans			
16		Physician knew about pharmacy screening				
17			Referral letter given to the doctor			
18			Told doctor about pharmacy screening			
20		Follow up tosts were undertaken by the physi	cian			
20 21		Follow-up tests were undertaken by the physi	Rlood pressure			
22			Total cholesterol			
23			HDL cholesterol			
24 25			Blood sugar level			
25 26			Waist			
27			Weight			
28			Other			
29		Lifestyle changes since screening	Increased regular exercise			
30 21			Attempted to lose weight			
32			Improved diet			
33	516		Started new medications			
34 35	517					
36 37	518					
38 39	519					
40 41	520					
42 43	521					
44 45	522					
46 47	523					
48	524					
49 50 51 52 53 54	525					
	526					
	520					
55 56	527					
57 58	520					
59 60		For peer review only - http://br	njopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml			

n

3	529	Table 4	4: Participants' experiences, feedback, and	d satisfaction with screening (n=75)				
4 5								
6		Experie	nce and feedback on pharmacist-delivered scro	eening				
7		-	Person who initiated the conversation	Another participant in the project				
8			about screening between participant and	Pharmacist				
9			pharmacist	Pharmacy staff				
10				Acquaintance				
11				Social media				
12		-	Clarity of pharmacist's explanation of risk	very clear				
13			of developing diabetes and CVD	Clear enough				
14				Some parts clear				
15			Double of the tractication of	Generally unclear				
16		-	Depth of pharmacist's exploration of	Very comprehensive				
17			possible lifestyle causes of increased	Discussed several issues				
18			diabetes and CVD risks	Discussed only one issue				
19		-	Steps undertaken following screening	we have the set of the set				
20				The pharmacist provided you with a written report of your results				
21				The pharmacist made sure that you understood everything				
22				The pharmacist clearly stated when the physician follow up was required				
23		-	Quality of the testing carried out in	Excellent				
24			pharmacy	Above average				
25				Average				
26				Slightly below average				
27		-	Perceived length of the diabetes and CVD	Much too long				
28			risk screening process	A little long				
29				About right				
30				A little short				
31		Satisfac	tion with the pharmacist-delivered screening					
32		-	Satisfaction with health risk assessment	Very satisfied				
33				Satisfied				
34				Average				
35				Dissatisfied				
36		-	Satisfaction with the quality of advice	Very satisfied				
37			provided in the pharmacy	Satisfied				
38				Average				
39				Dissatisfied				
40		Willing	ness to pay for the future pharmacist-delivered	I screening service				
41		-	Yes					
42		-	Acceptable amount to be paid	≤50 AED (≤ USD 13.6*)				
43				51-100 AED (USD 13.6-27.2*)				
44				101-150 AED (USD 27.2-48.8*)				
45				>150 AED (> USD 48.8*)				
46		-	Reasons for unwillingness to pay for future	Cannot afford it				
47			pharmacist-delivered screening service	Does not think it is worth it				
48				Thinks it should be free				
49				Other				
50	530							
51								
52	531	Figure	1: Pharmacy Screening Model in the UAE					
53								
54								
55								
56								
5/								
58								
59			For peer review only - http://bmio	nen hmi com/site/about/quidelines yhtml				
00			for peer review only intep.//binjo	periority steel about guidennes. Aftirn				



		Checklist for cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies (combined)	
Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1 and 3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5 and 6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses	7
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	10
Participants	6	 (a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up Case-control study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls Cross-sectional study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants 	
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed Case-control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	13
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	11 and 12
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	13
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	13
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	13
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	

		Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	15
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	14
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	15
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	
Outcome data	15*	Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	16-18
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	17
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	18
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	18
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	18
Other information		·	
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	20

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Diabetes and cardiovascular disease risk screening model in community pharmacies in a developing primary healthcare system: feasibility study.

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031246.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Sep-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Alzubaidi, Hamzah; University of Sharjah, College of Pharmacy , Pharmacy Practice & Pharmacotherapy Chandir, Subhash; Harvard Medical School Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai, Hasan, Sanah ; Ajman University of Science and Technology College of Pharmacy and Health Science McNamara, Kevin; Deakin University, Cox , Rachele; Harvard Medical School, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Krass, Ines; University of Sydney, Faculty of Pharmacy
Primary Subject Heading :	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Diabetes and endocrinology, Cardiovascular medicine
Keywords:	Primary Health Care, Cardiovascular Diseases, Point-of-Care Testing, General diabetes < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, Pharmacy, Screening

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

1 1 2	Title: Diabetes and cardiovascular disease risk screening model in community pharmacies in a developing
₃ 2 4	primary healthcare system: feasibility study.
53 6	Authors: Hamzah Alzubaidi ¹ *, Subhash Chandir ² , Sanah Hasan ³ , Kevin Mc Namara ^{4,5} , Rachele Cox ^{6,} Ines Krass ⁷
7 84 95 10	* Corresponding author: Dr. Hamzah Alzubaidi BPharm (Hons), MPharm (Clinic), PhD 1. Sharjah Institute for Medical Research and College of Pharmacy, University of Shariah
1 7 12 13	PO Box 27272, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates Tel: +9716505-7424
1 2 10	E-mail: <u>halzubaidi@sharjah.ac.ae</u>
¶∳ 17	<u>Co-authors:</u>
18 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	2. Dr. Subhash Chandir PhD, MBBS, MPH, CPH Epidemiologist, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai Harvard Medical School
P3 23 24	Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE PO Box 505276
123 128	Email: <u>Subhash_Chandir@hms.harvard.edu</u>
19 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	3. Sanah Hasan PharmD, PhD Department of Clinical Sciences College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences Aiman University
23	Email: <u>s.hasan@ajman.ac.ae</u>
26 27 28	4. Dr. Kevin Mc Namara BSc (Pharm), MSc (Community Health), PhD School of Medicine, Deakin University, 75 Pigdons Rd, Waurn Ponds, Vic 3216
289 40 349 342 342	Centre for Population Health Research, Deakin University, Burwood, Vic 3125
5-4-5 4-5 4-5 4-5 4-5 4-5 4-5 4-5 4-5 4-	
345 346 249	5. Rachele Cox MPH Research Assistant, Center for Global Health Delivery–Dubai
57 50 51 52 51 52 52 52	Building 14, Dubai Healthcare City, UAE PO Box 505276 Email: Bachele, cox@hms.barvard.edu
שפ 44 42	Email: <u>Rachele_cox@milis.narvara.caa</u>
457 457 459 459 60	 6. Ines Krass BPharm Dip Hosp Pharm, Grad Dip Educ Studies (Health Ed), PhD School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Medicine and Health For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- 47 27 University of Sydney
- Camperdown, NSW 2006
- 8 Email: ines.krass@sydney.edu.au

to peer terien only

51 Abstract:

Objectives: To develop an evidence-based community pharmacist-delivered screening model for diabetes and cardiovascular disease (CVD), and assess its feasibility to identify and refer patients with elevated risk.

