International Journal of Healthcare Sciences ISSN 2348-5728 (Online)
Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp: (1232-1239), Month: October 2016 - March 2017, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

Management of Diabetes Mellitus in Primary Care

[1]Wafa Hamad Galmutairi, [2]Abeer Fahad M Al Mutairi, [3]Huda Hamad G Al Mutairi

Abstract: **It has been forecasted that 221 million people will have diabetes around the world. The main treatment objectives for persons with diabetes consist of achieving optimal high blood pressure, lipid, and glycemic control .This requires adherence to a intricate and long-lasting routine of way of life modification, pharmacotherapy, periodic follow-up goes to with medical care service providers, and self-management skills (e.g. blood glucose monitoring, foot examinations, and so on) .Our searches identified 19 randomized controlled trials. Favorable effect sizes of household interventions on knowledge for 5 studies (N = 217) were demonstrated 0.94 [95% confidence interval (CI) 0.67, 1.82]. An useful impact of interventions on GHb for eight research studies (N = 505) was likewise observed using meta-analysis [− 0.6 (95% CI − 1.2, − 0.1)].Evidence suggests that household interventions in family or home members of individuals with diabetes might work in enhancing diabetes-related knowledge and glycemic control.**

Keywords: **Management of Diabetes Mellitus, self-management skills.**

1. INTRODUCTION

It has been forecasted that 221 million people will have diabetes around the world [1] The main treatment objectives for persons with diabetes consist of achieving optimal high blood pressure [2], lipid [3], and glycemic control [4] This requires adherence to a intricate and long-lasting routine of way of life modification, pharmacotherapy, periodic follow-up goes to with medical care service providers, and self-management skills (e.g. blood glucose monitoring, foot examinations, and so on). This is challenging for the patient acting alone.While health care employees play a role in providing diabetes care and educating patients, this approach alone has been woefully insufficient. Extra methods have actually been sought to boost the effectiveness of conventional treatment interventions. Fisher has actually noted that family-based approaches to persistent disease management have promise as an accessory to standard treatment techniques due to the fact that they emphasize the context where the disease occurs, including the family's physical environment; instructional, relational, and individual requirements of patients and member of the family; and the capability to include the patients and family members in thorough programs of care and result evaluation [5].Families can play a substantial function in handling diabetes for adults, teenagers, and children, especially when special needs exists [6] due to the fact that relative are affected mentally, cognitively, and behaviorally [7,8]. Family participation is potentially valuable in helping those with diabetes who live with relative to preserve and embrace diabetes self- management training skills. To assist facilitate family involvement, behavioral, psychosocial, and academic interventions have actually been utilized to inform families about expectations and possible roles in treating diabetes, keeping in mind that familial involvement in management tasks can be enhanced through these interventions [9-11].While the past 15 years has spawned a number of smaller studies on this subject, a detailed assessment of published literature is warranted. In this paper we methodically evaluated released literature on the effectiveness of intervention methods that particularly include people with diabetes and their member of the family.

The main aim of this research is to conduct a systematic review of reports of published literature to assess which family interventions are effective in improving diabetes-related outcomes in people with diabetes and family members (blood or non-blood relatives) residing in their homes.

2. METHODOLOGY

The search strategy used a combination of free-text words and medical subject heading (MeSH) terms targeting 'diabetes' and 'family interventions', and 'education' or 'training', and was tailored to accommodate varying databases.

Computerized databases, including MEDLINE (2007), EM- BASE (2011), CINHAHL (2014), PsycInfo (2011), Web of Science (2013), the Cochrane Library (2012 issue 3), Sociological Abstracts (2012), ERIC (2009), and Chronic Disease Prevention Database (2013), were searched between the date indicated in parentheses and February 2009. In addition, hand searches were manually conducted from 1980 to March 2013 of journals considered to have highest topic relevance and included *Diabetes Care* and *The Diabetes Educator* .

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We recognized 19 RCTs (in 28 publications) that explained interventions for family members residing in the house of individuals with diabetes. Demographic and intervention design attributes of trials consisted of in this evaluation are presented in Table 1. The majority of research studies were carried out in the USA (40%) and the UK (25%). Other studies were carried out in Spain (15%), Canada (10%) and Sweden (10%).

