

Analysis of Influencing Factors of Community Management of Diabetes based on Adaptive-Lasso Logistic Regression Model

Wei Lin

Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine

Zejuan Huang

Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine

Zhiqing Cao

Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine

Jing Zhou

Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine

Yang Tian

Shizishan Community Health Service Centre

Jiawei Li

Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine

Mingyue Zheng (✉ mingyue.zheng@adelaide.edu.au)

The University of Adelaide Adelaide Medical School <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7946-8911>

Research article

Keywords: Community diabetes management, Adaptive-lasso logistic model, Influencing factors, Health technology assessment

Posted Date: January 17th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.21067/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

27 and 1981, which were lower than the full-variable logistic model (2349, 2023) and the ridge
28 logistic model (2312, 2013). From the perspective of time cost, the adaptive-lasso logistic
29 regression model was better than the other two models. **Conclusions:** The adaptive-lasso
30 logistic regression model can be used to analyse the influencing factors of community
31 management in patients with diabetes. Community intervention and intensive management
32 measures can significantly improve the blood glucose status of patients with diabetes.
33 **[Key words]** Community diabetes management, Adaptive-lasso logistic model, Influencing
34 factors, Health technology assessment

35 **1. Background**

36 The global costs of diabetes and its consequences are large and will substantially increase more
37 than \$2.1 trillion in 180 countries by 2030 [1], especially in developing countries. Community-
38 based diabetes management has become a cost-effective strategy for controlling and managing
39 diabetes in primary settings. The community-based intervention positively reduced the HbA1c
40 level of diabetic people [2, 3], improved disease control [4], and improved psychosocial
41 outcomes [5].

42 In primary care and community settings, interventions targeting diabetes management were
43 better targeted at individuals with poor glycemic control, old age, and family history [6, 7].
44 Moreover, younger age and lower educational attainment were associated with lower
45 probability of meeting the goals of diabetes management [8]. However, the influencing factors
46 of diabetic patients based on community management are complex, and how to choose the most
47 effective influencing factors requires in-depth research.

48 In terms of community health service, it proposed that patients' satisfaction with community
49 health service was moderate, high satisfaction with the community health service shown better
50 medication adherence and regular self-monitoring of blood glucose, and these associations
51 varied by socioeconomic status [9]. In particular, team-based care can improve patients'
52 glucose levels, blood pressure, and lipid levels based on community preventive services task
53 force [10]. However, what effective services the community health service or the family doctor
54 should provide to a diabetic patient is still to be investigated (i.e. counselling, education, free
55 health service).

56 The lasso model was first proposed by Tibshirani (1996) [11]. This model is to compress the
57 parameters and make some regression coefficients gradually smaller or even close to zero. It
58 has the advantages of subset selection and ridge regression. Huang (2008) proposed a new
59 variable selection and estimation method based on the lasso model, which can predict the

60 correlation pattern between variables [12]. Furthermore, many studies adopted the lasso model
61 to screen variables and use them for optimisation and optimisation [13-15]. However,
62 according to the author's knowledge, no adaptive-lasso logistic regression model has been used
63 to investigate the influencing factors of diabetes community management.

64 Therefore, this study aimed to analyse which influencing factors may be more effective to
65 achieve diabetes management targets in the community by the adaptive-lasso logistic
66 regression model.

67 **2. Methods**

68 **2.1 Data Sources**

69 A cross-sectional survey method (N=1,127) based on the multi-stage cluster sampling was used
70 to survey selected samples from three communities from January 2019 to August 2019. We
71 surveyed the registered residents with the help from community health service centres in the
72 Shizishan Community, Longzhou Road Community, and Lianxin Community of Chengdu,
73 Sichuan Province. The inclusion criteria were through community mobilisation and publicity
74 by the community health service centre. To avoid bias in the study design, we conducted a
75 multidisciplinary expert demonstration and formulated reasonable inclusion and exclusion
76 criteria to ensure higher reliability and validity when formulating the questionnaire. Random
77 number tables were used to select registered diabetic patients in three communities in this study.
78 The survey included demographic information (i.e. gender, age, marital status, education,
79 number of children), self-diabetes management status (i.e. self-assessment of glycemetic
80 management, hospital history), basic situation of living (i.e. main source of income, average
81 monthly income, medical payment methods), diabetes management in the community in the
82 past six months (i.e. number of follow-up evaluations by the family doctor team, number of
83 health consultations and free consultations, whether to participate in community blood glucose
84 measurement voluntarily) and latest fasting blood glucose level and other information. Family

85 doctor follow-up records, blood glucose records, and health consultations and free
86 consultations were derived from the residents' health management files and the Chengdu
87 regional health information platform.