Design: A feasibility study.

Setting: A purposive sample of 12 community pharmacies in three cities in the United Arab Emirates (UAE).

Participants: Adults 40 years of age and above who have not been previously diagnosed with either diabetes or CVD.

Intervention: Pharmacist screening of adults visiting pharmacies involved history, demographics, anthropometric measurements, blood pressure, and point-of-care testing including HbA1c levels and lipid panel. Participants with a 10-year CVD risk \geq 7.5%, HbA1c level \geq 5.7% or American Diabetes Association risk score \geq 5 points, were advised to visit their physician.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: (1) Development of UAE pharmacist-delivered screening model, (2) the proportion of screened participants identified as having high CVD risk (ASCVD 10-year risk defined as \geq 7.5%), (3) the proportion of participants identified as having elevated blood glucose (high HbA1c level \geq 5.7% (38.8mmol/mol)) or high self-reported diabetes risk (ADA risk score \geq 5 points). Secondary outcomes: participants' satisfaction with the screening.

Results: The first UAE pharmacist-delivered screening model was developed and implemented. A total of 115 participants were screened, and 92.3% of the entire screening process was completed during a single visit to pharmacy. The mean duration of the complete screening process was 27 minutes. At-risk individuals (57.4%) were referred to their physicians for futher testing, 94.5% of participants were at least satisfied with their screening experience.

Conclusions: The community pharmacist-delivered screening of diabetes and CVD risk is feasible in the UAE. The model offers a platform to increase screening capacity within primary care and provides an opportunity for early detection and treatment. However, pathways for the integration of the pharmacist-delivered screening service with physicians in primary care are yet to be explored.

Keyword: Diabetes, Cardiovascular Diseases, Screening, Pharmacy, Point-of-Care Testing, Primary Health Care

5 Strengths and limitations of this study

- An expert panel was used to adapt an international screening and develop the first contextually-tailored pharmacy screening model for diabetes and cardiovascular diseases risk in UAE.
- Lipid panel and glycated hemoglobin level were measured using a finger-prick point-of-care testing device (Roche Cobas b 101 POC dual system).
- Follow-up with physicians on referral outcomes of participants at-risk could not be determined due to the fragmented healthcare system. We relied on patient self-report data.
- Patient recruitment heavily relied on a direct invitation from pharmacists
- Follow-up times with screened participants were short and may not have encompassed all results regarding follow-up with physicians.

BMJ Open

96 Introduction

Type 2 diabetes (T2DM) and cardiovascular disease (CVD) are leading contributors to the global burden of disease, albeit with distinct long-term trends.(1) Diabetes, a rapidly growing global epidemic, affects all countries, and is substantially caused by rapidly increasing rates of obesity over recent decades. (2) By 2040 T2DM will affect an estimated 642m people; 10.4% of the adult population, compared with 8.8% in 2015.(2-4) Age-standardized CVD trends are more geographically nuanced – generally, the incidence has declined markedly in highly developed countries over several decades, but this decline has now plateaued.(5) Likewise, some middle-income regions have experienced declines in CVD mortality, but in most regions of the developing world, a rapid increased incidence has recently prevailed.(5) Globally in 2015, there were an estimated 422.7 million prevalent cases of CVD, and ischemic heart disease and stroke remained the leading causes of death.(6) A combination of an aging western society, and increasing CVD mortality rates in many developing regions, has resulted in increasing CVD-related deaths from 12.6 million in 1990 to 17.9 million in 2015.(6) Both CVD and diabetes represent major public health challenges in all countries. Globally, CVD affects 32.2% of all persons with T2DM.(7)

An estimated 45.8% (174.8 million) of adult diabetes cases worldwide are undiagnosed, ranging from 24.1% to 75.1% in different countries.(8) Overall, the prevention and delay of diabetes complications are facilitated by combining early detection of undiagnosed diabetes using population or opportunistic screening approaches with effective prevention interventions.(9-11)

In Arabic-speaking countries, prevalence of T2DM is at alarming levels with high morbidity and mortality rates.(12) Six Arabic-speaking countries (Kuwait, Lebanon, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Saudi Arabia, and Bahrain) lead the world in the prevalence of T2DM, affecting approximately one in five people.(13) There is an urgent need to increase capacity for the detection of diabetes and to reduce its burden in these Arabic-speaking countries. Previous research has identified negative health beliefs, poor health-seeking

1 behaviors, and intentional delay in accessing available medical services are commonplace in Arabic-speaking communities, hence the need for proactive and opportunistic population screenings. (14-16) **2**1 6 The feasibility of pharmacist-delivered screening, for a variety of conditions including diabetes and CVD, is well supported by evidence.(17, 18) Such screening interventions identified at-risk individuals and increased rates of disease diagnosis, reduced disease risk factors, improved health behaviors, enhanced quality of care, and increased patient knowledge and awareness.(19) Community pharmacists have face-to-face contact with around 90% of the population annually and appear to interact regularly with those who have elevated risk of diabetes and CVD, or undiagnosed diabetes.(20) The potential, therefore, exists for pharmacists to improve access to health screening services and promote public health awareness. 128 23 In the UAE a substantial number of people with diabetes and a high prevalence of overweight and obesity are 129 currently thought to remain undiagnosed. (21) There are around 2,500 licensed community pharmacies in UAE *3*0 28 that are generally open seven days per week, easily accessible, and have an average working day of 13 hours 130 (22, 23); this potentially makes pharmacies an effective setting to offer screening for diabetes and CVD within the primary care system. To our knowledge, no systematic diabetes and CVD screening programs exist in the primary care setting in the UAE, meaning these diseases continue to be undiagnosed precluding the opportunity to initiate early prevention and treatment. 40 The aim of this study was to test the feasibility of pharmacist-delivered diabetes and CVD risk screening model in the UAE. The specific objectives were to: **34** 45 1. Develop locally-appropriate pharmacist-delivered diabetes and CVD risk screening model for the 1348 community pharmacies in UAE.

139 2. Evaluate the feasibility of implementing diabetes and CVD risk screening model in the selected
 50
 51
 51
 community pharmacies in the UAE.

- **4**4

Page 7 of 28

BMJ Open

142 Methods

3 **Ethical approvals**

This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Sharjah, the Ministry of Health and Prevention in the UAE, and deemed Exempt by the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health Institutional Review Board.

