

Enhanced community care for type 2 diabetes in Ireland: the patient's perspective on attending an integrated care centre

A. Ferris¹, T. Kyaw-Tun², JH. McDermott², S. Sreenan², C. Davenport^{1,2}

- 1. Dublin North West Integrated Care Centre, St Mary's Hospital, Phoenix Park, Dublin 20, Ireland.
- 2. Department of Academic Endocrinology, Connolly Hospital Blanchardstown, Mill Rd., Abbottstown, Dublin 15, Ireland.

Abstract

Background

Chronic diseases, particularly type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), present significant challenges to Ireland's healthcare system. Sláintecare's Enhanced Community Care (ECC) initiative involves the nationwide establishment of integrated care centres (also known as hubs) that facilitate specialist management of T2DM within the community. This study evaluated the experience of people living with Diabetes (PWD) attending the Dublin North West (DNW) hub as part of this novel paradigm of T2DM care.

Methods

Consecutive PWD attending the hub T2DM service completed a standardized questionnaire on various aspects of their T2DM care. The hub operates as a multidisciplinary service designed to provide comprehensive diabetes management. Staff members include diabetes specialist nurses, podiatrists, endocrinologists, and dietitians, ensuring a holistic approach to patient care. The service aims to integrate these specialities to address the diverse challenges associated with T2DM management.

Results

In total, 40 PWD completed the study, of which 35 (87.5%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the care they had received in the hub. Notably, 34 (85%) patients indicated a preference for community-based T2DM management with their general practitioner (GP) in the future (GP alone or their GP with hub support). With regards to opportunities for "making every contact count" (MECC); 17 (42.5%) of patients reported discussions had taken place about smoking cessation, 23 (57.5%) about weight loss,33 (82.5%) about nutrition, 21(52.5%) about alcohol use and 25 (62.5%) about mental health.



Discussion

This is the first study to report on the T2DM patient's experience as part of ECC in Ireland. It is notable that patient preference was for continued follow up of their diabetes within the community as opposed to the hospital, and that additional opportunities for MECC interventions were identified within the community setting.

Introduction

Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM) poses a significant and growing global health challenge¹. According to the International Diabetes Federation (IDF), about 1 in 10 adults aged 20–79 years, totalling 537 million people worldwide, are living with diabetes². This trend is mirrored in Ireland, where longer lifespans and a rise in chronic diseases are increasing the demand for integrated, community-based healthcare solutions. There is limited information available regarding the population prevalence of diagnosed and undiagnosed type 2 diabetes and pre-diabetes in the Republic of Ireland in the absence of a diabetes register. In 2022, Ireland's population was 5,149,139³. With an estimated diabetes prevalence of 6%, approximately 308,000 people in Ireland are living with diabetes. The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing (TILDA) reveals that nearly 75% of adults aged 58 years and older suffer from multiple chronic conditions⁴ highlighting the substantial burden on the healthcare system. This increasing burden significantly impacts individual health and the healthcare system, with chronic conditions accounting for 76% of annual deaths and contributing to 40% of hospital admissions and 75% of hospital bed days in Ireland⁵.

In response to these challenges, Ireland introduced Sláintecare, a 10-year plan designed to realign the healthcare system to better meet population needs through integrated, community-based services⁶. A key component of this reform is the Enhanced Community Care (ECC) programme, which encompasses several initiatives, including Chronic Disease Management (CDM) led by GPs and the establishment of specialist hubs. These hubs support GPs in managing chronic conditions such as T2DM, asthma, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD), and cardiovascular disease, while also relieving pressure on the hospital system⁷. Community-based multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) within these hubs provide a range of services including diagnostics, rehabilitation, and self-management support, with the goal of reducing hospitalizations and improving care coordination⁸.

