behavior. Third, the use of branded therapies may be proportionately greater in our sample of individuals, who are privately insured, than in the general population. Finally, our outcome measures may not be sufficiently sensitive to detect benefits of the disclosure laws.

Overall, our results suggest that the Physician Payments Sunshine Provision in the federal health care law may have a limited effect on prescribing and on expenditures.
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**Characteristics of “Complex” Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus According to Their Primary Care Physicians**

Despite recent trends toward improved risk factor control, most patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus still do not achieve all evidence-based management goals, suggesting that new approaches are needed to further improve the quality of diabetes care. Patient complexity is a concept that is defined to describe the multiple factors that contribute to the challenges associated with clinical care. Because primary care physicians (PCPs) have a unique perspective on type 2 diabetes management, we hypothesized that greater insight into PCP-defined complexity among patients with type 2 diabetes could help inform strategies for improving diabetes primary care.

Methods. We conducted a cross-sectional analysis of PCP-defined patient complexity by asking 40 PCPs from the Massachusetts General Primary Care Practice-Based Research Network, Boston, to review randomly generated lists of 120 of their own patients and to designate which of these patients “in their view” they considered complex. Among the patients with type 2 diabetes, we examined the relative impact of diabetes-related vs other more general medical conditions on PCP-defined complexity. For each comorbid diagnosis that was significantly associated with complexity in univariate analysis, we constructed a separate logistic regression model and reported the relative odds of PCP-defined complexity after adjusting for age, sex, glycemic control, and patient clustering by PCP. The study was approved by the institutional review board of Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston.

Results. The PCPs reviewed 327 patients with type 2 diabetes (mean [SD] number of patients per PCP, 8.4 [5.1]; range, 2-25 patients per PCP) and designated 68.2% of these patients as complex. The PCP-defined complex patients with diabetes were 3 years older and more often female than non-complex patients with diabetes but had similar race/
HbA1c levels were controlled for, the likelihood of being patients with diabetes. In separate models, after age, sex, and take inhibitors (33.6% vs 14.4%; azepines (30.0% vs 13.5%; therapy (36.3% vs 18.3%; higher prevalence of comorbid conditions than noncom-

Comment. The PCPs who reviewed a randomly selected list of their own patients designated just over two-thirds of their patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus as complex. Prevalence and management of the “core triad” of glycemia, blood pressure, and dyslipidemia did not appear to account for this complexity (with the exception of insulin use), which suggests that dyslipidemia and hypertension do not add substantially to the complexity of patients with type 2 diabetes. These findings indicate that—with the exception of facilitating insulin prescription—we may be reaching a “ceiling” on how much more benefit can be obtained in diabetes-specific quality improvement interventions.

In contrast, significant differences were seen in the prevalence of conditions such as atrial fibrillation, osteoarthritis, depression, and anxiety, conditions that may interfere with either the therapeutic relationship or the self-management activities that are necessary to achieve good diabetes control, suggesting that substantial advances in the quality of diabetes primary care may require focusing resources on these other comorbid conditions that complicate diabetes care.

The PCP-identified complex patients had significantly more outpatient clinical care contact during the previous year. Therefore, the patients in our study had ample opportunity to engage with the primary care system. Further improvements in diabetes management may thus require a greater emphasis on comprehensive, patient-centered rather than diabetes-specific interventions.
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which enrolled more than 18 000 patients with atrial fi-

treated by the results of the landmark Randomized Evalu-

tion of patients receiving dabigatran compared with warfarin was

concluded. Quantitative conclusions should always be taken into account before defi-

creased risk of myocardial infarction (MI) or acute

coronary syndrome (ACS). Even though meta-analyses

gested that dabigatran therapy is associated with in-

sidered together. Thus, the relative risk estimate was highly

the most practical and statistically not significant.

In conclusion, the meta-analysis by Uchino and Her-
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We appreciate the comments from Correia and Lopes. We acknowledge in the “Comment” section of our article that the Randomized Evaluation of Long Term Anticoagulant Therapy (RE-LY) Trial had a large impact on our study, comprising 59% of the cohort and 74% of the events. In all of the 7 studies, myocardial infarction (MI) and acute coronary syndrome (ACS) were secondary safety outcomes, and limitations in interpreting secondary outcomes are true across the studies. Given the scarcity of MI and ACS events and the imbalance between trial arms, performing a Mantel-Haenszel fixed-effects model for meta-analysis is a better method than a random-effects model.

The risk derived from the 6 remaining studies is reported by Correia and Lopes to have an odds ratio of 1.12 (95% CI, 0.66-1.90). This does not exclude an increased risk. We found a consistently higher risk of MI and ACS with 12 000 more patients and 25% more events than the RE-LY Trial alone. We believe that our consistent results using different meth-

ods and models are not methodological artifacts.
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