Diabetes Audit Results, Portland Area, 2004-2013

Site-Specific Trends

The following report contains information from your program’s annual diabetes audit submission to the Indian Health Service over the past few years. The report was prepared for your site by the Western Tribal Diabetes Project at the Northwest Portland Area Indian Health Board, which receives Special Diabetes Program for Indians (SDPI) funding to assist Northwest tribes in managing their diabetes information. If you have any questions about the report, or if you would like this report in Excel format, please contact the Western Tribal Diabetes Project at wtdp@npaihb.org or (800) 862-5497.

Notes:
• Due to rounding, charts will occasionally not add up to 100%.
• Data are presented by the year in which the data were submitted. Most likely, the patient care reflected in the audit was delivered in the previous year. For example, the columns 2011 in these charts reflect care that was delivered in 2010.
• Blank spaces have been left for some indicators in years when information was not reported.
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**Gender of Patients with Diabetes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 (n=3877)</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (n=6043)</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (n=6343)</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (n=6308)</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (n=6400)</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age of Patients with Diabetes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>&lt;15 years</th>
<th>15-44 years</th>
<th>45-64 years</th>
<th>65 years and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 (n=3877)</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (n=6043)</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (n=6343)</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (n=6308)</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (n=6400)</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Diabetes Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 (n=3877)</th>
<th>2010 (n=6043)</th>
<th>2011 (n=6343)</th>
<th>2012 (n=6308)</th>
<th>2013 (n=6400)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>98 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duration of Diabetes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 (n=3877)</th>
<th>2010 (n=6043)</th>
<th>2011 (n=6343)</th>
<th>2012 (n=6308)</th>
<th>2013 (n=6400)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis date not recorded</td>
<td>15 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to &lt;10 years</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A blank indicates a category not reported on in a given year; FY = Fiscal Year, the year in which data were submitted.
Notes

Body Mass Index (BMI) is calculated using the last weight in the audit year recorded on a non-prenatal visit, along with the most recent height measured since the patient’s 19th birthday. The formula is

\[
\text{BMI} = \frac{\text{weight (lbs)}}{\text{height (inches)}} \times 703
\]

Before 2005, overweight and obesity were reported from the audit using cutoffs from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). Women were considered overweight with a BMI of 27.3 or higher and obese with BMI 32.3 or higher. Men were overweight at a BMI of 27.8 and obese at 31.1 or higher. These results are still calculated from audit data but are not presented here for the sake of clarity in the chart.

The bars in the graph reflect current cutoffs, which are the same for men and women. Overweight is defined as a BMI of 25 or higher and obesity is 30 or higher. Using these standards, more patients are considered overweight than with the older standards.
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**Hemoglobin A1c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 (n=3877)</th>
<th>2010 (n=6043)</th>
<th>2011 (n=6343)</th>
<th>2012 (n=6308)</th>
<th>2013 (n=6400)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c missing</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c 10.0 or higher</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c 7.0-9.9</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c &lt;7</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c ≤6.5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Hemoglobin A1C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 (n=5660)</th>
<th>2011 (n=5934)</th>
<th>2012 (n=5860)</th>
<th>2013 (n=6004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean HbA1c</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI upper limit</td>
<td>7.867</td>
<td>7.881</td>
<td>7.866</td>
<td>7.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI lower limit</td>
<td>7.818</td>
<td>7.842</td>
<td>7.760</td>
<td>7.889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A blank indicates a category not reported on in a given year; FY = Fiscal Year, the year in which data were submitted.
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**Before 2010:** Based on the average of the last 3 blood pressure measurements taken within the audit year. If <3 measurements were taken, blood pressure control is undetermined.

**In 2010:** Based on the average of the last 2 or 3 blood pressure measurements taken within the audit year. If <2 measurements were taken, blood pressure control is undetermined.

### Average Blood Pressure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean systolic BP</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>95% CI upper limit</th>
<th>95% CI lower limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>129.80</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>129.952</td>
<td>129.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>130.78</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>130.922</td>
<td>130.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>130.35</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>130.701</td>
<td>130.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>130.65</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>131.004</td>
<td>130.294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean diastolic BP</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>95% CI upper limit</th>
<th>95% CI lower limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>76.87</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>76.975</td>
<td>76.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>76.87</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>76.960</td>
<td>76.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>76.79</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>77.031</td>
<td>76.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>76.99</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>77.230</td>
<td>76.755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tobacco Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tobacco use not documented</th>
<th>Not a current tobacco user</th>
<th>Current tobacco user</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 (n=3877)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (n=6043)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (n=6343)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (n=6308)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (n=6400)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The 'n' in this graph refers to the total number of tobacco users included in the audit.

Tobacco Cessation Referrals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Counsel rate/users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 (n=1202)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (n=1960)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (n=2268)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (n=2208)</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (n=2240)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The 'n' in this graph refers to the total number of tobacco users included in the audit.