Study design

The study was conducted in three phases: Phase 1 (formative phase) explored development of a suitable model for diabetes screening and CVD risk assessment in community pharmacies in the UAE, Phase 2 (implementation phase) assessed the feasibility of the screening model, and Phase 3 (evaluation phase) tested the impact of the screening model.

Phase 1: Formative Phase

A systematic approach was used to develop the intervention of diabetes and CVD screening.(24) The formative phase commenced with identifying needs for diabetes and CVD risk screening program. After identifying the suitability of community pharmacies for providing screening services, a literature review of pharmacist-delivered screening models was conducted to identify useful and effective approaches to screening. The Australian Cardiovascular Absolute Risk Screening Study (CARS) was considered an appropriate template model to inform the development of the first UAE pharmacy-based screening program.(25) Two local health professionals were consulted to determine the adaptation of CARS into the local context and acceptability of the proposed protocol prior to presenting the model to an expert panel. In the absence of national guidelines and frameworks regarding risk assessment and management for diabetes and CVD in the UAE, an expert panel forum was tasked to develop a consensus on the proposed screening program. Prospective panelists were identified through extensive online search; evaluating experts' specialty, experience, and research involvement. Shortlisted experts, including two cardiologists, two endocrinologists, two senior clinical pharmacists, were invited to participate in the forum. The Delphi technique was used to help arrive at a

166 1	onsensus on a specific question in one or more rounds - supportive documents were created to aid	in voting				
2 1637	nd to calculate the level of agreement.(26) The Delphi discussion focused on locally-appropriate me	thods for				
4 1678 6	osolute cardiovascular and diabetes risk assessment, including: use of absolute CVD risk assessr	nent and				
7 1 6 9	her multi-factorial risk algorithm cut-offs; selection of screening tools; and risk factor thresh	nolds for				
9 17 0 11	nysician referrals. The following questions were discussed during the forum:					
	1. When should the participant's blood pressure measurement be taken? Moreover, what	at is the				
14 173 16	minimum time interval needed between taking the two blood pressure readings?					
173	2. Which tool to use to calculate participants' absolute CVD risk?					
19 I2∕∯	3. Which method would be most suitable for calculating the participants' absolute CVD ris	sk in the				
21 1 73 23	community pharmacy setting?					
24 1769	4. Which self-reported tool to use to determine the participants' risk of having T2DM? What	absolute				
26 [777 28	CVD risk threshold should be used when deciding to refer a participant to a physician?					
29 1 38	5. At what HbA1c level should a participant be referred to a physician?					
31 [739] 22	6. Should at-risk participants who are referred to physicians for further testing be contacted to a	isk about				
	any lifestyle modifications and outcomes of a visit to a physician? And should the physicians w	/hom the				
36 1817	referred participants visited be contacted?					
38 182 40	ne screening model planning involved the development of resources in supporting pharmacists-	delivered				
41 1 & 3	reening including: training manual, data collection tools, and patient follow up documents. The	ese were				
43 1844 45	eveloped through a process of co-production in consultation with the international co-researchers	who had				
46 1 & 5	evious experience in pharmacist-delivered screening services. To ensure local context applicability	ty, study				
48 1869 50	aterials were sent to three local community pharmacists for feedback and comments.					
51 1872	Phase 2: Implementation Phase					
53 \$\$ 55	Community pharmacists were trained through a face-to-face workshop that lasted for three hours on the					
1 859	udy protocol, and on how to: (1) approach potential participants, (2) use point-of-care testing de	vices, (3)				
58 1 930 60	andle refusals to participate, (4) collect data, (5) communicate risk assessment results to particip For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	ants, (6)				

9

16 198

19 190

21 200 23

24 2015

26 2**97** 28

293 293

31 2034

33 2q3

36 206

38 207

41 2048

43 2019 45

46 2 ⊾0

50 2 <u>5</u>1 2 <u>5</u>2

53 2 53

60

BMJ Open

191 engage and refer at-risk individuals to physicians, (7) counsel participants on required lifestyle changes, and 2 1932 (8) respond to participants' questions.

1**9**3 Study setting and participants

194 A purposive sample of 12 community pharmacies (with necessary infrastructre) in the three emirates of Dubai, 199 Sharjah, and Ajman in the UAE was selected. The recruited sites represented chain pharmacies. Study 11 1963 pharmacists were offered a small monetary incentive (AED 23 (equivalent to USD 6)) per screening in 14 appreciation of their time and effort. 193

Recruitment of participants

Pharmacy-based advertising, including posters and flyers, were used to recruit participants. Individuals were mainly invited directly by the pharmacists to participate based on their judgment of the individual's age. Interested voluntary participants were pre-screened by the pharmacists to determine their eligibility. Eligible participants were given written patient information sheet and they signed a consent form.

Inclusion criteria:

- Arabic or English speaking.
- Aged between 40 to 74 years. There is no international consensus on the age range for diabetes screening, however, 40 years is recommended in several guidelines and was therefore considered appropriate.

Exclusion criteria:

- Previous diagnosis of diabetes or CVD.
- Use of medications for treatment of diabetes, hypertension or any other CVD at the time of screening.
- Pregnancy.
- Terminal illness.
- Severe mental illness.

216 Data collection and risk factor assessment

2 j_j7

2 k9

20

23

24

223

26

*2*7

29

23g

31

*3*4 *3*45

*3*8

238

To document the screening process, participating pharmacists completed brief paper-based records of each screening undertaken. This provided patient risk assessment data, documentation of patient counseling (e.g. lifestyle factors assessed, targets specified, and criteria for referral to a physician) and logistical information (e.g. time taken to conduct screening and counseling, number of visits required, reasons for deviating from suggested screening schedule).