Within this context, the Dublin North West (DNW) hub, "Cuan Aoibheann," launched in October 2022, was the first fully operational community hub in Ireland, with consultant-led cardiology, respiratory and diabetes services accepting referrals from a catchment area of



150,000 people within the Blanchardstown, Finglas, and Blakestown community health networks (CHNs).

As ECC represents a novel paradigm of T2DM care in Ireland, to date there has been limited research exploring outcomes for people attending these new community-based specialist T2DM teams, in particular from the perspective of the patients themselves. The latter is of particular importance as person-centred care and patient-reported outcome measures are vital for the delivery of a high standard of chronic disease care. It was with this in mind that the present study was designed with the primary goal of characterising the experience of PWD's attending the community-based specialist team for this first time.

Methods

This study aimed to gather patient perspectives on diabetes care within the community by recruiting participants aged 18 and older with a formal diagnosis of T2DM from the diabetes MDT clinic at the DNW hub. Individuals with Type 1 diabetes, gestational diabetes, severe cognitive or psychiatric conditions, or with limited proficiency in English were excluded. Recruitment took place after clinic visits, where eligible patients were approached by the primary researcher and invited to participate in the study.

This was a pilot study and a sample size of 40 consecutive PWD was chosen based on activity levels for new patients within the hub. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed based on the Chronic Care Model Elements Survey⁹, incorporating validated tools such as the Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care Survey¹⁰ and the HSE Patient Experience Survey¹¹. For transparency and to facilitate future research, the complete questionnaire is provided in a supplementary table (Appendix 1). The questionnaire also examined patient experiences with 'Making Every Contact Count' (MECC). MECC is a public health framework that integrates brief, evidence-based interventions into routine healthcare interactions to encourage healthier lifestyles, addressing key risk factors such as diet, physical activity, and smoking. It is particularly relevant in managing chronic conditions like T2DM. Frequency distributions, percentages, means, and medians were calculated for categorical and continuous variables. Cross-tabulations and chi-square tests explored relationships between key variables, such as ease of access and overall satisfaction.

The study protocol was approved by the University of Galway Ethics Committee. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, who were assured of the confidentiality of their responses and their right to withdraw from the study at any time without affecting their care.



Results

In total, 40 PWD completed the study, with a slight majority being male (55%) and a mean age of 60.2 (±10.1) years. The study cohort displayed a multicultural composition, with 30% of participants coming from countries outside of Ireland, including China (10%), Nigeria (5%), and 15% from seven additional countries. The majority of respondents reported holding a Medical Card (50.0%), followed by those with a GP Visit Card (22.5%).

Self-reported satisfaction with the care PWD received for their T2DM was high, with 70% of respondents replying 'very satisfied' and 27.5% 'satisfied. Regarding future care preferences, the majority (85%) of patients expressed a preference for the future care of their T2DM to be located within the community (Table 1).

Table 1:	Participant	preferences	for location	of future	diabetes care
----------	-------------	-------------	--------------	-----------	---------------

Future T2DM Care	Frequency	Percent
GP Only	6	15.0
GP with access to a community specialist hub	28	70.0
Diabetes Clinics in the Hospital	6	15.0
Total	40	100.0

Cleanliness of the hub was rated positively, with 82.5% of patients describing it as excellent. As community-based care involves patients travelling to new locations for their healthcare we also explored the patient perspective with regards to accessing the hub. In total, access to the DNW hub was generally reported as easy or very easy by 80% of patients.

Interestingly, a chi-square test indicated no significant association between ease of access to the hub and overall patient satisfaction, with a Pearson Chi-Square value of 6.672 and a p-value of 0.352. A further correlation analysis revealed no significant relationship between wait times in the hub on the day of appointment and overall satisfaction, as evidenced by a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.190 and a p-value of 0.241.