The settings for interventions were described as a diabetes center, pediatric ward/ clinic, health center house, ward vs. healthcare facility, house vs. worksite, home-based, office-based, diabetes club, or smoking cessation clinic. In 6 of the studies, the intervention setting could not be identified or was inadequately reported. Most of the studies present main results for interventions associated with children with diabetes and their parents. Although parents were included in the interventions and outcomes associated to parents are presented, children and teenagers are the specific targets of interventions and outcomes reported from these interventions (GHb, self-monitoring of blood glucose, family-related conflicts).

Table 1Summary of demographic, setting, intervention, design characteristics and outcomes by diabetes type and age category

Diabetes type, age category Study ID	Methods/participants	Intervention: setting/IG, intervention group CG, comparison group	Intervention characteristics	Outcomes
Mendez [28]	Follow-up: post-treatment; HbA1c 1 month *N*: children 38; parents 38 Age: children IG1 8.6 (3.0); CG 8.3 (3.0); range 9–12, parents IG1 38.4 (5.0); CG 36.0 (5.5) % Male: (children) 36; (parents) 11	Country: Spain Setting: Elche County Diabetes Association IG, parents taught stress management on how to deal with negative thoughts, stressful situations and imagery; assigned homework (i.e. progressive relaxation techniques, etc.) CG, usual care	Duration: 6 weeks Frequency: 1.5-h sessions weekly	GHb (%): significant decrease IG1 9.3 (1.6) ($P < 0.008$) in children whose parents were in the experimental treatment group CG 9.8 (1.6); diabetes-related stressors decreased significantly IG 5.8 (6.7); CG 18.1 (7.4) ($P < 0.0001$)
Mitchell [16]	Follow-up: 12 months (follow-up for GHb available for 3.5 years post intervention) *N*: 32 Age: IG1 10.4 (2.4); CG 11(2.3); range: 8–16 % Male: 56	Country: Canada Setting: diabetes clinic children's hospital IG, standard multidisciplinary education and support; in addition, a booklet titled *Improving Compliance with Treatment for Diabetes* CG, similar to IG; no booklet Country: Spain Setting: Spanish Red Cross & Vega Baja Diabetics Association of Orihuela IG, information for parents re: shared responsibility, behaviour modification	Duration: 3 months Frequency: not clearly reported	Other: Problems Situation Questionnaire (PSQ): parents reported no significant difference between groups at 1 & 12 months. Significant difference at 3 months ($P < 0.05$). No significant differences between child-reported problems at any interval