88 Participants whose home address or contact details were unchanged for more than three years
89 were included in this study. The collection questionnaire was double-entry by two individually
90 researches to avoid bias in the data collection process. During the process of data collection
91 and entry, no data loss occurred.

92 Each participant signed an informed consent form, and they volunteered to withdraw from the
93 questionnaire process at any time without reason. For illiterate and semi-illiterate participants,
94 data were collected by investigators reading informed consent and reading questionnaires. Data
95 collectors were not involved in the data analysis process to avoid bias. The Chronbach 's α
96 coefficient of the knowledge, attitude and behaviour evaluation scale for people with diabetes
97 was 0.757, which can be considered as a good internal consistency.

98 **2.2 Lasso Algorithm**

99 Lasso algorithm is a regularisation method based on parameter estimation and variable
100 selection. The parameter estimation is defined as follows:

$$101 \hat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}} = \arg \min^2 \left\| Y - \sum_{j=1}^p X_j \beta_j \right\|^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j| \quad (1-1)$$

102 In formula (1-1), λ is a regularised non-negative parameter, $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_p)^T$ is the
103 regression coefficient, $X_j = (x_{1j}, x_{2j}, \dots, x_{nj})^T$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ are predictor variables,

104 $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p)^T$ is the predictor matrix, $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n)^T$ is the response

105 variable. $\lambda \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j|$ is called 'l penalty', when λ increases, the lasso model allows the

106 coefficients to approach zero; when $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, the coefficients almost reach zero.

107 The improvement of the adaptive-lasso method is to add different weights to different

108 coefficients, and its expression is defined as:

$$109 \quad \hat{\beta}^{*(n)} = \arg \min \left\| Y - \sum_{j=1}^p X_j \beta_j \right\|^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{w}_j |\beta_j| \quad (1-2)$$

110 In formula (1-2), $\hat{w}_j = \frac{1}{|\hat{\beta}_j|^\gamma} (\gamma > 0)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$, where $\hat{\beta} = (\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_2, \dots, \hat{\beta}_p)^T$ is the

111 coefficient estimated value obtained by the ordinary least squares method. Its weight vector

112 expression is as follows:

$$113 \quad \hat{W} = (\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \dots, \hat{w}_p)^T = \left(\frac{1}{|\hat{\beta}_1|^\gamma}, \frac{1}{|\hat{\beta}_2|^\gamma}, \dots, \frac{1}{|\hat{\beta}_p|^\gamma} \right) = \frac{1}{|\hat{\beta}|^\gamma} \quad (\gamma > 0) \quad (1-3)$$

114 2.3 Adaptive-lasso Estimation of Logistic Regression Models

115 Based on logistic regression, $\hat{\beta}$ is defined as $\hat{\beta} = \arg \min^2 \left(-L(\beta) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j| \right)$, where $L(\beta)$ is

116 its log-likelihood function. When the fasting glucose level of included patients is less than or

117 equal to 6.1mol/L, y_i will be defined as 0; when the fasting glucose level is greater than

118 6.1mol/L, y_i will be defined as 1, then:

$$119 \quad p_i(y_i) = p_i^{y_i} ((1 - p_i)^{1-y_i}) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

120 From this, we can obtain the log-likelihood function of the joint density function for n

$$121 \quad \text{samples as follows: } L(\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i y_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i \log \frac{p_i}{1 - p_i} + \log(1 - p_i) \right)$$

122 Based on logistic regression, the estimated value of lasso can be expressed as follows:

$$123 \quad \hat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}} = - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i \left(\beta_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i x_i \right) - \log \left(1 + \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i x_i \right) \right) \right) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j|$$

124 2.4 Statistical Methods

125 Data were entered using Epidata (Version 3.1), data analysis was performed by R (Version

126 3.5.3), and chi-square test and adaptive lasso-logistic regression were used to analyse the
127 influencing factors of diabetes management. Due to the inconsistency of the dimensions, the
128 data in this article is standardised using $lar()$ in R, so that different eigenvalues have the same
129 scale. Among them, the lasso-logistics regression model was completed by the *glmnet* package
130 in R.