In terms of opportunistic interventions around other aspects of healthcare as part of the MECC initiative, patients reported variable rates of discussions around the topics of mental health, smoking, weight management, physical activity, illicit drug use and alcohol consumption (Table 2). Patients answered 'not applicable' if they felt the topic was not relevant to them. Within this context the most frequently discussed topic was nutritional health (82.5%) and the least frequently discussed topic was illicit drug use (37.5%)



Topics Discussed	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Applicable
			(%)
Mental Health	62.5	20	17.5
Smoking	42.5	7.5	50
Drug Use	37.5	2.5	60
Losing Weight	57.5	7.5	35
Nutrition	82.5	2.5	15
Physical Activity	87.5	2.5	10
Alcohol	52.5	5	42.5

Finally, with regards to the involvement of patients in their own care 82.5% of respondents indicated that they had been involved in their T2DM care planning, 92.5% had been asked about their treatment goals and 55% of patients reported received a copy of their treatment plan.

Discussion

The findings from this study provide the first insights into community-based T2DM care in Ireland, as delivered by the specialist team within the integrated care centre and as part of ECC. The primary research question focused on understanding patient satisfaction and involvement in diabetes care at the DNW hub. The results reveal a high level of satisfaction, and while the sample size is limited and from a single centre only, these findings suggest that T2DM care in the hub appears to be well-received by patients. Of potentially greater importance however, is the finding that 85% of respondents, having experienced T2DM care in the community hub, expressed a preference for continued management of their T2DM within the community as opposed to the hospital. While these findings are novel for ECC and Ireland, it is notable that they do align with some of the broader literature on CDM. The 2015 report on CDM in Ireland, highlighted a general preference among stakeholders (which included patient advocacy groups but not individual patients) for integrating chronic disease management within primary care¹². We submit that the alignment of our patient-reported findings with the 2015 report further supports the current direction of T2DM management as part of Sláintecare.

An additional key finding of the present study is that 82.5% of patients were asked for their ideas and 92.5% were asked about their goals during consultations. This is in keeping with the



principles of person-centred care and the involvement of the patient as the key stakeholder in their own healthcare¹³.Our findings contrast with previous research indicating that patient involvement in healthcare decisions in this manner is typically limited¹², and our research does not indicate whether our findings were unique to our centre or indicative of a broader change in practice in this regard.

With regards to opportunistic healthcare interventions, this study also assessed the implementation of the 'Making Every Contact Count' (MECC) initiative from the perspective of the patient. While subjects reported that certain aspects of MECC had been discussed with relatively high frequency (particularly smoking and alcohol use), our results also indicated room for improvement in discussion around mental health and drug use. This suggests a need for a broader and more consistent application of MECC principles, particularly regarding mental health. Future research could also focus on integrating mental health discussions into routine diabetes care to enhance the overall effectiveness of MECC and support patient health and well-being.

Several methodological limitations should be acknowledged. Potential sampling bias may have resulted in an overrepresentation of more engaged or satisfied patients. Self-reported data introduces biases such as recall and social desirability bias, and the cross-sectional design limits the ability to infer causality. PWD who experienced difficulties accessing the hub, for example, may have been less likely to participate, leading to a potential underrepresentation. The study's setting within a single specialized ambulatory centre may limit the generalizability of the findings to other contexts. Non-response bias and ethical constraints also impacted the study, limiting the depth of insights into sensitive issues.

Although detailed demographics on diabetes indices, such as HbA1c levels, were not collected in this study, their inclusion in future research would add valuable insights into the complexity and clinical profiles of individuals attending the service.

To conclude, the present study demonstrates high levels of patient satisfaction with diabetes care at the DNW hub, along with a stated preference for T2DM in the community in the future. These findings therefore can be seen to be in support of ECC for T2DM as it is currently being implemented. Future research should explore the community-based patient experience over longer periods, with larger sample size and incorporate direct comparisons across multiple hubs. Robust evidence will help refine clinical practices and contribute to the development of more effective, patient-focused healthcare strategies at both national and local level as novel models of chronic disease care continue to be implemented across Ireland.

Declarations of Conflicts of Interest:

None declared.