After checking eligibility and obtaining consent, trained pharmacists screened participants with the following measurements:

- Anthropometric measurements: Weight, height and waist circumference were measured along with body mass index calculations.
- Point-of-care testing: Total cholesterol (TC), high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL), low-density lipoprotein (LDL) plasma levels, and glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) level, were measured using a finger-prick point-of-care testing device (Roche Cobas b 101 POC dual system). Systolic blood pressure (SBP) and diastolic blood pressure (DBP) were measured after participants rested for 5 minutes using the Omron 1A1B[®] automated Blood Pressure (BP) monitor. Pharmacists advised participants to seek immediate medical attention if SBP was ≥180 mmHg, or DBP ≥110 mmHg. Pharmacists also reminded at-risk individuals that point-of-care tests may not have the same sensitivity and specificity as laboratory based equipment and hence the need to refer to the medical practice for confirmation.
 - CVD risk assessment: Projected 10-year atherosclerotic CVD risk was calculated for each participant.
 Diabetes risk assessment: In addition to HbA1c level, the American Diabetes Association (ADA) T2DM risk questionnaire was completed.
- Patient History: Detailed socio-demographic information, brief medical history, family history of diabetes, smoking status, physical activity, and dietary behaviors. Patients referral and follow-up:
 Participants at high risk, defined as having any of the following: (1) 10-year ASCVD risk ≥ 7.5% (2)

HbA1c level \geq 5.7 (3) ADA T2DM risk questionnaire \geq 5 points, were advised to visit their physician. All participants identified, by pharmacists, as at high risk for either CVD or diabetes were given a referral letter summarizing pharmacy screening results to the physician for further testing. A rapid phone follow-up of all participants was conducted (within two weeks of screening) by a member of the research team to determine participants' satisfaction and experience with the pharmacy screening service. Participants were asked about perceived depth and clarity of pharmacist explanation of diabetes and CVD risk; their satisfaction with the risk assessment and the quality of testing and advice; instructions on the need for further evaluation by a physician; and the perceived length of the screening. They were also asked about their opinion on community pharmacies as a venue of the screening service, whether screening should be routinely provided by community pharmacists, and their willingness to pay for future pharmacist-delivered screening.

The follow-up also included questions about self-reported health status, frequency, and pattern of physician visits in the past year. Participants were asked if they had undergone an assessment of lifestyle that affects diabetes and/or CVD risk by any healthcare professional in the past year or whether they were advised of the need to reduce their diabetes or CVD risk. The research team members identified themselves as such to the participants and informed them that their responses would not be communicated to the pharmacists who performed the screening.

Outcomes

1. Development of UAE pharmacy-based screening model:

A consensus statement from the expert panel detailing the screening processes, cut off points/levels, and referral mechanisms to physicians, all suited to the community pharmacy context in UAE.

2. Feasibility assessment:

a) The proportion of screened participants identified as having high CVD risk (ASCVD 10-year risk defined as ≥7.5% - as determined by the expert panel, see section 3.1).

- b) The proportion of participants identified as having elevated blood glucose (high A1c level >6.5% (48mmol/mol)) or high self-reported diabetes risk (T2DM risk questionnaire score ≥ 5 points as determined by the expert panel, see section 3.1).
 - c) Participants' acceptability and satisfaction with the pharmacist-delivered screening.

Patient and Public Involvement: We did not involve patients or the public in our work

Data analysis

The data was entered into Microsoft Access and 10% of participant files were randomly selected for validation. Stata, release 14 (StataCorp, College Station, TX) was used for data analysis.(27) Normally distributed continuous variables were described using means and standard deviations (such as participants' age, visits to physicians and nutritional habits). Categorical variables were described using counts and frequencies (such as demographic data, BMI (grouped) and medical history). The Chi-squared test was used to test differences in risk factors by age and gender. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Consensus statement on screening intervention

The expert panel reached a consensus on the use of absolute risk assessment and other multi-factorial risk algorithm cut-offs, screening tools, and risk factor thresholds. Panel members unanimously agreed on: taking two seated measurements of BP after a five-minute rest and separated by two minutes. If the two systolic and diastolic BP readings differed by ≥ 10 mmHg or ≥ 6 mmHg respectively, a third measurement would be needed, and the two closest readings would be used to calculate mean BP. Regarding the calculation of 10-year atherosclerotic CVD risk score, the ACC/AHA pooled cohort equations CVD risk calculator should be used. Participants having a 10-year risk $\geq 7.5\%$ were classified as high risk and had to be referred to a physician for further testing. The official ASCVD Risk Estimator Plus smartphone application with off-line feature was deemed most feasible to perform the calculation. Other criteria that independently necessitated referral to a

BMJ Open

287 physician were an HbA1c level exceeding 5.7% (pre-diabetes) or a score above five points on the ADA
 2
 2
 88 questionnaire to measure the risk of T2DM.

Regarding the determination of uptake of referral and physician action on the results of the screening, the panelists identified the impracticality of contacting physician's offices; instead it was agreed that uptake of referral and physician action would be best reported by participants themselves during follow-up calls. Clinical training manual and implementation resources were developed to ensure systematic approaches for the execution of pharmacist-delivered screening and to minimize variability amongst participating pharmacists. Data collection tools and consent forms were adapted from the CARS project. Figure 1 illustrates the final screening model.

Socio-demographic and health characteristics

From December 15, 2017 to May 8, 2018, 120 consenting participants were screened for CVD and T2DM from the population visiting the 12 participating community pharmacies (which had sufficient/appropriate space to accommodate the screening service, and had high volume and variability in clientele). Five participants were excluded for not meeting study criteria. Socio-demographic and health characteristics of the 115 screened participants are summarized in Table 1. Gender representation was almost equal with most participants having been born in Syria and Egypt. When participants were asked about their present state of health, 32% reported being 'excellent'. On average, participants visited a physician three times a year. 24% of participants reported having regular physicians, while 18.6% had regular clinic but visited different physicians, and 38.6% visited different clinics. In the past 12 months, only 6.4% reported undertaking a detailed examination of lifestyle factors by a health professional.

Implementation fidelity

Of the screened participants, 57.4% were identified as high-risk for diabetes and/or CVD. After each screening encounter, pharmacists completed a checklist that documented the screening process (Table 2). Most participants (91.7%) were screened immediately following their recruitment and the signing of informed

consent, and the remainder were given appointments for a later time. In the majority of cases (92.3%), the entire screening process was completed during a single visit to the pharmacy.

3 ₱3 6 A total of 12 participants did not undergo a complete assessment as per the screening protocol. A full lipid 3 **j**4 profile was not obtained in four cases, and four other participants did not obtain an HbA1c measurement. 9 319 Furthermore, pharmacists did not perform a waist circumference measurement for three participants and 11 34g blood pressure measurement for one participant. Pharmacists documented the reasons for incomplete 14 313 assessments for these 10 participants: a technical error in the POC device prevented the measurement in nine 16 31¹8 cases, and the participant objected to the measurement in one case. Assessments of diabetes risk as per the 19 3 120 ADA questionnaire, dietary habits, and physical activity habits were completed for all participants. On average, 21 320 23 assessment and testing took 27±9.4 minutes.

In all cases where pharmacists documented post-assessment counseling, pharmacists explained the meaning
of participants' ASCVD and ADA questionnaire risk scores and the targets for suboptimal blood test results.
HbA1c test results were explained to 96.3% of participants. Regarding lifestyle behaviors, the pharmacists
documented counseling 85.8% and 81.1% of participants about healthy diet and physical activity, respectively.
Finally, pharmacists reported informing 87.9% of participants of the need for confirmatory testing at the
physician's office. Pharmacists reported that post-assessment counseling lasted 11.6±6.5 minutes on average.