131 **2.5 Model Analysis**

132 From January 2019 to August 2019, the questionnaire survey was conducted among diabetic
133 patients in community hospitals or primary health service centres in Chengdu, Sichuan
134 Province. In terms of sample size, one independent variable of the regression needs at least ten
135 samples to support. A total of 15 independent variables were selected in this study. Considering
136 the replacement of some samples in the sampling, elimination, and poor questionnaire
137 compliance will lead to a reduction in the number of evaluable cases. Therefore, a total of 1,200
138 questionnaires were distributed, and 1,127 valid questionnaires were collected. Participants can
139 exit without giving any reason during the process. No participant withdrew from this study, but
140 73 of the surveys were considered invalid because they were incomplete. The effective
141 response rate was 93.9%. The age range was 28-97 years old. Regarding self-assessment of
142 glycemic management, 32.5% of patients felt satisfied, 59.8% of patients felt generally
143 satisfied, and 6.8% of patients felt not very satisfied, and 6.9% of patients felt dissatisfied (See
144 Table 1).

145 **2.6 Analysis of Influencing Factors of Self-management in Patients with Diabetes**

146 The univariate chi-square test was performed for each categorical variable included in the
147 model and the latest fasting blood glucose (See Table 1). It can be seen that age, education level,
148 main source of income, marital status, average monthly income, medical payment methods
149 (basic medical insurance for residents, basic medical insurance for employee and free medical
150 service), and hospital history were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Table 1 Variables and fasting glucose control

Variable		Proportion (%)	χ^2
Gender	Male (540)	47.90%	0.393
	Female (587)	52.10%	
Educational level	Illiterate or semi-illiterate (106)	9.40%	15.062**
	primary school (395)	35.00%	
	Junior school (337)	29.90%	
	High school (251)	22.20%	
	University and above (38)	3.40%	
Age	18-44 (Youth) (38)	3.40%	14.594**
	45-59 (Middle-aged people) (163)	14.50%	
	60-74 (Younger seniors) (627)	55.60%	
	75 or above (Seniors) (299)	26.50%	
Marriage status	Yes (838)	74.40%	15.304**
	No (289)	25.60%	
Main source of income	Retirement salary (462)	41.00%	12.331**
	Social Security (405)	35.90%	
	Salary income (154)	13.70%	
	Other (106)	9.40%	
Average monthly income	1,000 yuan or less (183)	16.20%	24.073***
	1,000-2,000 yuan (443)	39.30%	
	Over 2,000 yuan (501)	44.40%	
Basic medical insurance for residents	Yes (587)	52.10%	14.274**
	No (540)	47.90%	
Basic medical insurance for employee	Yes (518)	46.00%	13.461**
	No (609)	54.00%	
Free medical service	Yes (39)	3.40%	16.013**
	No (1,088)	96.60%	
Hospital history	Yes (241)	21.40%	13.843**

	No (886)	78.60%	
Self-assessment of glycem management	Satisfied (366)	32.50%	11.89**
	Generally satisfied (674)	59.80%	
	Not very satisfied (77)	6.80%	
	Dissatisfied (10)	0.90%	
Number of follow-up evalua tions by the family doctor team	0 times (16)	1.20%	
	1 time (94)	8.3%	13.181**
	2 times and above (1,017)	90.50%	
Voluntary participation in community blood glucose measurement	Yes (1083)	96.10%	
	No (44)	3.90%	8.93**

152 *: $p < 0.1$; **: $p < 0.05$.

153 Notes: 1) Hospital history means as long as the patient self-reports that they have been hospitalised once, the
154 answer is yes, otherwise the answer is no; 2) Self-assessment of glycem
155 self-evaluation of patients and their satisfaction with blood glucose management; 3) The number of follow-up
156 evaluations by the family doctor team refers to the number of family doctor follow-ups arranged by the community
157 health service centre during the period from January 2019 to August 2018; 4) Voluntary participation in
158 community blood glucose measurement refers to the determination of patient's blood glucose and other
159 biochemical information regularly held by the community health service centre, and whether the patient comes
160 voluntarily.

