



## City Research Online

### City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Coxon, A., McBain, H. B., Pavlova, N., Rowlands, H. & Mulligan, K. (2020). Are diabetes self-management programmes for the general diabetes population effective for people with severe mental illness?: a systematic review.. *BMC Psychiatry*, 20, 386. doi: 10.1186/s12888-020-02779-7

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/24433/>

**Link to published version:** <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02779-7>

**Copyright:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

**Reuse:** Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

---

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

[publications@city.ac.uk](mailto:publications@city.ac.uk)

---

1 **Are diabetes self-management programmes for the general diabetes population effective**  
2 **for people with severe mental illness?: a systematic review.**

3

4

5 Anne Coxon, MSc; Centre for Health Services Research, School of Health Sciences, City,  
6 University of London, Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, UK [anne.coxon.2@city.ac.uk](mailto:anne.coxon.2@city.ac.uk)

7

8 Dr Hayley McBain, PhD, CPsychol, Centre for Health Services Research, School of Health  
9 Sciences, City University of London, Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, UK;

10 [Hayley.mcbain.1@city.ac.uk](mailto:Hayley.mcbain.1@city.ac.uk)

11

12 Neli Pavlova, MSc; Centre for Health Services Research, School of Health Sciences, City,  
13 University of London, Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, UK

14

15 Hannah Rowlands, MSc; Centre for Health Services Research, School of Health Sciences, City,  
16 University of London, Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, UK

17

18 Dr Kathleen Mulligan, PhD, CPsychol; Centre for Health Services Research, School of Health  
19 Sciences, City, University of London, Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, UK;

20 Community Health Newham, East London NHS Foundation Trust, Trust Headquarters, 9

21 Alie Street, London E1 8DE, UK; [kathleen.mulligan.1@city.ac.uk](mailto:kathleen.mulligan.1@city.ac.uk)

22

23 **Corresponding Author:** Dr Kathleen Mulligan

24

25

26

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Diabetes self-management education programmes are effective in improving  
3 health outcomes in the general population with diabetes. However, it is not known if these  
4 programmes include people who also have a severe mental illness (SMI) and, if so, what their  
5 outcomes are. The aim of this review was to examine if evaluations of diabetes self-  
6 management education programmes included people with SMI, and if so, whether the  
7 interventions were beneficial for this population.

8 **Methods:** The inclusion criteria for this systematic review, defined by PICOS criteria, were:  
9 Population - Adults with type 2 diabetes; Intervention - self-management education  
10 programme; Comparator – another active intervention or usual care; Outcomes of interest –  
11 inclusion of people with SMI and the clinical, behavioural and psychosocial outcomes in this  
12 population; Study design - randomised controlled trials.

13 The following bibliographic databases were searched from January 2004 to April 2018:  
14 Cochrane Library, Medline, Embase, PsychINFO, Allied and Complimentary Medicine  
15 Database, Health Technology Assessment, NHS Economic Evaluations Database and CINAHL.  
16 Data were extracted on study characteristics, inclusion and exclusion criteria, participant and  
17 intervention characteristics, number of participants with SMI, and outcomes for people with  
18 SMI, if reported. Authors were contacted by email for missing data.

19 **Results:** A total of 410 trials were included. At least 42% of trials did not recruit any  
20 participants with SMI. Only nine confirmed inclusion of participants with SMI, of which six  
21 provided data on the number recruited. These six trials recruited a total of 1009 participants,  
22 of whom 31 (3.1%) had SMI. It was not possible to assess intervention effectiveness for people  
23 with SMI as none of the trials reported outcomes for these participants.

24 **Conclusions:** This systematic review confirms that people with SMI are often excluded from  
25 trials of diabetes self-management education, resulting in a lack of an evidence base on which  
26 to base treatment paths for this vulnerable population. It cannot be assumed that

1 programmes developed for the general diabetes population meet the needs of people with  
2 SMI. Future research needs to examine if and how these programmes could be adapted for  
3 people with SMI or if new programmes are required.

4 **Key words:** Diabetes self-management education, DSME, Severe mental illness, SMI, Type 2  
5 diabetes.

6 346 words

7

8

9

## 1 **Background**

2 The estimated prevalence of diabetes mellitus in people with psychosis is 13%, which is  
3 between two and five times higher than the general population [1]. Several factors are  
4 thought to contribute to this increased risk, including the effects of anti-psychotic  
5 medications, pathophysiology of SMI and lifestyle factors such as poor diet, obesity and  
6 physical inactivity [2]. Among people with diabetes mellitus, the risk of acute complications  
7 and mortality is also greater in those with SMI [3, 4].