		skills, recognizing patterns of behaviour (i.e. indulgent or democratic) CG, usual care		
Olivares [29]	Follow-up: 9 months *N*: (children) 36 Age: IG1 (children) 10.2 (1.0); CG children 10.2 (1.0); range: 9–12 % Male: 50	Country: Spain Setting: Spanish Red Cross & Vega Baja Diabetics Association of Orihuela IG, information for parents re: shared responsibility, behaviour modification skills, recognizing patterns of behaviour (i.e.indulgent or democratic)CG, usual care	Duration: 8 weeks Frequency: 70-min sessions weekly	Knowledge: significant increase in IG1 post intervention and maintained at 9 months follow-up ($P < 0.001$) GHb: a significant reduction in blood glucose [IG1 52.52 (23.4); CG 72.18 (34.85) ($P = 0.033$)] Significant improvement in problem behaviours of the children and degree of 'shared responsibility'
Olivares [30]	Follow-up: not reported *N*: 28 Age: children approximately 6 years range: all children < 8 eligible % Male: (children) 57	Country: Spain Setting: not clearly reported IG, modifying eating habits, reinforcing behaviours, therapeutic methods of behaviour acquisition and strengthening CG, usual care	Duration: 8 weeks Frequency: 1-h sessions weekly	Knowledge: increase in behaviour modification knowledge in IG1 and maintenance levels in the CG, except for factor 2 (behavioural interpretation based on reasons of need and biologistic assumptions)
Ryden [31] Companion(s): Hansson [40]	Follow-up: 22 months after treatment and 32 months after 1st assessment *N*: 15 Age: IG (FT) 12.8; IG (PS) 14.0; range: 8–18 % Male: 33	Country: Sweden Setting: paediatric clinic IG, family therapy (FT)—focus on analysing diabetic behaviour; problem solving and identification. Hierarchy of the family was analysed focusing on maladaptive behaviour CG, paediatric support (PS)— intensive instruction in diabetes starting with family's current knowledge	Duration: 5–11 months Frequency: two 3-h pretreatment sessions; 7.5-h sessions, over approximately 6 months	SE: Self-Esteem Questionnaire (SEQ); no significant change for SEQ scales GHb: 8/9 patients in IG group showed improvement in diabetic control compared with two patients in CG Only two families completed PS programme; high drop-out rate may constitute an inherent problem with the PS condition
Satin [20]	Follow-up: 6 months *N*: 32 families Age: IG1 (MF) 15.0 (2.4); IG2 (MF + S); range: 12–19 14.9 (2.8); CG 13.7 (2.7) % Male: 38	Country: USA Setting: not clearly reported IG, encouragement to work as a family; diabetes management training; discussion groups of family feelings IG2, similar intervention as IG1 + parents asked to simulate diabetes management for 1 week CG, usual care	Duration: 6 weeks Frequency: 90-min sessions weekly	FC: Family Environment Scale—no significant changes on subscales GHb (%): 6 weeks post intervention values rose 0.52 for IG1 group and 0.27 for CG, but decreased in IG2 –1.21; at the 6-month follow-up, all groups declined, but compared with pretreatment were not significant (mean

				decrements for HbA1 were IG 0.32 (1.32), IG2 1.10 (0.98) and CG 0.01 (1.2)
Forsander [44]	Follow-up: 5 years *N*: 38 (families) Age: IG1 8.0 (range: 3–13.1); CG 8.8 (range: 4–14.5) % Male: 36	Country: Sweden Setting: conventional treatment vs. intense 2-week stay in hospital apartment IG, parents (and siblings encouraged) live in hospital apartment. Family involved in meetings and teaching sessions CG, usual care	Duration: 5 weeks (approximately 3 weeks in hospital ward with an additional 2 weeks in apartment) Frequency: not applicable	FC: Family Climate Test (FCT): both parents significant improvement in FC at 2 years; 5-year follow-up for mothers ($P < 0.02$) fathers ($P = 0.05$)

Thirteen research studies involved children with Type 1 diabetes [9,15-17,19-21,27-32] .The average age of individuals was roughly 10 years; nevertheless, wide variety within studies were kept in mind. 10 research studies reported procedures of GHb [9,15,17, 19,20,27,28,31-33] and 8 of these supplied enough information to be integrated in a meta-analysis [9,15,17,19-21,28,32] .The total pooled effect size was a decrease of − 0.6% (95% confidence period − 1.2, − 0.1) . 2 studies reported steps of blood sugar [29,30] and revealed efficacy of parent training for self-management responsibility transfer on children's blood glucose (P = 0.03) [30], and for a moms and dad training program on barriers to compliance (children < 8 years), glucose levels as a repercussion of an improvement in compliance could not be proven (P = 0.06, result size d = − 0.34) [29]. Two studies did not provide enough information to be drawn out [27,31] Of the 12 research studies analyzing the results of interventions on metabolic control, 7 studies reported a decline in GHb levels publish intervention [9,15,19-21,28,31]. No research studies reported damaging impacts associated with any of the interventions.

3 research studies included interventions for adults with Type 1 diabetes [34-36] 2 of those studies involved the participant of the patient's partner or partner in the intervention [35,36]. Outcomes indicate a considerable enhancement in knowledge [35] and GHb [36].Only one study [36] was a culturally specific intervention directed towards Mexican-Americans. This study included the spouse (loved one) of the patient with diabetes and included customized information concerning self-care, diet/weight management, medication preparation and usage, self-monitoring of blood glucose, and foot and skin care. The intervention included multilingual/ bicultural trainers and outcomes showed topics in the education group with their spouse were most likely than the other groups to abide by the healing regimen.