161 **2.7 Adaptive-lasso Logistic Regression Analysis of Influencing Factors of Diabetes Self-** 162 **management**

163 Due to the inconsistency of the dimensions, the data in this study was standardised by using lar
164 () in R, so that different feature values had the same scale. This study adopted the latest fasting
165 blood glucose measurement (0 or 1) as the dependent variable. The following factors that may
166 affect the management of diabetes were assigned as independent variables (See Table 2). The
167 logistic regression model of adaptive-lasso variable selection was introduced [4], and the
168 coefficients of each selected variable were estimated to analyse the factors affecting diabetes

169 management. The Lasso-logistics regression model of this study is completed by the glmnet
 170 package in R. The relationship between the model error and was obtained through cross-
 171 validation. The number of folding times was eight times. The selected variables and parameter
 172 estimates were shown in Table 3.

173 Table 2 Variable assignment

Variable	Symbol	Assignment
Latest fasting blood glucose	Y	Measured value <6.1: Y = 0; Measured value > 6.1: Y = 1
Age	X ₁	0-17: X ₁ =0; 18-44: X ₂ =1; 45-59: X ₃ =2; 60-74: X ₄ =3; 75 and above: X ₅ =4
Educational level	X ₂	Illiterate or semi-illiterate: X ₂ = 0; Primary school: X ₂ = 1; Junior school: X ₂ = 2; High school: X ₂ = 3; University and above: X ₂ = 4;
Marriage status	X ₃	Yes: X ₃ =0; No: X ₃ =1
Main source of income	X ₄	Retirement salary: X ₄ = 0; Social security: X ₄ = 1; Salary income: X ₄ = 2; others: X ₄ = 3
Average monthly income	X ₅	1000 yuan or less: X ₅ =0; 1000-2000 yuan: X ₅ =1; Over 2000 yuan: X ₅ =2
Free medical service	X ₆	Yes: X ₆ =0; No: X ₆ =1
Basic medical insurance for residents	X ₇	Yes: X ₇ =0; No: X ₇ =1
Basic medical insurance for employee	X ₈	Yes: X ₈ =0; No: X ₈ =1
Hospital history	X ₉	Yes: X ₉ =0; No: X ₉ =1
Gender	X ₁₀	Male: X ₁₀ =0; Female: X ₁₀ =1
Self-assessment of glycemc management	X ₁₁	Satisfied: X ₁₁ = 0; Generally satisfied: X ₁₁ = 1; Not very satisfied: X ₁₁ = 2; Dissatisfied: X ₁₁ = 3
Number of follow-up evaluations by the family doctor team	X ₁₂	$X_{12} \in N^+$

Number of health consultations and free consultations	X_{13}	$X_{13} \in N^+$
Voluntary participation in community blood glucose measurement	X_{14}	Yes: $X_{14}=0$; No: $X_{14}=1$

174 Notes: 1) Self-assessment of glycemic management is a relatively subjective self-evaluation of patients and their
175 satisfaction with blood glucose management; 2) The number of follow-up evaluations by the family doctor team
176 refers to the number of family doctor follow-ups arranged by the community health service centre during the
177 period from January 2019 to August 2018; 3) The number of health consultations and free consultations refers to
178 the number of times patients participated in health consultations and free consultations organised by community
179 health service centres; 4) Voluntary participation in community blood glucose measurement refers to the
180 determination of patient's blood glucose and other biochemical information regularly held by the community
181 health service centre, and whether the patient comes voluntarily.

182 Table 3 Parameter estimation

Variable	Adaptive-lasso	Full-variable	Ridge
	logistic	logistic	logistic
Intercept	-2.092	-2.797	-2.334
Age			
18-44 years old	0.155	0.139	0.094
45-59 years old	0.683	0.703	0.625
60-74 years old	0.654	0.701	0.601
Educational level			
Illiterate or semi-literate	0.000	-0.909	-0.423
primary school	0.000	0.549	0.434
Junior school	0.139	0.119	0.087
High school	0.748	0.779	0.754
Marital status	-0.412	-0.438	-0.432
Main source of income			
Retirement salary	-0.801	-0.824	-0.820
Social Security	-0.991	-0.995	-0.993
Salary income	0.000	-0.540	0.000

