

Letter

DOI: 10.1111/dme.13934

Comment on the consensus report on the management of hyperglycaemia in Type 2 diabetes by the American Diabetes Association and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes

Diabet. Med. 36: 911–912 (2019)

We read with interest the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD) joint consensus report on the management of hyperglycaemia in Type 2 diabetes [1]. Following publication of the report, discussions of the content among networks of behavioural and educational researchers prompted us to write this letter.

This consensus report is to be commended for recommending that ‘providers and health care systems should prioritize the delivery of patient-centered care’. The report is also to be commended for providing some clear actions that can be taken to promote person-centred care, including emphasizing the importance of diabetes self-management education and support, promoting shared decision-making between the person with diabetes and the healthcare professional, and pointing to some methods that may be beneficial in achieving this. At the same time, we also appreciate that there are challenges in implementing a person-centred approach and we would like to highlight and comment on some of the challenges we see in the Consensus Report.

The first is that the report uses the term ‘adherence’ throughout, making the recommendation that ‘Facilitating medication adherence should be specifically considered when selecting glucose-lowering medications’. Whilst we agree that it is important to discuss the issues surrounding an individual’s willingness and ability to take any prescribed medications, we suggest that the word ‘adherence’ is used ill-advisedly in the report. A recent series of position statements from Diabetes Australia [2], jointly by the ADA and American Association of Diabetes Educators [3] and jointly by Diabetes UK and the UK’s National Health Service [4], have pointed to the negative consequences of using the terms ‘adherence’ and ‘compliance’, when talking with or about people living with diabetes. These position statements echo earlier commentaries that argue that compliance and adherence are dysfunctional concepts, and empirical work demonstrating that the assumptions underpinning these words are not substantiated [5]. The continued use of the term ‘adherence’, which implies an unequal relationship in which people with diabetes passively follow clinicians’ instructions,

is at best unhelpful. The fact that diabetes care is largely stuck in this ‘adherence’ paradigm may explain why a series of Cochrane reviews on interventions to promote adherence have repeatedly concluded that ‘Current methods of improving medication adherence for chronic health problems are mostly complex and not very effective’ [6], and argued that the problem needs to be reconceptualized. This can be done readily by active adoption of ‘strengths-based, empowering language’ [3] and of other recommendations in the above-mentioned position statements [2–4] to facilitate active engagement in self-care, health and well-being.

We are also concerned with the statement that ‘effective consultations include motivational interviewing’. ‘Motivational interviewing’ is a specific set of intervention strategies and techniques requiring extensive training and significant time to deliver. Consequently, it is not possible for most health professionals to include ‘motivational interviewing’ in routine clinical and education practice. Furthermore, recommendations for integrating a specific set of tools and techniques into clinical practice require a high-quality evidence base; however, this does not exist for motivational interviewing in diabetes or chronic disease care [7]. Whilst meta-analyses indicate a possible small benefit of such interventions, this is conflated with the additional time investment. We suggest that the emphasis needs to be placed not on specific methods but on the principles underpinning ‘motivational interviewing’, common to many effective psycho-educational interventions and essential to effective diabetes care. These principles move the clinician away from an ‘adherence’ paradigm, to focus not on persuading the person with diabetes to take a certain medication, but rather to raise awareness of the individual’s choices and enable agreement about which management option best fits the individual’s needs, goals, values and preferences.

As part of the goal to individualize care, the Consensus Report also provides guidance on the assessment of ‘key patient characteristics’; specifically, recommending assessment of ‘issues such as motivation and depression’. This seems at odds with ADA’s 2016 position statement on the psychosocial care of people with diabetes, which recommends considering an ‘assessment of symptoms of diabetes distress, depression, anxiety, and disordered eating and of cognitive capacities’ [8], and the ADA’s 2019 standards of diabetes care [9]. Thus, we are surprised that this joint consensus report does not specifically recommend assessment of diabetes distress, especially given a recent meta-analysis, which indicates that about one-third of individuals with Type 2 diabetes experience clinically significant levels of diabetes distress [10]. We are also surprised that the report recommends the assessment of ‘motivation’, given that this

term is vague, often used inappropriately, and is not easily assessed. We acknowledge that achieving a paradigm shift takes time, and requires persistent, consistent and insistent advocacy. However, it is disappointing that this joint Consensus Report does not appear to be implementing the recent recommendations of the ADA, and other international bodies, to incorporate strengths-based language and related strategies, with the aim of enabling widespread promotion of truly *person-centred* diabetes care. We would therefore like to recommend that future similar endeavours (consensus reports, guidelines, position statements) include representation of a broader range of disciplines and relevant associations and study groups, e.g. the American Association of Diabetes Educators (AADE), the Psycho-Social Aspects of Diabetes Study (PSAD) group of the EASD, and the US-based Behavioral Research In Diabetes Group Exchange (BRIDGE).

