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Study Goal

• Establish the rate of diabetic foot exam by resident PCPs (primary care physicians) in our teaching clinic.
• Outline the efficacy of various changes implemented to improve the rate of screening.

Background

• The lifetime risk of a foot ulcer in diabetic patients is as high as 34% \(^1\).
• Diabetic foot disease represents a spectrum of complications including superficial ulcer formation to deep osteomyelitis caused by vascular and neuropathic involvement.

Methods

• This is a mixed-methods study.
• The study population included a total of 121 adults with diabetes (confirmed by HbA1c) between June 2021 - March 2022 in outpatient clinic.
• They were divided into two groups: pre-intervention (52) and post-intervention (69).
• The health records of the control group (pre-intervention phase of 3 months) were reviewed retrospectively. Intervention phase (3 months) included measures to increase awareness for diabetic foot examination amongst the resident PCPs. In the post-intervention phase (4 months), we evaluated the effects of these changes on the rate of screening prospectively.
• Comparison between the two groups was made using the chi-square calculation. We followed the PDSA cycle (Plan - Do - Study - Act).

Results

• The frequency of diabetic foot examination completed in the pre-intervention group is 44.2% (23/52) compared to 65.2% (45/69) in the post-intervention group (Fig. 1).
• The percentage of overdue examinations significantly decreased in the post-intervention phase [34.8% (24/69)] compared to the pre-intervention phase [55.8% (29/52) \(P = 0.034\)] (Fig. 2)
• The average age of the patients in the study was 60 years and the majority of the demographic population was African American (70%).

Discussion

• The rate of diabetic foot screening increased significantly in the post-intervention group by implementing the following measures:
  1. Checking care gaps via electronic health record regularly
  2. Displaying "catchy leaflets" at workstations (Fig. 3)
  3. Implementing "no shoe rule"
  4. Providing monofilament by staff while rooming diabetic patients
• The limitation of this study is the small sample size and a single institution.

Conclusion

• We found a significant increase in the screening rates of diabetic foot exam in our teaching clinic by conducting educational didactics and visual reminders to learners.
• We are planning to re-evaluate the rate in 12 months to monitor the long-term efficacy of our approach.
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