Two research studies included persons with Type 2 diabetes [37,38] One research study included the education of offspring of individuals with Type 2 diabetes [37] and no considerable result was found on the proportion of children stressed over establishing diabetes. Wing and coworkers reported a substantial weight reduction in both the alone and together condition (P < 0.005); however, there was a considerable interaction of treatment and gender, women doing better overall when spouses were associated with the programmers. This finding was not noted amongst men, who were most likely to perform much better when their partner was not involved in the intervention [38].One research study consisted of a blended population of both Type 1 and Type 2 patients [39] Patients were offered either intensive cigarette smoking cessation guidance or regular advice in a smoking cigarettes cessation clinic. Numerous participants claimed to have decreased cigarette smoking intake, however urinary cotinine concentrations did not validate this finding.

Understanding scores (throughout all categories) were reported in eight research studies [15,17,19,29,30,34,35,37], and 5 of these reported adequate information determined among parents and the results were pooled [7,15,17,19,30] (Table 2). One of the 8 studies was conceptually various and was not integrated with the other studies as the result was understanding of family diabetes run the risk of among children of parents with diabetes [37]

6 studies reported outcomes related to household climate [9,17,20,21,27,32] We did not feel it appropriate to get a pooled quote for these studies for several reasons. First, many research studies presented only a narrative summary for the family climate result and we were not able to draw out quantitative information. Second, the meaning of the family environment construct differed substantially amongst research studies. Third, various scales and procedures were used to quantify household climate. Five of six research studies [9,17,21,27,32] showed considerable decrease in the variety of household conflicts associated with diabetes and the sixth research study [20] reported a non-significant reduction.

Only one study took a look at the expense effectiveness of an intervention. Dougherty and coworkers [15] delivered personalized diabetes-related home-care services using the knowledge of nurses, a dietician, and a diabetology's. This intervention was compared with typical care at 24 months. There were no considerable distinctions between groups post intervention; nevertheless, education ratings in both groups increased and were steady over time. There was a substantial decline in HbA1c in the intervention group at the 2-year follow-up. Parents in the home-care group spent an average of 52.1 fewer hours on diabetes-related care ($P < 0.001$) and £ 53.50 ($100.53) less on out-of-pocket expenses ($P = 0.06$) throughout the very first month of the intervention. The authors suggest that these results may be due to parents investing less time at the medical facility and less money on babysitters, travel expenditures, health center meals, and so on, as their children are home quicker [15]. However, these expenses were not considerable.Just eight studies scored more than 2 points of the possible 4, and only two got a rating of ≥ 3 for quality assessment (Table 3). The methods of randomization treatment were not stated clearly in any study. Unbiased data collection (blinding of assessor) was accomplished in just four research studies [15,16,35,37] .Attrition rates ranged from 0% to 88% in 12 studies supplying enough information to determine attrition rates [15-17,19,21,30-32,34,37-39].

Table 2 Summary effect size for knowledge outcomes (random effects model)

Intervention outcome	No. of studies (*k*)	No. of subjects	Summary effect size*	95% CI	*P*
Knowledge	5	217	0.94	(0.67, 1.82)	0.035

Meta-analysis results:

The pooled effect of family directed interventions for children and teenagers with Type 1 diabetes on GHb (%) was − 0.6 (− 1.2, − 0.1) ($P = 0.02$) . The $\chi 2$ test for homogeneity for eight research studies at the distal follow-up shows heterogeneity of result sizes ($P < 0.0001$). The existence of heterogeneity may be explained, in part, by the truth that most of the research studies took a look at differing populations, settings, interventions, and strengths. The study by Wing et al. [38] is included in Fig. 1, however left out from the pooled quote because it reported results of a spouse vs. 'alone' condition in adults and was felt to be conceptually different from the other studies which involved children and adolescents.

