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Trials of disease management programs pose several methodological challenges. Our objective is to assess the extent to which the various development steps of a cluster randomized trial to evaluate disease management are represented in the framework for the design and evaluation of complex interventions. The framework for evaluating complex interventions developed by Campbell and colleagues is composed by five phases: theoretical, identification of components of the intervention, definition of trial and intervention design, methodological issues for main trial, and promoting effective implementation. Using these phases the corresponding stages in the development of the cluster randomized trial to evaluate the effectiveness of disease management programs are identified and described. Synthesis of evidence needed to construct the program, survey and qualitative research used to define components of the program, a pilot study to assess the feasibility of delivering the care, methodological issues in the main trial including choice of design, allocation concealment, outcomes, sample size calculation and analysis are adequately represented using the stages of the framework for evaluating complex interventions. Even though is difficult to define precisely what exactly the “active ingredients” of a program of disease management and how they relate to each other, we think that the applied framework is a powerful resource for researchers planning a randomized clinical trial to evaluate the effectiveness of such programs.
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This study assesses the Rasch measurement properties of the SF-12 version 2 (SF-12v2) physical and mental health (PH and MH) items in respondents with prevalent chronic conditions. Medical Expenditures Panel Survey (MEPS) respondents’ age ≥ 18 with complete SF-12v2s from 2003 were extracted (n = 19,906). Eleven subgroups were identified using the primary ICD-9-CM code for the top 10 chronic conditions (hypertension, diabetes, depression, back disorder, arthritis, cholesterol, asthma, sinusitis, anxiety and joint disorder) and healthy persons (n = 8324). Respondents with perfect scores demonstrating ceiling (n = 303) and floor effects (n = 12) were removed to ensure uncertainty in the responses. Coding reflected that higher scores represent healthier respondents. The Rasch partial credit model was used to examine the item category properties and fit statistics. Residual factor analysis was conducted to assess the factor loadings on the items. Item misfit took place mostly among MH items (infit/outfit z-score >2.0). Particularly, MH item “Have you felt calm and peaceful?” showed misfit across all subgroups. Rasch residual analysis identified 75.2% to 86.9% of the shared variance within clusters of all items. Further, PH items had positive factor loadings while MH items had negative factor loadings, with few exceptions (3/11). Some item category steps had poor step properties. Mental health items are more likely to be noisy. The patterns of the factor loadings of the PH and MH items were as expected in most of the groups suggesting that the SF-12v2 has two distinct factors measuring the overall health. Poor item category performance suggests that collapsing of these categories might improve the quality of the instrument.
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OBJECTIVES: Temporary health states (states with a duration of less than one year) are common and include many infectious diseases, short-term treatments, and diagnostic procedures. Valuation of these states requires special consideration because the health state is transitory and standard methods ignore the influence of duration on preferences. Inaccurate assessments could introduce bias into cost-utility ratios. There is no “gold stan-