Uptake of referral

41

58 59

60

A total of 71 (61.7%) at-risk individuals were referred to their physicians for further testing; 37 participants (52.1%) completed the second follow-up survey to determine uptake of referral (Table 3). Only nine of these participants (24.3%) had visited their physician following the screening, 29.7% had not visited their physician (7able 3). Only nine of these participants (24.3%) had visited their physician following the screening, 29.7% had not visited their physician (7able 3). (7able 3). (7able 3). (7able 3). Five participants told their physicians about the pharmacy screening results; 4 of the 5 cases reported that

53
 53
 53
 53
 54
 55
 55
 55
 55
 55
 56
 57
 57
 58
 59
 59
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 57
 58
 59
 59
 50
 51
 51
 52
 54
 55
 56
 57
 57
 58
 59
 59
 59
 50
 50
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 51
 5

Page 15 of 28 **BMJ** Open 335 When asked about lifestyle changes that participants adopted following the screening, 63.1% reported 3356 improved diet, 57.8% attempted to lose weight, and 40% started new medications since the screening (Table 4 3**3**7 3). 7 338 Participants' experiences, feedback, and satisfaction with the screening service 9 3**39** All participants were contacted by telephone to determine their experiences and satisfaction with the 11 34g pharmacy screening service (Table 4). A total of 75 participants completed the follow-up survey (65.2%). In 14 345 68% of the cases, the pharmacist-initiated the conversation about the screening service. Other participants 16 342 reported learning about the service from personal acquaintances (17.3%), and social media (10.7%). 19 340 Almost all participants reported that the pharmacists' explanation of their risk of developing diabetes or CVD 21 344 23 were either 'very clear' or 'clear enough' and that pharmacists explained the various lifestyle causes of 24 345 increased CVD or diabetes risk 'very comprehensively' or 'discussed several issues'. 26 346 28 At the conclusion of the screening, 94.5% of participants reported that pharmacists made sure participants 347 347 understood all key points, and 89.3% indicated that pharmacists provided participants with a written 31 348 screening report. 33 343 Most participants (94.5%) reported either being "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the risk assessment 36 350 undertaken by the pharmacists and the quality of the pharmacists' advice. 38 351 40 Eighty-six percent of participants thought pharmacies are good venues for conducting screening tests, and 41 86.6% thought pharmacists should routinely provide CVD and diabetes risk screening. Most participants 3542 43 353 45 (82.7%) indicated they would be willing to pay for pharmacist-delivered screening services should it be 46 354 provided in the future (Table 3). 48 49 3**59** Discussion 51 52 356

This study is the first in an Arabic-speaking country (UAE) to assess the feasibility and performance of an evidence-based pharmacist-delivered screening program for T2DM and CVD. The screening model, adapted

57 58 59

60
358 from the CARS model with the advice of local experts, was successfully implemented in community 3539 pharmacies and resulted in the identification and referral of at-risk individuals. (25)

360 The proportion of screened participants identified with high diabetes or CVD risk in this study was higher 3681 compared to reported rates in the international pharmacy screening literature. This could be partially 362 explained by the higher prevalence of diabetes and CVD in the UAE.(21, 28) The high referral rate (61.7%) in 11 363 this study is consistent with the recent trend towards higher rates of referral.(18) Without systematic 14 364 diabetes and CVD screening programs in the primary care setting in the UAE, lack of universal healthcare 16 365 coverage, all in tandem with poor health-seeking behavior and the delay in access to medical services these 19 3**66** conditions are likely to continue to be undiagnosed. The potential, therefore, exists for community 21 367 23 pharmacists who have regular contact with the population to improve access to health screening services and 24 3**6**8 promote public health awareness.

3*6*9 Several pharmacy and pharmacist-levels factors at selected pharmacies contributed to the success of 28 379 379 implementing pharmacist-delivered screening, these include: (i) the necessary infrastructure (such as 31 37¥ sufficient/appropriate space) to accommodate the screening service, (ii) motivation of the pharmacist to learn 33 3734 about and perform the screening, (iii) the high volume and variability in clientele.

3733 The purposive sampling of community pharmacies and the exploratory study design might have limited the 38 374 40 generalizability of study results. However, equally, it could be argued that the somewhat driven community 41 pharmacists in this study would have been representative of the expected pharmacists in future program roll-374<u>5</u> 43 376 45 out. The study was designed to demonstrate the feasibility of pharmacist-delivered screening and to 46 3747 understand how implementation support and processes might have been optimized to enable such a health 48 3748 service. Follow-up with physicians on pharmacist-delivered screening was not carried out as per the expert 50 3 7 51 3 7 52 panel advice; due to: the complexity of access to physician services ad different health coverage/schemes, lack 53 380 of integration and communication between services provided at the government and private institutions, the 55 3§j current lack of integration of pharmacy services with other health care services, and the scattered primary care structure in the country. Such lack of follow-up with physicians is not uncommon in studies exploring For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

58 38Ø 60

9

26

36

Page 17 of 28

BMJ Open

383 early stages of pharmacy-based screening given the complexity of the primary care setting. To optimize the 384 health impacts of a screening service a more effective referral pathway will need to be established in futher 4 3**§**5 6 discussions between pharmacists and physicians. Better uptake of screening may have been achieved with 3&6 training of other staff in the pharmacy to aid in recruitment. A focused advertising campaign, including 9 389 advertorials in local media may also have boosted uptake. A better follow-up rate may have been achieved if 11 38g the pharmacist him/herself followed up screened participants several weeks after the referral was advised. In 14 389 this follow-up, the pharmacist could check if at-risk screened individuals had taken up the referral or prompt 16 390 18 them to act upon it if had they not done so. It may also have been helpful to send a copy of the referral 19 3**2**0 directly to the referred individual's nominated physician. It could also have been that participants still 21 392 23 questioned the validity of the risk screening process carried out in community pharmacies, and that they could 24 3923 have taken its results more seriously had it been carried out in a clinic or a more traditional care setting. 26 394 Patient and physician reservations about services being provided in community pharmacies have been 28 329 325 reported in the literature. In the UAE, reasons cited for this included doubt about pharmacist competence to 31 396 provide the services, a business image rather than a healthcare image of community pharmacy that prevails in 33 3<u>3</u>4 the country, little privacy in the pharmacy setting and lack of effective collaboration between pharmacists and 36 398 physicians.(29-31) For community pharmacies to be a acceptable setting for providing screening services in 38 399 40 the UAE, the service model in the pharmacy will need to assure minimum expectations of patients including 41 patient privacy and properly trained pharmacists. We acknowledge that the focus of this trial was on 40,62 43 4**01** 45 determining feasibility from a health service perspective. However, it seems relevant to point out that the 46 404 original CARS model, which we adapted, did engage with a diverse range of Australian consumers (n=46) 48 4**0}**3 before design completion to support model acceptability and patient engagement. This included 20 Arabic 50 494 speaking migrants, 10 male and 10 female in separate focus groups facilitated by the lead investigator HA, to 53 4**6**5 explore various aspects of a pharmacy screening service from a culturally and linguistically diverse consumer 55 4q5 perspective. This process established the generally acceptable parameters for a pharmacist-delivered service 58 409 from the perspective of Middle Eastern adults, arguably validated by the strong satisfaction with the For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/quidelines. 60