We summarized effect sizes for adult knowledge constructs (5 studies, N = 217) and there was considerable ($P = 0.0001$) heterogeneity among studies for knowledge outcomes (Table 3). The general weighted typical result size (0.94) suggests a statistically favorable effect for family-directed interventions on diabetes knowledge-related results ($P = 0.035$) (traditional analysis in the behavioral sciences to analyze effect sizes of ~ 0.20 as little, ~ 0.50 as medium, and > 0.80 as large) [18]

A major factor adding to heterogeneity might be the variation in follow-up interval. We made an attempt to group research studies by follow-up interval; however, there was an insufficient variety of research studies for meaningful stratification by follow-up interval. We observed a trend in data which recommended that research studies with longer follow-up results demonstrated even worse impacts [9,32] when compared to much shorter follow-up outcome assessments [15]

Three research studies consisted of in our GHb meta-analysis favored the control over the intervention group [21,32,38] Wing et al. [38] examined the use of a spouse vs. no-spouse intervention for weight-loss amongst overweight Type 2 diabetes patients. The primary focus of their intervention was not glycemic control. The intervention group put on weight, which may help to discuss the boost in GHb. Sundelin [32] reported results of a trial that compared traditional treatment with a new routine with a crisis developers that consisted of a milieu healing setting. Couple of significant differences were seen between groups. This might be described by a number of factors that included a small sample size (38 households); the exact same team of specialized staff dealt with both the treatment and control groups; and the total treatment time for both groups was comparable for the pediatrician and social worker. The difference between groups consisted of time invested with the diet professional in the study group and the addition of a psychotherapist. Wysocki and associates [21] compared behavioral family systems therapy with academic support, with present treatment, and reported that overall GHb values increased throughout the research study [21], although there were no significant between-group or interaction impacts on GHb at any measurement point. There were, nevertheless, lasting improvements in parents adolescent relationships and diabetes-specific conflict. Aspects that may have added to these results could have been that the sample hired for this research study was patients who were chronically in bad diabetic control and whose families had actually been unable to include appropriate diabetes self-management practices into their daily regimen. The research study sample included

teenagers (14.3 ± 1.3) and the authors noted that perhaps targeting households of more youthful adolescents or having longer intervention duration might have altered the results of this research study.

The majority of research studies in this evaluation preferred the intervention over the contrast group or revealed non-detrimental results of the intervention, our findings may overstate the impacts due to high between-study irregularity (i.e. intervention style, recruitment methods, and so on).

Table 3 Quality assessment for randomized controlled trials for family/ household-directed interventions

Study	Appropriate randomization	Unbiased data collection (blinding of assessor)	Follow-up ≥ 80%	Difference in attrition between groups ≤ 2%	Final score (out of 4)
Anderson [10]	–	–	✓	–	1
Ardron [39]	–	–	✓	✓	2
Barr Mazzucca [33]	–	×	✓	✓	2
Bloomfield [18]	–	–	✓	✓	2
Dougherty [16]	–	✓	✓	✓	3
Gross [28]	–	×	–	–	0
Hackett [20]	–	–	✓	✓	2

4. CONCLUSION

Evidence suggests that household interventions in family or home members of individuals with diabetes might work in enhancing diabetes-related knowledge and glycemic control.

REFERENCES

[1] Amos AF, McCarty DJ, Zimmet P. The rising global burden of diabetes and its complications: estimates and projections to the year 2010. *Diabet Med* 1997; 14: S1– 85.

[2] FonsecaVA.Managementofdiabetesmellitusandinsulinresistancein patients with cardiovascular disease. *Am J Cardiol* 2003; 92: 50J –60J.

[3] Roselli della RG, Lapolla A, Sartore G, Rossetti C, Zambon S, Minicuci N *et al.* Plasma lipoproteins, apoproteins and cardiovascular disease in type 2 diabetic patients. A nine-year follow-up study. *NutrMetab Cardiovasc Dis* 2003; 13: 46 –51.

[4] TheDiabetesControlandComplicationsTrialResearchGroup.The effect of intensive treatment of diabetes on the development and progression of long-term complications in insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 1993; 329: 977–986.

[5] Fisher L, Weihs KL. Can addressing family relationships improve outcomes in chronic disease? Report of the National Working Group on Family-Based Interventions in Chronic Disease. *J Fam Pract* 2000; 49: 561–566.