8  
9 Self-management of type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is complex, and to achieve this  
10 successfully, diabetes clinical guidelines [5-9] recommend structured education for all  
11 patients. A number of systematic reviews have reported the positive effects of diabetes self-  
12 management education (DSME) programmes [10-12], such as better glycaemic control,  
13 greater diabetes knowledge and self-management skills, and higher self-efficacy, but it is  
14 unclear if people with SMI also experience these benefits. A recent Cochrane review of  
15 DSME specifically for people with SMI [12], conducted by members of the current  
16 authorship team, identified only one intervention [13], Diabetes Awareness and  
17 Rehabilitation Training (DART), which was evaluated in 64 people aged over 40 with T2DM  
18 and either schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder. DART used adapted materials and  
19 reinforced behaviour change, to help overcome impaired motivation and insight. At the end  
20 of the 24-week trial, the DART group experienced a greater reduction in weight, body mass  
21 index (BMI), waist circumference and plasma triglycerides than controls, and had  
22 significantly increased their diabetes knowledge, diabetes self-efficacy and self-reported  
23 physical activity. The effects on participants' BMI, waist circumference and diabetes  
24 knowledge were maintained at 6-month follow-up [14]. There were however no statistically  
25 significant changes in fasting glucose or glycosylated haemoglobin (HbA1c) levels. This study  
26 indicates that where interventions are developed to address the particular needs of people

1 with SMI and T2DM, positive lifestyle changes can be achieved. The DART programme has  
2 since been combined with the Life Goals Program [15] (an intervention that focuses on  
3 mental health but not diabetes) to form the Targeted Training in Illness Management (TTIM)  
4 intervention, which has been tested in an RCT with 200 individuals with SMI and type 2  
5 diabetes [16]. This 12-week group programme resulted in significantly better mental health  
6 and diabetes knowledge in the intervention group but no group differences were found in  
7 diabetes self-management behaviour or HbA1c.

8

9 Given that neither intervention [13, 16] achieved a change in HbA1c, this suggests a need for  
10 further research to identify how best to optimise diabetes self-management for people with  
11 SMI to improve clinical as well as behavioural outcomes. The sparsity of evidence from SMI-  
12 specific DSME highlights that it is important to try to determine whether evidence of efficacy  
13 of DSME developed for the general diabetes population is also applicable to people with SMI.  
14 A recent rapid synthesis of the evidence on interventions supporting self-management [17]  
15 identified 179 unique randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of DSME in the general diabetes  
16 population. This plethora of data may provide insight into whether and how DSME  
17 programmes for the general population have been implemented for people with SMI, and if  
18 they have been successful.

19

20 This systematic review therefore sought to answer the question: Are DSME programmes for  
21 the general diabetes population effective for people with SMI?

22

23 **Method**

24 Inclusion criteria, defined by Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome, and Study  
25 design (PICOS) [18] were:

26

1 **Population** - Adults aged 18 or over and diagnosed with T2DM.

2 **Intervention** - Interventions that were targeted to improve the self-management of T2DM

3 by providing structured education. This could include interventions that targeted diabetes

4 self-management behaviours such as self-monitoring of blood glucose, medication

5 adherence, foot care, diet or physical activity. Although self-management of SMI could be

6 included, interventions that focused solely on the management of SMI without any diabetes

7 education were excluded. Interventions could be delivered individually or in groups, in

8 person or remotely e.g. telephone or online.

9 **Comparator** – comparators were either another active intervention or usual care.

10 **Outcomes** – outcomes of interest were: inclusion of people with SMI (defined as psychosis,

11 schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, bipolar disorder, depression with psychotic features

12 or personality disorder); number (%) of participants with SMI; plus clinical (HbA1c, body

13 mass index, weight, blood pressure), behavioural (diabetes self-care behaviours such as

14 blood glucose monitoring, medication adherence, diet and physical activity), and

15 psychosocial (health-related quality of life, diabetes knowledge, self-efficacy) outcomes for

16 participants with SMI.

17 **Study design** - RCTs

18 Publications were excluded if they:

19 - included only participants with type 1 diabetes or gestational diabetes

20 - were written in languages other than English

21 - were published as conference abstracts, editorials, or letters

22 - had not undergone formal peer review.