Average monthly income			
1000 yuan or less	0.000	-0.704	0.384
1000-2000 yuan	0.073	0.068	0.067
Medical payment methods			
Free medical service	0.427	0.206	0.452
Basic medical insurance for residents	0.637	0.852	0.689
Basic medical insurance for employee	0.000	0.689	0.000
Hospital history			
	0.584	1.489	0.761
Number of follow-up evaluations by the family doctor team			
	0.737	0.724	0.692
Number of health consultations and free consultations			
	1.049	0.933	0.847
Latest fasting blood glucose			
	0.000	0.432	0.323
BIC	2062	2349	2312
AIC	1981	2023	2013

183 Notes: 1) Hospital history means as long as the patient self-reports that they have been hospitalised once, the
184 answer is yes, otherwise the answer is no; 2) Medical payment methods include Basic medical insurance for
185 residents, Basic medical insurance for employee, and free medical service; 3) Self-assessment of glycemie
186 management is a relatively subjective self-evaluation of patients and their satisfaction with blood glucose
187 management; 4) The number of follow-up evaluations by the family doctor team refers to the number of family
188 doctor follow-ups arranged by the community health service centre during the period from January 2019 to August
189 2018.

190 Comparing the three models from Table 3, it was found that the adaptive-lasso logistic model
191 was more significant in selecting variables, and the model was more concise. The Adaptive-
192 lasso logistic model had the smallest AIC and BIC criteria, and the full-variable logistic model
193 had the largest AIC and BIC criteria.

194 **2.8 Comparison of Model Prediction Accuracy**

195 To predict the results of diabetes management, the established full-variable logistic model,
196 adaptive-lasso logistic model and ridge logistic model were used. Table 4 shown the prediction

197 accuracy of the models with different proportions of the training set. The prediction accuracy
 198 of the full-variable logistic model and the adaptive-lasso logistic model was slightly higher
 199 than that of the ridge logistic model (See Table 4). However, the prediction accuracy of the
 200 three models was not significantly different, and the reason for the small difference in accuracy
 201 might relate to data collection. But only from the time required to collect data, the running time
 202 of the adaptive-lasso logistic model was less than the prediction time of the full-variable
 203 logistic model. When the prediction accuracy of the three models was close, or there was not
 204 much difference, from the perspective of time cost, the adaptive-lasso logistic model was better
 205 than the other two models.

206 Table 4. Prediction accuracy of the models

Model category	Proportion of training set		
	95%	90%	80%
Adaptive-lasso logistic model	61.34%	61.89%	62.76%
Full-variable logistic model	61.52%	62.01%	62.50%
Ridge logistic model	60.21%	61.48%	62.18%

207

208 3. Results and Discussion

209 3.1 Community management of people with diabetes affected by multiple factors

210 Community diabetes management in the are complex and are affected by many variables.
 211 Adaptive-lasso logistic model, full-variable logistic model and ridge logistic model were used
 212 to screen variables, and then age, education, marital status, main source of income, monthly
 213 average income, basic medical insurance for employees, and whether they have been
 214 hospitalised were all included in the above three models. It indicated that these factors were
 215 related to self-management factors in patients with diabetes. Our findings indicated that the
 216 effects of age, marital status, and hospital history on self-management of patients with diabetes
 217 were significant, this result was consistent with Lian (2019) and Bansal (2018) [16, 17]. It also

218 found that the younger the diabetic patients are, the more rigorous they are. As age increases,
219 the elderly need to strengthen their self-management of diabetes [13, 16]. Besides, educational
220 level [8, 14] was an influential factor in community management of diabetes, and the higher
221 the educational level, the better the self-glycemic control. In terms of public medical care, we
222 also found that compared with those who did not receive public medical care, those who had
223 public medical care had a slight advantage in blood glucose management. Besides, patients
224 with a history of hospitalisation were better at controlling blood glucose than patients without
225 a history of hospitalisation.

226 **3.2 Adaptive-lasso logistic model can be used to analyse the influencing factors of** 227 **community management in diabetic patients**