[6] Patterson JM. Understanding family resilience. *J Clin Psychol* 2002; 58: 233–246.

[7] Patterson J. A family stress model: the family adjustment and adaptation response model. *Family Systems Med* 1988; 5: 202–237.

[8] Patterson JM. Family resilience to the challenge of a child's disability. *Pediatric Ann* 1991; 20: 491– 499.

[9] Anderson BJ, Brackett J, Ho J, Laffel LM. An office-based intervention to maintain parent–adolescent teamwork in diabetes management. Impact on parent involvement, family conflict, and subsequent glycemic control. *Diabetes Care* 1999; 22: 713 –721.

[10] Brown SA, Hanis CL. A community-based, culturally sensitive education and group-support intervention for Mexican Americans with NIDDM: a pilot study of efficacy. *Diabetes Educ* 1995; 21: 203 –210.

[11] Garay-Sevilla ME, Nava LE, Malacara JM, Huerta R, Diaz DL,Mena A *et al.* Adherence to treatment and social support in patients with non-insulin dependent diabetes mellitus. *J Diabetes Complications* 1995; 9: 81– 86.

[12] DiCenso A, Guyatt G, Willan A, Griffith L. Interventions to reduce unintended pregnancies among adolescents: systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2002; 324: 1426.

[13] Feinstein A. *Clinical Epidemiology. The Architecture of Clinical Research.* New Haven, CT: W.B. Saunders, 1985.

[14] Norris SL, Lau J, Smith JS, Schmid CH, Engelgau MM. Self- management education for adults with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2002; 25: 1159 –1171.

[15] Dougherty G, Schiffrin A, White D, Soderstrom L, Sufrategui M. Home-based management can achieve intensification cost-effectively in type I diabetes. *Pediatrics* 1999; 103: 122–128.

[16] Mitchell B. The effects of an early intervention strategy in improving the adjustment to diabetes in children. *Can J Diabetes Care* 1996; 3: 21–27.

[17] Bloomfield S, Calder JE, Chisholm V, Kelnar CJ, Steel JM, Farquhar JW *et al.* A project in diabetes education for children. *Diabet Med* 1990; 7: 137–142.

[18] Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edn. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum and Associates, 1988.

[19] Hackett AF, Court S, Matthews JN, McCowen C, Parkin JM. Do education groups help diabetics and their parents? *Arch Dis Childhood* 1989; 64: 997–1003.

[20] Satin W, La Greca AM, Zigo MA, Skyler JS. Diabetes in adolescence: effects of multifamily group intervention and parent simulation of diabetes. *J Pediatric Psychol* 1989; 14: 259 –275.

[21] Wysocki T, Greco P, Harris MA, Bubb J, White NH. Behavior therapy for families of adolescents with diabetes: maintenance of treatment effects. *Diabetes Care* 2001; 24: 441– 446.

[22] Donnelly JE, Jacobsen DJ, Whatley JE, Hill JO, Swift LL, Cherrington A. *et al.* Nutrition and physical activity program to attenuate obesity and promote physical and metabolic fitness in elementary school children. *Obes Res* 1996; 4: 229 –243.

[23] DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 1986; 7: 177–188.

[24] RevMan Analyses. Version 4.2 (for Windows). In: *Review Manager (RevMan)* 4.2. Oxford: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2003.

[25] Stata Statistical Software: release 8. College Station: Stata Corp. LP,2003.

[26] Hedges LV, Okin I. *Statistical Methods for Meta-analysis.* [Chapter 5]. San Diego: Academic Press, 1985.

[27] Gross AM, Magalnick LJ, Richardson P. Self-management training with families of insulin-dependent diabetic children: a controlled long-term investigation. *Child Family Behav Ther* 1985; 7: Spr50.

[28] Mendez FX, Olivares J, Ros MC, Bermejo R. Applicability of the parent's stress reduction strategies on the children with insulin- dependent diabetes mellitus. [Spanish] *Analisis y Modificacion Conducta* 1997; 23: 669.