Funding sources








None

Competing interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in this letter reflect those of the authors and not of their institutional affiliations.

T. Skinner^{1,2} , M. Byrne³, J. K. Dickinson⁴, L. Fisher⁵ , M. Funnell⁶, S. Guzman⁷, C. Hendrieckx^{8,9}, N. Hermanns¹⁰ , K. Kanc¹¹, C. Lloyd¹² , A. Mocan¹³, A. Nouwen¹⁴ , F. Pouwer¹⁵, N. Saleh-Statinn¹⁶, F. Snoek¹⁷, J. Speight^{8,9} , J. Sturt¹⁸, M. Vallis¹⁹ , J. Wagner²⁰, I. Willaing², D. Young-Hyman²¹ and V. Zoffmann¹

¹University of Copenhagen, ²Steno Diabetes Centre Copenhagen, Denmark, ³School of Psychology, National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland, ⁴Diabetes Education and Management, Teachers College Columbia University, New York, NY, ⁵Family and Community Medicine, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, LA, ⁶University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, MI, ⁷Behavioural Diabetes Institute, San Diego, CA, USA, ⁸Australian Centre for Behavioural Research in Diabetes, Melbourne, Victoria,

Australia, ⁹Deakin University, Australia, ¹⁰Jazindiabetes, (Diabetes & Me), Slovenia, ¹¹Forschungsinstitut Diabetes-Akademie, Bad Mergentheim, Germany, ¹²Open University, Milton Keynes, UK, ¹³Emergency Clinical County Hospital, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, ¹⁴Middlesex University, London, UK, ¹⁵University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark, ¹⁶Academic Primary Health Care Centre, Stockholm, Sweden, ¹⁷Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, Netherlands, ¹⁸Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery, Kings College London, London, UK, ¹⁹Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada, ²⁰Behavioral Sciences and Community Health, University of Connecticut Health Center, Farmington, CT, and ²¹National Institute of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

References

- Davies MJ, D'Alessio DA, Fradkin J, Kernan WN, Mathieu C, Mingrone G *et al.* Management of Hyperglycemia in Type 2 Diabetes, 2018. A Consensus Report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2018; **41**:2669–2701.
- Speight J, Conn J, Dunning T, Skinner TC; on behalf of Diabetes Australia. A new language for diabetes: improving communications with and about people with diabetes. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2012; **97**: 425–431.
- Dickinson JK, Guzman SJ, Maryniuk MD, O'Brian CA, Kadohiro JK, Jackson RA *et al.* The Use of Language in Diabetes Care and Education. *Diabetes Care* 2017; **40**: 1790–1799.
- Cooper A, Kanumilli N, Hill J, Holt RIG, Howarth D, Lloyd CE *et al.* Language matters. Addressing the use of language in the care of people with diabetes: position statement of the English Advisory Group. *Diabet Med* 2018; **35**:1630–1634.
- Glasgow RE, Anderson RM. In diabetes care, moving from compliance to adherence is not enough. Something entirely different is needed. *Diabetes Care* 1999; **22**:2090–2092.
- Nieuwlaat R, Wilczynski N, Navarro T, Hobson N, Jeffery R, Keenanasseril A *et al.* Interventions for enhancing medication adherence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; **(11)**:CD000011.
- Frost H, Campbell P, Maxwell M, O'Carroll RE, Dombrowski SU, Williams B *et al.* Effectiveness of Motivational Interviewing on Adult Behaviour Change in Health and Social Care Settings: A Systematic Review of Reviews. *PLoS One* 2018; **13**: e0204890.
- Young-Hyman D, de Groot M, Hill-Briggs F, Gonzalez JS, Hood K, Peyrot M. Psychosocial Care for People With Diabetes: A Position Statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2016; **39**: 2126–2140.
- Lifestyle Management: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes-2019*. American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2019; **42** (Suppl. 1):S46–S60.
- Perrin NE, Davies MJ, Robertson N, Snoek FJ, Khunti K. The Prevalence of Diabetes-specific Emotional Distress in People with Type 2 diabetes: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Diabet Med* 2017; **34**: 1508–1520.