228 The parameter estimation of the adaptive-lasso logistic model was both unbiased and has the
229 advantages of ridge regression and subset selection [13]. In this study, the adaptive-lasso
230 algorithm was introduced into a logistic regression model to analyse the influencing factors
231 among people with diabetes and to evaluate community diabetes management. According to
232 the authors' knowledge, using this model to discuss the influencing factors of blood glucose
233 management from the perspective of community diabetes management has not been reported.
234 The adaptive-lasso algorithm was used in the logistic regression model to achieve the purpose
235 of filtering variables and simplifying the model in this study. Based on the cross-sectional
236 survey data, comparing the fitted full-variable logistic model and the ridge logistic model, the
237 AIC and BIC criteria of the adaptive-lasso logistic model were the smallest; when making
238 predictions, the time cost of the adaptive-lasso logistic model was the least. Through analysis
239 and comparison, the adaptive-lasso logistic model was more concise than the variables selected
240 by full-variable logistic, and the model was more compressed. The adaptive-lasso logistic
241 model considered the variables that affect diabetes self-management included age, education
242 level, the main source of income, marital status, average monthly income, free medical service,

243 basic medical insurance for residents, hospital history, number of follow-up evaluations by
244 family doctor team, voluntary participation in community blood glucose measurement.
245 Community intervention and intensive management measures can significantly improve blood
246 glucose management among patients with diabetes. In particular, increasing the number of
247 follow-up evaluations, health consultations and free consultations by the family doctor team
248 will significantly affect the blood glucose management effect of diabetic patients, our results
249 were consistent with the results of Aponte (2017) [4]. It seems that practical strategies to
250 improve diabetes self-management based on the community include social support for family
251 members, health cares, and community members, and local free or low-cost diabetes education
252 materials and courses [18]. However, this study also had some limitations. The samples were
253 mainly from three communities, the sample size was relatively small, and the prediction
254 accuracy of the three models was not much different, which may be related to the insufficient
255 sample size. Moreover, the survey of this study could not include lifestyle influencing factors
256 such as physical activity and diet, considering the target population was based on the
257 community setting.

258 **4. Conclusions**

259 The adaptive-lasso logistic model can be used in the analysis of community management
260 factors for diabetes. It can accurately screen out the factors that affect diabetes management.
261 The obtained model can better explain the indicators of these influencing factors and provide
262 advice for primary care settings and communities. Diabetes management is affected by many
263 factors, and relevant knowledge and education should be strengthened for elderly, non-married,
264 low-educated, low-income people, diabetic patients without public medical care and no history
265 of hospitalisation. Moreover, the number of follow-up evaluations of family doctor teams and
266 the frequency of health consultations and free consultations should be increased to achieve
267 optimal management of diabetes based on community.

268 **5. Declarations**

269 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

270 This study was an observational study obtained consent from the ethics committee of Chengdu
271 University of Traditional Chinese Medicine. All participants signed an informed consent form,
272 and they volunteered to withdraw from the questionnaire process at any time without reason.
273 For illiterate and semi-illiterate participants, data were collected by investigators reading
274 informed consent and reading questionnaires. Data collectors were not involved in the data
275 analysis process to avoid bias.

276 **Consent for publication**

277 All participants agreed that we use the collected data for academic publications.

278 **Availability of data and materials**

279 All data analysed during this study are included in this manuscript.

280 **Competing Interests**

281 All authors of the study stated that there were no conflicts of interest.

282 **Funding**

283 This work was supported by the Primary Health Care Development Research Center of Sichuan
284 Province (grant number SWFZ17-Y-33) and Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese
285 Medicine (grant number ZRQN2019010) hold by Wei Lin. Chengdu University of Traditional
286 Chinese Medicine (grant number ZRQN2019009) hold by Mingyue Zheng.

287 **Authors' contributions**

288 Wei Lin and Mingyue Zheng conceptualised the study, drafted the initial manuscript, reviewed
289 and revised the manuscript. Jing Zhou, Zejuan Huang and Zhiqing Cao, Yang Tian collected
290 data, carried out the initial analyses. Wei Lin and Mingyue Zheng mainly discussed and edited
291 the manuscript. Wei Lin, Mingyue Zheng, Jiawei Li designed the data collection instruments,
292 coordinated and supervised data collection, and critically reviewed the manuscript. All authors

293 approved the final manuscript as submitted and agree to be responsible for all aspects of the
294 work.

295 **Acknowledgements**

296 We are very grateful for the support from the doctors and nurses of the community health
297 service centre during the questionnaire distribution and data collection process from the Lion
298 Mountain Community, Longzhou Road Community, and Lianxin Community in Chengdu,
299 Sichuan Province.