408

intervention reported in patient surveys. In these focus groups, there were a number of comments suggesting greater confidence and trust in Arabic pharmacists and pharmacy systems than their Australian counterparts. What this process missed was consumer guidance regarding their specific support needs in the context of this model being operated in within the UAE health system. We have relied on health professionals and experts for guidance on this because of the complexity of the health system, absence of primary care, and the novelty of the intervention, which required a significant level of insight and extensive engagement to determine a model that might work. We fully acknowledge that we need to engage UAE consumers further before scaling up this intervention.

Participant selection was heavily based on pharmacist perception of their age. Until screening becomes known and accepted as a community pharmacy service in UAE, the most likely pathway to uptake of screening in community pharmacy in the UAE is by direct invitation from a pharmacist. It is also likely to yield more individuals at high risk and in need of further testing and diagnosis. This has also been the case in other screening trials (Krass et al 2007, CARS trial). Once such service becomes established it is likely that consumers may request it themselves in response to advertising, posters in the pharmacy etc. The six-dollar per participant was an incentive for the pharmacists to engage in the study, and it was not based on a calculation of what an actual service would cost. Future studies should aim to establish effectiveness of the pharmacistdelivered screening model for diabetes and CVD in the UAE, and generate evidence of its cost-effectiness. Then pharmacists' remuneration would eventually need to be negotiated with government and private insurance. At this point, this was not within the scope of this study.

The research team, at the planning phase, aimed to document the proportion of patients approached, the proportion of those who consented to be screened and the reason(s) for individual refusal to be screened. However, pharmacists reported that this would be an added work and preferred not to collect such data. The short follow-up period with patients was perhaps inadequate to capture all further diagnostic and management activities as a result of pharmacist-delivered screening. This feasibility study was continued on a larger scale to evaluate the efficacy of pharmacist-delivered screening in identifying participants with high

For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines

diabetes and/or CVD risk in the UAE. Additional future studies should evaluate strategies to establish closer
links between community pharmacy and physicians in primary care, creating structured referral pathways and
emphasis on interprofessional coordination between pharmacists and physicians.

436 Conclusions

9

36

43

53 4**5**9

55 456

58 4**5**9

60

439 It is feasible for community pharmacists to screen and refer individuals for diabetes and CVD risks in the UAE. 11 43g The successful implementation of the screening model in community pharmacy, in terms of identifying at-risk 14 4**39** 16 individuals and advising them to visit their physicians for further evaluation, offers a new platform to increase 448 screening capacity within the primary care setting, and represents a key opportunity for the early detection 19 4**4**0 and intervention to tackle the increasing burden of both diseases. However, pathways for the integration of 21 442 23 the pharmacist-delivered screening service with physicians in primary care are yet to be explored.

Acknowledgment: The authors sincerly thank study participants for their time, and participating pharmacists and pharmacies including Bin Sina Group, Makkah Group, and Al Seha Wal Jamal Group. Special thanks for the field team of brilliant pharmacists: Mr. Ward Saidawi, Ms. Safa Al Awad, Ms. Amna Othman, and Ms. Lujain Aloum for their exceptional efforts in data collection/management and post-implementation support. Authors are grateful for valuable input of Professor Rifat Atun, School of Public Health, Harvrd University.

Funding: This research was supported by two research grants: (1) the research cooperative grant from Center
for Global Health Delivery-Dubai, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University (agreement No. 027562-746845 0302), (2) operational grant from the University of Sharjah.

Author contribution: HA designed the study, supervised data collection process, assisted with data analysis,
wrote, reviewed and edited the entire manuscript. SC and RC analyzed data, reviewed and edited manuscript.
SH wrote parts of manuscript. KM and IK assisted with designing of the study, reviewed the methods and data
analysis contributed to the discussion, and reviewed all drafts.

Competing interests: None declared.

Data sharing statement: All feasibility-related data were reported, additional participants' lifestyle data are

available upon reasonable request.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

458 References

4359 Forouzanfar MH, Afshin A, Alexander LT, Anderson HR, Bhutta ZA, Biryukov S, et al. Global, regional, and 1. 4**6**40 national comparative risk assessment of 79 behavioural, environmental and occupational, and metabolic risks or clusters 4**6**1 of risks, 1990–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. The Lancet. 462 2016;388(10053):1659-724.

463 Unnikrishnan R, Pradeepa R, Joshi SR, Mohan V. Type 2 Diabetes: Demystifying the Global Epidemic. Diabetes. 484 2017;66(6):1432-42.

3. Guariguata L, Whiting DR, Hambleton I, Beagley J, Linnenkamp U, Shaw JE. Global estimates of diabetes prevalence for 2013 and projections for 2035. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2014;103(2):137-49.

465 466 467 468 Ogurtsova K, da Rocha Fernandes JD, Huang Y, Linnenkamp U, Guariguata L, Cho NH, et al. IDF Diabetes Atlas: 4 Global estimates for the prevalence of diabetes for 2015 and 2040. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice. 4694 2017:128:40-50.

470 Roth GA, Johnson C, Abajobir A, Abd-Allah F, Ferede Abera S, Abyu G, et al. Global, Regional, and National 5. 47¢ Burden of Cardiovascular Diseases for 10 Causes, 1990 to 2015. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. May 2017;23715.

Roth GA, Johnson C, Abajobir A, Abd-Allah F, Abera SF, Abyu G, et al. Global, Regional, and National Burden of 6. Cardiovascular Diseases for 10 Causes, 1990 to 2015. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2017;70(1):1-25.

Einarson TR, Acs A, Ludwig C, Panton UH. Prevalence of cardiovascular disease in type 2 diabetes: a systematic 7. literature review of scientific evidence from across the world in 2007-2017. Cardiovascular diabetology. 2018;17(1):83-.