[29] Olivares J, Mendez FX, Bermejo RM, Ros MC. Effects of a training program for parents with diabetic children with obstacles to comply with therapy. *Psicologia Conductual* 1997; 5: 199 –218.

[30] Olivares J, Mendez FX, Ros MC, Bermejo RM. The care of insulin- dependent diabetes mellitus: effects of a behavior modification pro- gram for parents. *Psicologia Conductual* 1997; 5: 219 –235.

[31] Ryden O, Nevander L, Johnsson P, Hansson K, Kronvall P, Sjoblad S. *et al.* Family therapy in poorly controlled juvenile IDDM: effects on diabetic control, self-evaluation and behavioural symptoms. *Acta Paediatr* 1994; 83: 285 –291.

[32] Sundelin J, Forsander G, Mattson SE. Family-oriented support at the onset of diabetes mellitus: a comparison of two group conditions during 2 years following diagnosis. *Acta Paediatrica* 1996; 85: 49–55 .

[33] Wysocki T, Harris MA, Greco P, Harvey LM, McDonell K, Danda CL. *et al.* Social validity of support group and behavior therapy interventions for families of adolescents with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *J Pediatric Psychol* 1997; 22: 635 – 649.

[34] Barr Mazzuca K, Farris NA, Mendenhall J, Stoupa RA. Demonstrating the added value of community health nursing for clients with insulin-dependent diabetes. *J Community Health Nursing* 1997; 14: 211–224.

[35] Hicks C. Comparison of the effects of educating patients' partners on diabetic control. *J Inst Health Education* 1991; 29: 94 –97.

[36] Tamez EG, Vacalis TD. Health beliefs, the significant other, compliance with therapeutic regimens among adult Mexican American diabetics. *Health Education* 1989; 20: 24 –31.

[37] Pierce M, Ridout D, Harding D, Keen H, Bradley C. More good than harm: a randomised controlled trial of the effect of education about familial risk of diabetes on psychological outcomes. *Br J General Prac* 2000; 50: 867–871.

[38] Wing RR, Marcus MD, Epstein LH, Jawad A. A 'family-based' approach to the treatment of obese type II diabetic patients. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1991; 59: 156 –162.

[39] Ardron M, MacFarlane IA, Robinson C, van Heyningen C, Calverley PM. Anti-smoking advice for young diabetic smokers: is it a waste of breath? *Diabet Med* 1988; 5: 667– 670.

[40] Hansson K, Ryden O, Johnsson P. Parent-rated family climate: a concomitant to metabolic control in juvenile IDDM? *Family Systems Med* 1994; 12: 405– 413.

[41] Forsander G. Family attitudes to different management regimens in diabetes mellitus. *Pract Diabetes Int* 1995; 12: 80 – 85.

[42] Forsander G, Persson B, Sundelin J, Berglund E, Snellman K, Hellstrom R. Metabolic control in children with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus 5 y after diagnosis. Early detection of patients at risk for poor metabolic control. *Acta Paediatr* 1998; 87: 857– 864.

[43] Forsander GA, Sundelin J, Persson B. Influence of the initial manage- ment regimen and family social situation on glycemic control and medical care in children with type I diabetes mellitus. *Acta Paediatr* 2000; 89: 1462–1468.

[44] Forsander GA, Sundelin J. [Comparison of two therapeutic regimes for diabetes-stricken children. Social and mental resources of the family are often crucial for the prognosis]. [Swedish] *Lakartidningen* 2001; 98: 5484 –5486.

[45] Wysocki T, Miller KM, Greco P, Harris MA, Harvey LM, Taylor A. *et al.* Behavior therapy for families of adolescents with diabetes: effects on directly observed family interactions. *Behav Ther* 1999; 30: 507–525.

[46] Wysocki T, Harris MA, Greco P, Bubb J, Danda CE, Harvey LM *et al.* Randomized, controlled trial of behavior therapy for families of adolescents with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *J Pediatric Psychol* 2000; 25: 23 –33.

[47] Harris MA, Greco P, Wysocki T, White NH. Family therapy with adolescents with diabetes: a litmus test for clinically meaningful change. *Families, Systems Health* 2001; 2: 159 –168.