300 **Abbreviations**

301 AIC: Akaike information criterion

302 BIC: Bayesian Information Criterion

303 **References**

- 304 1. Bommer, C., et al., *Global Economic Burden of Diabetes in Adults: Projections From*
305 *2015 to 2030*. *Diabetes Care*, 2018. **41**(5): p. 963-970.
- 306 2. Pamungkas, R.A. and K. Chamroonsawasdi, *HbA1c reduction and weight-loss*
307 *outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of community-based intervention*
308 *trials among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus*. *International Journal of Diabetes in*
309 *Developing Countries*, 2019. **39**(2): p. 394-407.
- 310 3. Little, T.V., et al., *Community health worker interventions for Latinos with type 2*
311 *diabetes: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials*. *Curr Diab Rep*, 2014.
312 **14**(12): p. 558.
- 313 4. Aponte, J., et al., *Health effectiveness of community health workers as a diabetes self-*
314 *management intervention*. *Diab Vasc Dis Res*, 2017. **14**(4): p. 316-326.
- 315 5. Davies, M.J., et al., *A community based primary prevention programme for type 2*
316 *diabetes integrating identification and lifestyle intervention for prevention: the Let's*
317 *Prevent Diabetes cluster randomised controlled trial*. *Prev Med*, 2016. **84**: p. 48-56.

- 318 6. Murphy, M.E., et al., *Improving risk factor management for patients with poorly*
319 *controlled type 2 diabetes: a systematic review of healthcare interventions in primary*
320 *care and community settings*. *BMJ Open*, 2017. **7**(8): p. e015135.
- 321 7. Omar, S.M., et al., *Prevalence, risk factors, and glycaemic control of type 2 diabetes*
322 *mellitus in eastern Sudan: a community-based study*. *Ther Adv Endocrinol Metab*, 2019.
323 **10**: p. 2042018819860071.
- 324 8. Siegel, K.R., et al., *Prevalence of Major Behavioral Risk Factors for Type 2 Diabetes*.
325 *Diabetes Care*, 2018. **41**(5): p. 1032-1039.
- 326 9. Yin, T., et al., *Socioeconomic status moderates the association between patient*
327 *satisfaction with community health service and self-management behaviors in patients*
328 *with type 2 diabetes: A cross-sectional survey in China*. *Medicine (Baltimore)*, 2019.
329 **98**(22): p. e15849.
- 330 10. Community Preventive Services Task Force. Electronic address, y.c.g., *Team-Based*
331 *Care to Improve Type 2 Diabetes Management: Recommendation of the Community*
332 *Preventive Services Task Force*. *Am J Prev Med*, 2019. **57**(1): p. e27-e29.
- 333 11. Tibshirani R. *Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso*. *Journal of the Royal*
334 *Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*. 1996;**58**(1):267-88.
- 335 12. Jian Huang, S. Ma, and C. Zhang, *Adaptive Lasso for Sparse High-dimensional*
336 *Regression Models*. *Statistica Sinica* 2008. **18**, 1603-1618.
- 337 13. Sun M, Tian M. *A Class of Derivative-Free CG Projection Methods for Nonsmooth*
338 *Equations with an Application to the LASSO Problem*. *Bulletin of the Iranian*
339 *Mathematical Society*. 2019:1-23.
- 340 14. Shukor, S., et al., *Quantitative assessment of LASSO probe assembly and long-read*
341 *multiplexed cloning*. *BMC Biotechnol*, 2019. **19**(1): p. 50.
- 342 15. Jung, A. and N. Tran, *Localized Linear Regression in Networked Data*. 2019.

- 343 16. Lian, J., et al., *Long-term cost-effectiveness of a Patient Empowerment Programme for*
344 *type 2 diabetes mellitus in primary care*. *Diabetes Obes Metab*, 2019. **21**(1): p. 73-83.
- 345 17. Bansal, V., et al., *Inpatient diabetes management by specialized diabetes team versus*
346 *primary service team in non-critical care units: impact on 30-day readmission rate and*
347 *hospital cost*. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care*, 2018. **6**(1): p. e000460.
- 348 18. Purnell, T.S., et al., *Perceived Barriers and Potential Strategies to Improve Self-*
349 *Management Among Adults with Type 2 Diabetes: A Community-Engaged Research*
350 *Approach*. *Patient*, 2016. **9**(4): p. 349-58.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [STROBEchecklistcrosssectionalWeiLin.doc](#)
- [InformedConsentforDiabetesCommunityQuestionnaire.docx](#)