23 Trials that recruited *only* people with T2DM and SMI were also excluded as the recent

24 Cochrane review [12] had already reviewed these.

25



1 Search strategy: A systematic literature search was undertaken in the following databases:  
2 Cochrane Library, Medline, Embase, PsychINFO, Allied and Complimentary Medicine  
3 Database, Health Technology Assessment, NHS Economic Evaluations Database and CINAHL  
4 from January 2004 to April 2018. The search included terms for diabetes, patient  
5 education/self-management and RCTs. The full list of terms is reported in Additional file 1.

6  
7 Study selection: Retrieved articles were imported into Reference Manager bibliographic  
8 software version 12 and duplicates removed. Titles and abstracts were independently  
9 screened against inclusion criteria by two reviewers (two of AC, KM, HR, NP, RS). Full texts of  
10 the remaining articles were then obtained and independently screened for inclusion by two  
11 reviewers (two of AC, KM, HR, NP, RS). Any disagreements were discussed with a third  
12 reviewer (KM or HM).

13  
14 Data were extracted by three of the review team (AC, NP, HR) using an adapted Cochrane  
15 data extraction form [19], which included information on study characteristics, inclusion and  
16 exclusion criteria, participant characteristics, intervention characteristics, number included  
17 with SMI, and outcomes for people with SMI, if reported. If the article did not report this  
18 information on SMI, authors were contacted by email for missing data.

19 Risk of bias in those trials that reported outcomes for people with SMI was independently  
20 assessed by two authors (KM and HM) using the Cochrane Collaboration tool [20]. Trials  
21 were rated as low, high or unclear risk of bias across seven criteria: sequence generation;  
22 allocation concealment; blinding of participants or personnel; blinding of outcome assessors;  
23 incomplete outcome data; selective reporting and other bias. Any disagreements were  
24 discussed to achieve consensus. Potential publication bias was assessed by creating a funnel  
25 plot of effect estimates against their standard errors for the outcome of Hba1c and  
26 conducting Egger's test for asymmetry of the funnel plot.

1

2 Data analysis: Descriptive statistics were used to calculate the proportion of trials that  
3 included participants with SMI. Where trials reported outcomes for participants with SMI,  
4 we planned to assess treatment effects using a random-effects meta-analysis.

5

6

## 7 **Results**

8 From an initial 52265 titles, 885 full texts were assessed for eligibility. A total of 410 RCTs,  
9 conducted in 53 different countries, were included in the review. (See PRISMA flowchart  
10 shown in Figure 1). Studies conducted in the USA dominated (n=134, 33%), followed by the  
11 UK (32, 8%), Iran (23, 5.6%) and China (20, 4.9%). Six trials (1.5%) were multinational.

12

13 Results for recruitment of people with SMI are reported in Table 1 and Additional file 2. Of  
14 410 included trials, 110 (26.8%) listed SMI in the publication inclusion/exclusion criteria (of  
15 which 109 excluded SMI), we received information from authors on a further 123 (30%) but  
16 authors of 177 (43.2%) trials did not respond to our email requests for information.

17

18 Of the 410 trials, at least 172 (42%) RCTs did not recruit any participants with SMI; this was  
19 74% of the 233 trials on which we were able to obtain data. In 229 (55.9%) RCTs, it is unknown  
20 if people with SMI were recruited, either because the authors did not respond to our request  
21 for information (n=177, 43.2%) or because the authors were unaware if they had recruited  
22 any participants with SMI as this data was not collected (n=52, 12.7%).

23

24 Nine (2.2%) RCTs [21-29] confirmed inclusion of people with SMI following email requests;  
25 however, of these, only six [21-23, 25, 28, 29] provided data on the numbers recruited and  
26 none provided data on effectiveness of the interventions in their participants with SMI. The

1 six trials that provided data recruited a total of 1009 participants with T2DM, of whom 31  
2 (3.1%) had SMI. This is in line with population prevalence, in which approximately 2% of  
3 people with type 2 diabetes have SMI (approximately double that of the general population)  
4 [30] [29].