Corresponding author:

Angela Ferris, Dublin North West Integrated Care Centre, St Mary's Hospital, Phoenix Park, Dublin 20, Ireland. **E-Mail:** angieferris@gmail.com

References:

- Hossain MJ, Al-Mamun M, Islam MR. Diabetes mellitus, the fastest growing global public health concern: Early detection should be focused. Health Science Reports. 2024;7(3). doi: 10.1002/hsr2.2004.
- Sun H, Saeedi P, Karuranga S, Pinkepank M, Ogurtsova K, Duncan BB, Stein C, Basit A, Chan JCN, Mbanya JC, Pavkov ME, Ramachandaran A, Wild SH, James S, Herman WH, Zhang P, Bommer C, Kuo S, Boyko EJ, Magliano DJ. IDF Diabetes Atlas: Global, regional and countrylevel diabetes prevalence estimates for 2021 and projections for 2045. Diabetes Research and Clinical Practice. 2022;183:109-119. doi: 10.1016/j.diabres.2021.109119.
- Central Statistics Office. Press statement: Census of Population 2022 Summary results <u>https://www.cso.ie/en/csolatestnews/pressreleases/2023pressreleases/pressstat</u> <u>ementcensusofpopulation2022-</u> <u>summaryresults/#:~:text=Census%202022%20shows%20that%20Ireland's,8%25%20incr</u> <u>ease%20since%20April%202016</u> [Accessed 29 November 2024].
- Apte, S, Doody, P, Hernández, B., Hever, A, Kenny, R, Wang, M, Ward, M. Almost threequarters of Irish adults aged 58 and over have two or more medical conditions <u>https://tilda.tcd.ie/news-events/2020/2037-w5report-eve-covid19pandemic/</u> [Accessed 2nd February 2024].
- 5. Department of Health Committee on the Future of Healthcare. Sláintecare report. Dublin: Houses of the Oireachtas; 2017.
- 6. Burke S, Barry S, Siersbaek R, Johnston B, Ni Fhalluin M, Thomas S. Slaintecare A ten-year plan to achieve universal healthcare in Ireland. Health Policy. 2018;122(12):1278-82. doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2018.05.006.
- Health Services Executive. Chronic disease Management Programme <u>https://www.hse.ie/eng/about/who/gmscontracts/2019agreement/chronic-disease-</u> <u>management-programme/</u> [Accessed 4th June 2024].



- 8. Health Service Executive. The Chronic Disease Integrated Care Programme 10 Step Guide. <u>https://www.hse.ie/eng/about/who/cspd/icp/chronic-disease/documents/the-chronic-disease-integrated-care-programme-10-step-guide.pdf</u> [Accessed 3rd February 2024].
- 9. Nutting, P. A., Dickinson, W. P., Dickinson, L. M., Nelson, C. C., King, D. K., Crabtree, B. F., & Glasgow, R. E. (2007). Use of chronic care model elements is associated with higher-quality care for diabetes. Annals of family medicine, 5(1), 14–20. doi: <u>10.1370/afm.610</u>.
- 10. Glasgow RE, Wagner EH, Schaefer J, Mahoney LD, Reid RJ, Greene SM. Development and validation of the patient assessment of chronic illness care (PACIC). Medical care. doi: <u>1;43(5):436-44.</u>
- Health Service Executive. Patient experience Survey. https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/list/2/primarycare/patient-experiencesurvey/ [Accessed 3rd February 2024].
- 12. Darker C, Whiston L, O'Shea B. Chronic disease management in Ireland: Perspectives from patients and clinical stakeholders–Implications and recommendations for the Irish healthcare system. Trinity College, Dublin, 2015.
- 13. Epstein, R. M., & Street, R. L., Jr (2011). The values and value of patient-centered care. *Annals of family medicine*, *9*(2), 100–103. doi: 10.1370/afm.1239.