47273 8. Beagley J, Guariguata L, Weil C, Motala AA. Global estimates of undiagnosed diabetes in adults. Diabetes Res 47288 Clin Pract. 2014;103(2):150-60.

479 9. The 10-Year Cost-Effectiveness of Lifestyle Intervention or Metformin for Diabetes Prevention. An intent-to-treat 4**80** analysis of the DPP/DPPOS. 2012;35(4):723-30.

487 483 483 483 484 485 10. Lindström J, Ilanne-Parikka P, Peltonen M, Aunola S, Eriksson JG, Hemiö K, et al. Sustained reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes by lifestyle intervention: follow-up of the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study. The Lancet. 2006;368(9548):1673-9.

11. Siu AL, Force obotUSPST. Screening for Abnormal Blood Glucose and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation StatementScreening for Abnormal Blood Glucose and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. 486 Annals of Internal Medicine. 2015;163(11):861-8.

4874 Abuyassin B, Laher I. Diabetes epidemic sweeping the Arab world. World Journal of Diabetes. 2016;7(8):165-74. 12.

488 13. Badran M, Laher I. Type II diabetes mellitus in Arabic-speaking countries. International Journal of Endocrinology. 2012:Article ID 902873.

489 490 493 493 493 493 493 14. Alzubaidi H, Mc Narmara K, Kilmartin GM, Kilmartin JF, Marriott J. The relationships between illness and treatment perceptions with adherence to diabetes self-care: A comparison between Arabic-speaking migrants and Caucasian English-speaking patients. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice. 2015;110(2):208-17.

493 Alzubaidi H, Mc Namara K, Browning C, Marriott J. Barriers and enablers to healthcare access and use among 15. 49442 Arabic-speaking and Caucasian English-speaking patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a qualitative comparative study. 49**15** BMJ Open. 2015;5(11).

4**90** 16. Alzubaidi H, Mc Mamara K, Chapman C, Stevenson V, Marriott J. Medicine-taking experiences and associated factors: comparison between Arabic-speaking and Caucasian English-speaking patients with Type 2 diabetes. Diabet Med. 2015;32(12):1625-33.

4**9**7 4**98** 4**93** 5**93** 5**93** 5**93** Ayorinde AA, Porteous T, Sharma P. Screening for major diseases in community pharmacies: a systematic 17. review. International Journal of Pharmacy Practice. 2013;21(6):349-61.

18. Willis A, Rivers P, Gray LJ, Davies M, Khunti K. The effectiveness of screening for diabetes and cardiovascular disease risk factors in a community pharmacy setting. PLoS One. 2014;9(4):e91157.

563 19. San-Juan-Rodriguez A, Newman TV, Hernandez I, Swart ECS, Klein-Fedyshin M, Shrank WH, et al. Impact of 5634 community pharmacist-provided preventive services on clinical, utilization, and economic outcomes: An umbrella 5**6**9 review. Preventive Medicine. 2018;115:145-55.

566 20. Namara KPM, Dunbar JA, Philpot B, Marriott JL, Reddy P, Janus ED. Potential of pharmacists to help reduce the 5**6**7 burden of poorly managed cardiovascular risk. Australian Journal of Rural Health. 2012;20(2):67-73.

58 59

60

BMJ Open

508 21. Sulaiman N, Elbadawi S, Hussein A, Abusnana S, Madani A, Mairghani M, et al. Prevalence of overweight and 5Q9 obesity in United Arab Emirates Expatriates: the UAE National Diabetes and Lifestyle Study. Diabetology & Metabolic Syndrome. 2017;9(1):88.

5 <u>5</u>0 5 <u>1</u>1 5 <u>1</u>2 5 <u>1</u>3 Alzubaidi H, Saidawi W, Mc Namara K. Pharmacist views and pharmacy capacity to deliver professional services 22. in the United Arab Emirates. International journal of clinical pharmacy. 2018.

Hasan S, Sulieman H, Chapman C, Stewart K, Kong DCM. Community pharmacy in the United Arab Emirates: 23. 5174 characteristics and workforce issues. International Journal of Pharmacy Practice. 2011;19(6):392-9.

5 B5 Green LW. Toward Cost-Benefit Evaluations of Health Education: Some Concepts, Methods, and Examples. 24. Health Education Monographs. 1974;2(1 suppl):34-64.

5 P6 5 1 9 5 1 8 5 1 8 5 1 9 5 2 8 5 2 8 5 2 8 5 2 8 25. Mc Namaraa K, Krass I, Peterson GM, ALZubaidi H, Grenfell R, Freedman B, et al. Implementing screening interventions in community pharmacy to promote interprofessional coordination of primary care – A mixed methods evaluation. Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy 2019; In Press

McMillan SS, King M, Tully MP. How to use the nominal group and Delphi techniques. International journal of 26. clinical pharmacy. 2016;38(3):655-62.

StataCorp. 2015. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14. College Station TSL. 27.

28. Al Busaidi N, Shanmugam P, Manoharan D. Diabetes in the Middle East: Government Health Care Policies and Strategies that Address the Growing Diabetes Prevalence in the Middle East. Current Diabetes Reports. 2019;19(8).

29. Hasan S, Stewart K, Chapman CB, Kong DCM. Physicians' perspectives of pharmacist-physician collaboration in the United Arab Emirates: Findings from an exploratory study. Journal of Interprofessional Care. 2018;32(5):566-74.

30. Hasan S, Sulieman H, Stewart K, Chapman CB, Kong DC. Patient expectations and willingness to use primary care pharmacy services in the United Arab Emirates. The International journal of pharmacy practice. 2015;23(5):340-8.

Hasan S, Stewart K, Chapman CB, Hasan MY, Kong DCM. Physicians' attitudes towards provision of primary care 31. services in community pharmacy in the United Arab Emirates. The International journal of pharmacy practice. 536 2015;23(4):274-82.