5 The six trials that provided data on participants with SMI were conducted in Brazil [23], New  
6 Zealand [28], Qatar [22], Slovenia [29] and the United States [21, 25]. The interventions they  
7 evaluated were varied. Mohamed et al [22] trialled a culturally sensitive group intervention  
8 including education on diabetes, healthy eating and exercise, and included five participants  
9 with schizophrenia. An individual programme trialled in Brazil [23] evaluated education plus  
10 blood glucose monitoring and pharmacotherapy adjustment. This trial included one  
11 participant with bipolar disorder, two with depression with psychotic features, and one  
12 participant diagnosed with personality disorder. The DECIDE education and problem-solving  
13 training programme was evaluated in two trials with African-American populations [21, 25].  
14 The first [21] compared intensive and condensed versions and included one participant with  
15 schizophrenia, two with bipolar disorder and one participant with other psychosis. The second  
16 [25] compared self-study, individual and group versions of DECIDE and recruited eight people  
17 with SMI, six with schizophrenia, one with bipolar disorder and one who had depression with  
18 psychotic features. Whitehead et al 2017 [28] recruited one person with SMI (personality  
19 disorder) to their comparison of nurse-led education plus Acceptance and Commitment  
20 Therapy (ACT) with nurse-led education alone or usual care. Two different levels of intensity  
21 of multidisciplinary care plus education were compared in a trial [23] that recruited four  
22 participants with SMI - one with bipolar disorder, two who had depression with psychotic  
23 features and one with personality disorder. The final trial [29], which recruited six people with  
24 SMI (one with schizophrenia, one with schizoaffective disorder, three with bipolar disorder  
25 and one who had depression with psychotic features) evaluated telemedicine plus education

1 compared with usual care. None of these interventions incorporated components that  
2 specifically targeted issues around managing SMI.

3

4 Assessment of Risk of Bias for the nine trials that included people with SMI is shown in Figure  
5 2. Risk of bias was mostly unclear for random sequence generation, allocation concealment  
6 and blinding of outcome assessment. All trials were rated high risk of bias for blinding of  
7 participants and personnel, which is unavoidable given the type of intervention. Risk of bias  
8 for incomplete outcomes data was rated as high in four trials, mostly because of differential  
9 dropout between trial arms. Selective reporting was rated as high or unclear risk of bias in  
10 most studies where they had not reported registration of the trial protocol and/or had not  
11 reported data in sufficient detail to enter into a meta-analysis/funnel plot. Only five trials  
12 reported sufficient data for the funnel plot, which is shown in Figure 3. The result of the  
13 Egger’s test for asymmetry of the funnel plot was non-significant ( $\beta$  0.54, SE 0.17 (95% CI 0.08  
14 – 1.01),  $p=0.47$ ), which suggests a low risk of publication bias, however this finding should be  
15 interpreted with caution in view of the small number of included trials.

16

17 The trials did not report, or were unable to provide, the results for participants with SMI; we  
18 therefore did not conduct analysis of treatment effects in people with SMI for these trials.

19

20

21 **Discussion**

22 The key findings of this review reveal that at least 42% of identified trials of DSME do not  
23 include any participants with SMI and only 2% had participants with a known diagnosis of SMI.

24 None of the interventions tested in these trials incorporated components that specifically  
25 targeted mental health issues that may affect self-management of diabetes and none of the  
26 trials reported data on effectiveness of the interventions for people with SMI.

1

2 Given the increased risk of T2DM in people with SMI and the large number of RCTs of DSME  
3 that have been conducted, their omission from trials of DSME is remarkable. However, our  
4 findings echo previous research [31], which has also found that people with SMI are often  
5 excluded from clinical trials. Of 400 highly cited trials across 20 common chronic health  
6 conditions published between 2002 and 2010, 55% of the papers that described diabetes  
7 research had psychiatric exclusion criteria [31]. Humphreys et al argued that excluding this  
8 population results in knowledge gaps that may harm people with SMI when a treatment  
9 becomes generalised [31].

10

11 The recent Cochrane review [12] identified only one intervention [13] that had been  
12 developed and evaluated for people with T2D and SMI, which has since been adapted and  
13 evaluated in another trial [16]. The small number of trials in the current review that included  
14 people with SMI did not specifically address the particular challenges faced by this population,  
15 for example, how to maintain diabetes control during periods of instability in their mental  
16 health [32, 33]. Furthermore, as the numbers recruited were small, which is not unexpected  
17 given the population prevalence of SMI, it is not possible to tell if these interventions were  
18 beneficial for people with SMI. These findings together indicate that the provision of evidence-  
19 based diabetes education is lacking for people with SMI.

20

21 The King's Fund [34] has recommended that people with SMI should be seen as a priority  
22 target group for public health interventions and the UK National Health Service (NHS) Long  
23 Term Plan [35] stresses the need for people with SMI to have their physical health needs met.  
24 However, our findings concur with other research that has identified under-representation of  
25 people with psychiatric disorders in diabetes research and highlighted this issue as an example  
26 of health inequity [31]. It is unclear to what extent this under-representation in research on

1 DSME is also borne out in referral to these programmes in clinical care. Research in the US has  
2 found that people with SMI are less likely than those without SMI to receive diabetes  
3 education [36] but this may not be the case in the UK [33].