Section	Question	Response Options
Your Details	What is your age?	years old
	What is your gender?	🗆 Female 🗆 Male 🗆 Other
	Do you have any of the following?	Medical Card GP Visit Card Long
	(tick all that apply)	Term Illness Card 🗆 None
	What is your country of origin?	🗆 Ireland 🗆 Poland 🗆 United Kingdom
		🗆 India 🗆 Romania 🗆 Other
	If Other, which country?	
	Who has helped you care for your	🗆 GP 🗆 Hospital Diabetes Service 🗆
	diabetes before now? (tick all that	Other (specify):
	apply)	
Access to	How would you describe the ease	🗆 Very easy 🗆 Easy 🗆 Difficult 🗆 Very
Service	of getting to the hub?	difficult
	Once you were at the hub, how	🗆 Very easy 🗆 Easy 🗆 Difficult 🗆 Very
	easy was it to navigate the	difficult
	building during your visit?	
	On a scale from 1 to 5, how would	
	you rate the overall cleanliness of	
	the building and facilities?	

Appendices: *Appendix 1 - Questionnaire*



	How long, in total, did you spend	\Box Less than 15 mins \Box 15–30 mins \Box
	waiting to interact with healthcare	31–45 mins □ Over 45 mins
	professionals today?	
	Did healthcare professionals wash	🗆 Yes 🗆 No 🗆 No contact 🗆 Can't recall
	or clean their hands before	
	contact?	
	Did healthcare professionals	□ Yes □ No □ Already known
	introduce themselves to you?	
	Were you treated with kindness	□ Yes □ No
	and respect during your visit?	
	Were you satisfied with the level of	□ Yes □ No
	privacy provided during your	
	appointment?	
	Was the advice and information	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	provided by healthcare	
	professionals easy to understand?	
Cuer		
Cuan	Which professionals did you see	Clinical Nurse Specialist Dietitian
Aoibheann	today?	Podiatrist 🗆 Endocrinologist
Service		
	Do you feel you know more about	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	managing your diabetes after	
	today's visit?	
	How important is knowledge	🗆 Not important 🗆 A little important 🗆
	about your condition for	Important 🗆 Very important 🗆
	managing your diabetes?	Extremely important
	After today's visit, do you feel your	□ Not controlled □ Moderately
		,
	blood glucose levels are well-	controlled 🗆 Well controlled
	controlled?	
	How satisfied are you with the	🗆 Not at all satisfied 🗆 Somewhat
	care you received today?	satisfied 🗆 Satisfied 🗆 Very satisfied
Care Plan	For each question, tick the	Yes / No / Not Applicable
Evaluation	appropriate box:	
	- I was asked for my ideas when	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	making a treatment plan.	
	- I was given choices about	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	treatment to think about.	
	- I was asked to talk about	Vac - No - Not applicable
		□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	problems with my medicines or	
	their effects.	
	- I was satisfied that my care was	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	well-organized.	
	- I was asked to discuss my goals	Yes I No I Not applicable
	for managing my condition.	
	- I was given a copy of my	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	treatment plan.	. ,
<u> </u>		



- I was encouraged to attend a	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
- Quitting smoking	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
- Losing weight	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
- Nutrition and healthy eating	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
- Physical activity	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
- Alcohol use	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
- Mental health and wellbeing	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
- Drug use	□ Yes □ No □ Not applicable
Where should your diabetes be	\square GP only \square GP with access to a
managed in the future?	community specialist hub 🗆 Diabetes
	Clinics in the hospital
Additional Comments:	
	group/class to help me cope with diabetes. - My values, beliefs, and traditions were considered when treatments were recommended. - I was helped to plan ahead for difficult times in managing my condition. - I was asked how diabetes affects my life. - I was provided with a follow-up plan for my future care. Did you receive advice or information today about: - Quitting smoking - Losing weight - Nutrition and healthy eating - Physical activity - Alcohol use - Mental health and wellbeing - Drug use Where should your diabetes be managed in the future?