Rezien onz

Table 1: Demographic and health characteristics (N=115)

Characte	ristic	n ((%)
Gender	Female	60	(52.1)
Age(yrs)	Mean ± SD	47.23	±7.3
Nationality	Syria	32	(27.8)
	Egypt	23	(20.0)
	India	11	(9.5)
	Jordan	7	(6.0)
	Pakistan	7	(6.0)
	Other	35	(30.4)
ducation	Not educated	2	(1.7)
	Primary/middle school	15	(13.0)
	High school	37	(36.2)
		50	(43.4)
Aarital status	Married	103	(99.5)
	Single	105	(6.0)
	Divorced	2	(0.5)
	Widowed	1	(0.8)
imployment	Full-time	1 67	(0.0)
	Part_time	6	(03.2)
	Home duties	25	(3.0)
	Other	17	(23.3)
elf-reported health status*	Excellent	2/	(14.7)
	Good	24 //1	(52.0)
	Average	41	(34.0)
umber of visits to a physician in the past year*	Average Moon + SD	2 05	(13.5)
battorns of physician uso	Have a regular physician	3.03 10	(24.1
	Have a regular clinic but often see different	10	(24.0)
	nave a regular clinic but often see unrerent	14	(18.0)
	Visit different physician clinics	20	(28 6)
	Parely or pover visit a physician	29 14	(38.0)
ource of advice to reduce rick of diabetes and	Rarely of never visit a physician	14	(10.0)
CVD rick in the past 12 months (apart from	A physician	15	(17.5)
nharmacy screening visit)*	A physician		
	A distition	1	(1 2)
	A checician		(1.5)
	A specialist physicial	2	(0.7)
	A pharmacist	2	(2.7)
	A family mambar	9	(12.1)
Turningtion of lifestule factors that offert dishets	A family member	/	(9.4)
Examination of mestyle factors that affect diabete	s and CVD risk by a nearth professional during	/	(6.4)
the past 12 months [*]			

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

2 3		Table 2: Pharmacist-documented components of	screening model completed (N=112)
4		Component of screening model	
5		Timing of screening	Immediately following recruitment
0 7			By appointment on same day
, 8			By appointment on another day
9		Number of visits peeded to complete screening	One visit
10		Number of visits needed to complete screening	
11			
12		Assessments and measurements completed	Anthropometric measurements
13			Diabetes risk assessment
14 15			ASCVD risk score calculation
16			Dietary habits assessment
17			Physical activity habits assessment
18		Tests and measurements not completed	Lipid profile
19			HbA1c
20			Waist circumference
21			Blood pressure
22		Reason for not completing test/measurement	Technical error in device
24			Participant objection*
25		Assessment, testing, and measurement duration	Mean duration ± SD (minutes)
26			10 – 20 minutes
27			21 – 30 minutes
28			31 – 40 minutes
29 30			Over 40 minutes
31		Post-assessment counseling	ASCVD risk score interpretation
32			ADA questionnaire score interpretation
33			HbA1c result interpretation**
34			Guideline targets for subontimal blood test results
35			Lifestula habaviars (tan two sovered aspects)
30 37			Dietary behaviors
38			- Dietary benaviors
39			- Physical activity
40			Need for further/confirmatory testing at physician's office
41		Post-assessment counseling duration	Mean duration ± SD (minutes)
42			1 – 10 minutes
43 11			11 – 20 minutes
45			21- 30 minutes
46	50.6		Not reported
47	536	* One participant objected to waist circumference measurement	nt. ** Documentation was missing for 30 participants.
48	537 538		
49	539		
50 51	540		
52	541		
53	542		
54	543		
55	544 545		
56	515		
57 58			
59			
60		For peer review only - http://bmjoper	n.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

n

546	Table 3: Outcomes of at-risk participant	ts' referral (n=37)
	Participants completed uptake of referra	al follow-up
	Participants visited a doctor to discuss p	harmacist-delivered screening results
		Visited doctor straight away
		Made some changes and went to doctor later
		Discussed results at routine visit
	Participants who did not visit a doctor	
		Haven't visited doctor yet but intend to
		Didn't think it was necessary
		Haven't visited doctor yet and made no plans
	Physician knew about pharmacy screening	ng Defermel letter einen te the deeter
		Told doctor about pharmacy screening
		Doctor treated the results of pharmacy screening
	Follow-up tests were undertaken by the	nhysician
	. Show up tests were undertaken by the	Blood pressure
		Total cholesterol
		HDL cholesterol
		Blood sugar level
		Waist
		Weight
		Other
	Lifestyle changes since screening	Increased regular exercise
		Attempted to lose weight
		Improved diet
547		Started new medications
577		
548		
5/10		
550		
551		
552		
553		
554		
555		
556		
557		
558		
559		

BMJ Open

2	-			
3 4	560	Table 4: Parti	cipants' experiences, feedback, and	d satisfaction with screening (n=75)
5		F		
6		Experience and	a reedback on pharmacist-delivered scre	eening Another participant in the project
7		- Perso	n who initiated the conversation	Pharmacist
8		about	screening between participant and	Pharmacist
9		pharm	hacist	
10				
11		Clarit	of above sist's supportion of visit	Social media
12		- Clarity	of pharmacist's explanation of risk	very clear
13		of dev	reloping diabetes and CVD	Clear enough
14				Some parts clear
15		D		Generally unclear
16		- Depth	of pharmacist's exploration of	Very comprehensive
17		possik	ble lifestyle causes of increased	Discussed several issues
18		diabet	tes and CVD risks	Discussed only one issue
19		- Steps	undertaken following screening	
20				The pharmacist provided you with a written report of your results
21				The pharmacist made sure that you understood everything
22				The pharmacist clearly stated when the physician follow up was required
23		- Qualit	ry of the testing carried out in	Excellent
24		pharm	nacy	Above average
25				Average
26				Slightly below average
27		- Percei	ived length of the diabetes and CVD	Much too long
28		risk so	creening process	A little long
29				About right
30				A little short
31		Satisfaction wi	th the pharmacist-delivered screening	
32		- Satisfa	action with health risk assessment	Very satisfied
33				Satisfied
34				Average
35				Dissatisfied
36		- Satisfa	action with the quality of advice	Very satisfied
37		provid	led in the pharmacy	Satisfied
38		-		Average
39				Dissatisfied
40		Willingness to	pay for the future pharmacist-delivered	screening service
41		- Yes		
42		- Accep	table amount to be paid	≤50 AED (≤ USD 13.6*)
43			·	51-100 AED (USD 13.6-27.2*)
44				101-150 AED (USD 27.2-48.8*)
45				>150 AED (> USD 48.8*)
46		- Reaso	ons for unwillingness to pay for future	Cannot afford it
47		nharn	nacist-delivered screening service	Does not think it is worth it
48		pram		Thinks it should be free
49				Other
50	561			
51	501			
52	562	Figure 1: Pha	rmacy Screening Model in the UAE	
53		0	, 6	
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59			F	
60			For peer review only - http://bmjop	ben.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xntml



 BMJ Open

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1 and 3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	5 and 6
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any pre-specified hypotheses	7
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	10
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up Case-control study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls Cross-sectional study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	
		(b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed Case-control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	13
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	11 and 12
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	13
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	13
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	13
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	
		(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	
		Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	

		Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	14
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	15
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	
		(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	
Outcome data	15*	Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
		Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	
		Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	16-18
Main results	16	(<i>a</i>) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	17
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	18
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	18
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	18
Other information	1		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	20

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies. **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.