4

5 Thornicroft [37] has described the mortality gap between people with SMI and the non-SMI  
6 population as *“at worst a form of lethal discrimination”* and calls for evidence-based  
7 interventions to address it. Furthermore, the Royal College of Psychiatrists [38] has  
8 recommended that their members should feel competent to address the physical as well as  
9 the mental health needs of people with SMI. Similarly, psychiatric associations internationally  
10 [39-41] consider the role of psychiatrists to include improving the physical as well as mental  
11 health of their patients. However, the lack of research into the effectiveness of DSME  
12 programmes in this vulnerable group leaves clinicians without a clear pathway for  
13 intervention.

14

15 If people with SMI are to be referred to general DSME programmes, it is essential that the  
16 programmes are evaluated in this population. Given the population prevalence of SMI in  
17 people with diabetes, recruitment of sufficient people with SMI to achieve adequate statistical  
18 power would require trials that oversample people with SMI when recruiting. However, in  
19 other research [32, 33] we have identified that learning how to maintain diabetes control  
20 during periods of instability in mental health would be an important aspect of DSME for  
21 people with SMI. As generic DSME programmes do not address this crucial issue, they will  
22 need to be adapted, or more tailored interventions developed and evaluated, if DSME is to  
23 meet the needs of people with SMI.

24

25 A limitation of this review is that, in spite of our attempts to contact all authors, we were  
26 unable to obtain data for a substantial number of trials. It is possible, therefore, that our

1 findings could under- or over-estimate the proportion of trials that do not include SMI. We  
2 received responses from authors of 124 RCTs that had not reported data in the trial  
3 publication, and of these, 63 (51%) did not have any participants with SMI. If this pattern  
4 was repeated for the trials on which we were unable to obtain data, it would raise the  
5 proportion who have not included SMI above the 42% reported.

6

7 We also acknowledge that we may not have identified all relevant trials, for example, we did  
8 not search grey literature or include papers published in languages other than English.

9

## 10 **Conclusion**

11 Very few tailored DSME programmes exist for people with T2DM and SMI therefore people  
12 with these conditions may be referred to generic DSME programmes. This systematic review  
13 has shown that trials of generic DSME programmes often exclude people with SMI and where  
14 they do include people with SMI, efficacy in this population is not tested. We therefore do not  
15 know if the DSME programmes to which people with T2DM are referred are effective for  
16 people with SMI. If people with SMI are to receive appropriate diabetes care in accordance  
17 with current guidelines, it is essential that evidence-based diabetes education is available. It  
18 is necessary for future research to examine whether existing programmes can meet the needs  
19 of people with SMI, or be adapted to do so, or if more tailored programmes need to be  
20 developed and evaluated.

21

## 22 **Abbreviations**

23 A<sub>1c</sub> or HbA<sub>1c</sub>: glycosylated haemoglobin; BMI: body mass index; DSME: diabetes self-  
24 management education; SMI: severe mental illness; T2DM: type 2 diabetes mellitus.

25

## 26 **DECLARATIONS**

1 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

2 As this is a systematic review of published data, ethical approval or consent to participate  
3 were not required.

4 **Consent for publication**

5 Not applicable

6 **Availability of data and materials**

7 Data are available on request from the corresponding author.

8 **Competing interests**

9 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

10 **Funding:** This research was unfunded.

11 **Authors' contributions:** KM and HM were involved in the conception and design of the study.

12 AC, NP, HR and KM were involved in study selection and data extraction. AC and KM

13 completed data analysis. KM, HM and AC were involved in data interpretation, either drafting

14 or revising the intellectual content of the manuscript and approving the final version for

15 publication. RS did not meet the journal criteria for authorship but is named in the

16 acknowledgements for assisting with literature searches and title screening. All authors have

17 read and approved the manuscript.

18 **Acknowledgements:** Anne Coxon's contribution to this work was conducted in part

19 fulfilment of the requirements of a Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology [42].

20 Reesha Solanki, [reesha96@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:reesha96@hotmail.co.uk), helped with conducting the literature searches

21 and screening of study titles for inclusion in the review.

22

23 **Additional files**

24 Additional file 1: Search terms; BMC Psychiatry\_Additional file 1\_Search; Word document

25 (.docx)

26



1

2 Additional file 2: Study Characteristics; BMC Psychiatry\_Additional file 2\_Results table; Word

3 document (.docx); Table of 410 included trials with study reference, country of origin,

4 number of participants at start of trial, brief description of intervention arms, participants

5 with Severe Mental Illness excluded or not, if not number of participants with Severe Mental

6 Illness included in trial if reported.

7 Word document (.docx);

8

1 Reference list

2

3 1. Ward, M. and B. Druss. The epidemiology of diabetes in psychotic disorders. *Lancet*  
4 *Psychiatry*, 2015. **2**(5): 431-451.

5 2. Osborn DP, Wright CA, Levy G, King MB, Deo R, Nazareth I. Relative risk of diabetes,  
6 dyslipidaemia, hypertension and the metabolic syndrome in people with severe mental  
7 illnesses: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Psychiatry*, 2008. **8**: 84.

8 3. Becker, T. and J. Hux. Risk of acute complications of diabetes among people with  
9 schizophrenia in Ontario, Canada. *Diabetes Care*, 2011. **34**(2): 398-402.

10 4. Vinogradova Y, Coupland C, Hippisley-Cox J, Whyte S, Penny C. Effects of severe  
11 mental illness on survival of people with diabetes. *Br J Psychiatry*, 2010. **197**(4): 272-7.

12 5. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, Type 2 diabetes in adults:  
13 management. 2015. [nice.org.uk/guidance/ng28](http://nice.org.uk/guidance/ng28).

14 6. Powers MA, Bardsley J, Cypress M, Duker P, Funnell MM, Hess FA et al. Diabetes  
15 Self-management Education and Support in Type 2 Diabetes: A Joint Position Statement of  
16 the American Diabetes Association, the American Association of Diabetes Educators, and the  
17 Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. *Diabetes Care*, 2015. **38**(7): 1372-82.

18 7. Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network, SIGN 116: Management of Diabetes.  
19 2010. [www.sign.ac.uk/assets/sign116.pdf](http://www.sign.ac.uk/assets/sign116.pdf).

20 8. International Diabetes Federation, Global Guidelines for Type 2 Diabetes. 2012.  
21 [https://www.iapb.org/wp-content/uploads/Global-Guideline-for-Type-2-Diabetes-IDF-](https://www.iapb.org/wp-content/uploads/Global-Guideline-for-Type-2-Diabetes-IDF-2012.pdf)  
22 [2012.pdf](https://www.iapb.org/wp-content/uploads/Global-Guideline-for-Type-2-Diabetes-IDF-2012.pdf).

23 9. Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, General practice management of  
24 type 2 diabetes 2016 -18. 2016.

25 [https://www.racgp.org.au/FSDEDEV/media/documents/Clinical%20Resources/Guidelines/Di-](https://www.racgp.org.au/FSDEDEV/media/documents/Clinical%20Resources/Guidelines/Diabetes/General-practice-management-of-type-2-diabetes_1.pdf)  
26 [abetes/General-practice-management-of-type-2-diabetes\\_1.pdf](https://www.racgp.org.au/FSDEDEV/media/documents/Clinical%20Resources/Guidelines/Diabetes/General-practice-management-of-type-2-diabetes_1.pdf).

- 1 10. Chrvala, C.A., D. Sherr, and R.D. Lipman. Diabetes self-management education for  
2 adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus: A systematic review of the effect on glycemic control.  
3 Patient Educ Couns, 2016. **99**(6): 926-43.
- 4 11. Steinsbekk A, Rygg L, Lisulo M, Rise MB, Fretheim A. Group based diabetes self-  
5 management education compared to routine treatment for people with type 2 diabetes  
6 mellitus. A systematic review with meta-analysis. BMC Health Serv Res, 2012. **12**: 213.
- 7 12. McBain H, Mulligan K, Haddad M, Flood C, Jones J, Simpson A. Self management  
8 interventions for type 2 diabetes in adult people with severe mental illness. Cochrane  
9 Database Syst Rev, 2016. **4**: CD011361.
- 10 13. McKibbin CL, Patterson TL, Norman G, Patrick K, Jin H, Roesch S et al. A lifestyle  
11 intervention for older schizophrenia patients with diabetes mellitus: a randomized  
12 controlled trial. Schizophr Res, 2006. **86**(1-3): 36-44.
- 13 14. McKibbin CL, Golshan S, Griver K, Kitchen K, Wykes TL. A healthy lifestyle  
14 intervention for middle-aged and older schizophrenia patients with diabetes mellitus: a 6-  
15 month follow-up analysis. Schizophr Res, 2010. **121**(1-3): 203-6.
- 16 15. Bauer M.S., McBride L. Structured Group Psychotherapy for Bipolar Disorder: The  
17 Life Goals Program. 2003, New York: Springer.
- 18 16. Sajatovic M, Gunzler DD, Kanuch SW, Cassidy KA, Tatsuoka C, McCormick R et al. A  
19 60-Week Prospective RCT of a Self-Management Intervention for Individuals With Serious  
20 Mental Illness and Diabetes Mellitus. Psychiatr Serv, 2017. **68**(9): 883-890.
- 21 17. Taylor SJC, Pinnock H, Epiphaniou E, Pearce G, Parke HL, Schwappach A et al. A rapid  
22 synthesis of the evidence on interventions supporting self-management for people with  
23 long-term conditions: PRISMS - Practical systematic Review of Self-Management Support for  
24 long-term conditions. Health Services and Delivery Research 2014, 2 : Southampton (UK).
- 25 18. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic  
26 reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Ann Intern Med, 2009. **151**(4): 264-9.

- 1 19. Higgins, JPT; Green, S., Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.  
2 Version 5.1.0. 2011, Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 3 20. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD. The Cochrane  
4 Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*, 2011. **343**: d5928.
- 5 21. Hill-Briggs F, Lazo M, Peyrot M, Doswell A, Chang YT, Hill MN et al. Effect of problem-  
6 solving-based diabetes self-management training on diabetes control in a low income  
7 patient sample. *J Gen Intern Med*, 2011. **26**(9): 972-8.
- 8 22. Mohamed H, Al-Lenjawi B, Amuna P, Zotor F, Elmahdi H. Culturally sensitive patient-  
9 centred educational programme for self-management of type 2 diabetes: a randomized  
10 controlled trial. *Prim Care Diabetes*, 2013. **7**(3): 199-206.
- 11 23. Pimazoni-Netto A, Rodbard D, Zanella MT. Rapid improvement of glycemic control in  
12 type 2 diabetes using weekly intensive multifactorial interventions: structured glucose  
13 monitoring, patient education, and adjustment of therapy-a randomized controlled trial.  
14 *Diabetes Technol Ther*, 2011. **13**(10): 997-1004.
- 15 24. Wolf MS, Seligman H, Davis TC, Fleming DA, Curtis LM, Pandit AU et al. Clinic-based  
16 versus outsourced implementation of a diabetes health literacy intervention. *J Gen Intern  
17 Med*, 2013. **29**(1): 59-67.
- 18 25. Fitzpatrick SL, Golden SH, Stewart K, Sutherland J, DeGross S, Brown T et al. Effect of  
19 DECIDE (Decision-making Education for Choices In Diabetes Everyday) Program Delivery  
20 Modalities on Clinical and Behavioral Outcomes in Urban African Americans With Type 2  
21 Diabetes: A Randomized Trial. *Diabetes Care*, 2016. **39**(12): 2149-2157.
- 22 26. Spencer MS, Rosland AM, Kieffer EC, Sinco BR, Valerio M, Palmisano G et al.  
23 Effectiveness of a community health worker intervention among African American and  
24 Latino adults with type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Public Health*, 2011.  
25 **101**(12): 2253-60.

- 1 27. Trief PM, Izquierdo R, Eimicke JP, Teresi JA, Goland R, Palmas W et al. Adherence to  
2 diabetes self care for white, African-American and Hispanic American telemedicine  
3 participants: 5 year results from the IDEATel project. *Ethn Health*, 2013. **18**(1): 83-96.
- 4 28. Whitehead LC, Crowe MT, Carter JD, Maskill VR, Carlyle D, Bugge C et al. A nurse-led  
5 education and cognitive behaviour therapy-based intervention among adults with  
6 uncontrolled type 2 diabetes: A randomised controlled trial. *J Eval Clin Pract*, 2017. **23**(4):  
7 821-829.
- 8 29. Iljaz R, Brodnik A, Zrimec T, Cukjati I. E-healthcare for Diabetes Mellitus Type 2  
9 Patients - A Randomised Controlled Trial in Slovenia. *Zdr Varst*, 2017. **56**(3): 150-157.
- 10 30. NHS Digital, National Diabetes Audit, 2016-17 Report 1: Care Processes and  
11 Treatment Targets. Severe Mental Illness - Supplementary Information. 2018.  
12 [www.hqip.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/National-Diabetes-Audit-2016-17-Report-1-](http://www.hqip.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/National-Diabetes-Audit-2016-17-Report-1-)  
13 [SMI-Care-Processes-and-Treatme....pdf](http://www.hqip.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/National-Diabetes-Audit-2016-17-Report-1-SMI-Care-Processes-and-Treatme....pdf).
- 14 31. Humphreys, K., J.C. Blodgett, and L.W. Roberts. The exclusion of people with  
15 psychiatric disorders from medical research. *J Psychiatr Res*, 2015. **70**: 28-32.
- 16 32. Mulligan K, McBain H, Lamontagne-Godwin F, Chapman J, Haddad M, Jones J et al.  
17 Barriers and enablers of type 2 diabetes self-management in people with severe mental  
18 illness. *Health Expect*, 2017. **20**(5): 1020-1030.
- 19 33. Mulligan K, McBain H, Lamontagne-Godwin F, Chapman J, Flood C, Haddad M et al.  
20 Barriers to effective diabetes management - a survey of people with severe mental illness.  
21 *BMC Psychiatry*, 2018. **18**(1): 165.
- 22 34. Naylor, C.D., P.; Ross, S.; Honeyman, M.; Thompson, J.; Gilbert, H. Bringing together  
23 physical and mental health. A new frontier for integrated care. 2016, The King's Fund:  
24 London.

- 1 35. National Health Service, The NHS long term plan. 2019.  
2 [www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/nhs-long-term-plan-june-](http://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/nhs-long-term-plan-june-2019.pdf)  
3 [2019.pdf](http://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/nhs-long-term-plan-june-2019.pdf).
- 4 36. Goldberg RW, Kreyenbuhl JA, Medoff DR, Dickerson FB, Wohlheiter K, Fang LJ et al.  
5 Quality of diabetes care among adults with serious mental illness. *Psychiatr Serv*, 2007.  
6 **58**(4): 536-43.
- 7 37. Thornicroft, G. Premature death among people with mental illness. *BMJ*, 2013. **346**:  
8 f2969.
- 9 38. Royal College of Psychiatrists, Physical health in mental health. Final report of a  
10 scoping group. 2009. [https://www.ucl.ac.uk/core-study/sites/core-](https://www.ucl.ac.uk/core-study/sites/core-study/files/18physical_mental.pdf)  
11 [study/files/18physical\\_mental.pdf](https://www.ucl.ac.uk/core-study/sites/core-study/files/18physical_mental.pdf).
- 12 39. De Hert M, Dekker JM, Wood D, Kahl KG, Holt RIG, Möller HJ. Cardiovascular disease  
13 and diabetes in people with severe mental illness position statement from the European  
14 Psychiatric Association (EPA), supported by the European Association for the Study of  
15 Diabetes (EASD) and the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Psychiatry*, 2009. **24**(6):  
16 412-24.
- 17 40. De Hert M, Correll CU, Bobes J, Cetkovich-Bakmas M, Cohen D, Asai I et al. Physical  
18 illness in patients with severe mental disorders. I. Prevalence, impact of medications and  
19 disparities in health care. *World Psychiatry*, 2011. **10**(1): 52-77.
- 20 41. Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, Keeping Body and Mind  
21 together: Improving the physical health and life expectancy of people with serious mental  
22 illness. 2015. [www.ranzcp.org/Files/Publications/RANZCP-Keeping-body-and-mind-](http://www.ranzcp.org/Files/Publications/RANZCP-Keeping-body-and-mind-together.aspx)  
23 [together.aspx](http://www.ranzcp.org/Files/Publications/RANZCP-Keeping-body-and-mind-together.aspx).
- 24 42. Coxon A. Applying health psychology theory to practice: informing and developing  
25 interventions for long-term conditions. Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of  
26 the Professional Doctorate in Health Psychology. School of Health Sciences, City, University

1 of London. September 2018.

2 [https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/21605/1/Coxon,%20Anne\\_Redacted.pdf](https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/21605/1/Coxon,%20Anne_Redacted.pdf)

Table 1. Number and % of RCTs that included or excluded participants with SMI

			TOTALS	
	N	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Included SMI</b>			<b>9</b>	<b>2.2</b>
<i>Authors provided data on numbers recruited but not effectiveness</i>	6	1.5		
<i>Authors did not provide data on numbers recruited or effectiveness</i>	3	0.7		
<b>Did not include SMI</b>			<b>172</b>	<b>42.0</b>
<i>Explicitly excluded SMI:</i>				
<i>Reported in paper</i>	109	26.6		
<i>Response from authors</i>	47	11.5		
<i>Not explicitly excluded but no-one with SMI recruited</i>	16	3.9		
<b>Unknown if SMI included</b>			<b>229</b>	<b>55.9</b>
<i>Authors did not collect data on SMI</i>	52	12.7		
<i>Authors did not respond to email request</i>	177	43.2		
TOTAL RCTs	410		<b>410</b>	