A blank indicates a category not reported on in a given year; FY = Fiscal Year, the year in which data were submitted.
Notes

"Diet and exercise alone" is the default selection in RPMS. If no records are found in the patient's chart of medications prescribed or dispensed in the last six months of the audit year, the patient is classified as being treated with "diet and exercise alone." The percentages for this category may be inflated if patients did not refill their prescriptions at the clinic in the last six months of the audit year. You can enter medication reviews as historical RXs so that the audit report will reflect those prescriptions.
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**ACE Inhibitor or ARB Prescriptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use in patients with overt proteinuria</td>
<td>74 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td>76 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use in patients with known hypertension</td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td>76 %</td>
<td>76 %</td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td>75 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use in overall patient population</td>
<td>63 %</td>
<td>69 %</td>
<td>66 %</td>
<td>67 %</td>
<td>68 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE or ARB use unknown</td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Antiplatelet Therapy**

Among patients 30 or over (until 2009), 40 or over (in 2010), and for men over 50 or women over 60 (2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspirin or antiplatelet prescription</td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td>74 %</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
<td>76 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No antiplatelet prescription</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denominators (n=) are not displayed on this page. These charts represent various subsets of patients, and not the entire population included in the audit.

A blank indicates a category not reported on in a given year; FY = Fiscal Year, the year in which data were submitted.
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**Annual Examinations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foot Exam</th>
<th>Eye Exam</th>
<th>Dental Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 (n=3877)</td>
<td>57 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (n=6043)</td>
<td>56 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (n=6343)</td>
<td>55 %</td>
<td>49 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (n=6308)</td>
<td>57 %</td>
<td>51 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (n=6400)</td>
<td>56 %</td>
<td>55 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eye Exam: A dilated fundoscopic exam conducted by a primary care provider, optometrist or ophthalmologist, or fundoscopic photographs reviewed by an ophthalmologist.

Foot Exam: An examination of the feet that includes neurologic and vascular evaluation as well as visual inspection for deformities or lesions.

Dental Exam: The dental examination is one that includes evaluation of the teeth (if present), gingiva and mucosal surfaces.

**Diabetes-Related Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Diet education, any provider</th>
<th>Diet education, RD only</th>
<th>Exercise education</th>
<th>Other diabetes education</th>
<th>Any of the listed topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 (n=3877)</td>
<td>51 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>51 %</td>
<td>67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (n=6043)</td>
<td>45 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (n=6343)</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
<td>69 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (n=6308)</td>
<td>46 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>69 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (n=6400)</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>61 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Immunizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Flu Vaccine - yearly (%)</th>
<th>Pneumovax - once (%)</th>
<th>Tetanus/Diphtheria - 10 years (%)</th>
<th>Heb B Series (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagnosed Depression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Depression as active diagnosis (%)</th>
<th>Depression NOT an active diagnosis (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Depression and depression screening were added to the audit in 2005.

A blank indicates a category not reported on in a given year; FY = Fiscal Year, the year in which data were submitted.
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**Depression Screening among Patients without Active Depression Diagnoses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010 (n=4168)</th>
<th>2011 (n=4483)</th>
<th>2012 (n=4479)</th>
<th>2013 (n=4544)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening among patients WITHOUT active diagnosis of depression</td>
<td>57 %</td>
<td>61 %</td>
<td>69 %</td>
<td>73 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Depression and depression screening were added to the audit in FY2005.

**Patients with Hypertension or Elevated Blood Creatinine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004 (n=3877)</th>
<th>2010 (n=6043)</th>
<th>2011 (n=6343)</th>
<th>2012 (n=6308)</th>
<th>2013 (n=6400)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>67 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>82 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatinine ≥2.0mg/dl</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patient has "known hypertension" if hypertension is on the problem list or the patient has had at least 3 visits with a diagnosis of hypertension.
Urinalysis results for 2008 exclude non-quantitative tests (e.g., dipstick) so cannot be compared to other years' data. 2009 data were also collected using different definitions than before. Estimated GFR was added in 2008.

Urinalysis results for 2008 exclude non-quantitative tests (e.g., dipstick) so cannot be compared to other years' data. 2009 data were also collected using different definitions than before. Estimated GFR was added in 2008.

A blank indicates a category not reported on in a given year; FY = Fiscal Year, the year in which data were submitted.
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Cholesterol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not tested</th>
<th>High (240 mg/dl or more)</th>
<th>Borderline (200-239 g/dl)</th>
<th>Desirable (&lt;200 mg/dl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 (n=3877)</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (n=6043)</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
<td>59 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 (n=6343)</td>
<td>22 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (n=6308)</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>59 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-HDL Cholesterol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-HDL no test or result</th>
<th>Non-HDL &gt;190</th>
<th>Non-HDL 160-190</th>
<th>Non-HDL 130-159</th>
<th>Non-HDL &lt;130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013 (n=6400)</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>37 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Low-Density Lipoprotein (LDL) Cholesterol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004 (n=3877)</th>
<th>2010 (n=6043)</th>
<th>2011 (n=6343)</th>
<th>2012 (n=6308)</th>
<th>2013 (n=6400)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not tested</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>22 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL &gt;160</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>4 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL 130-160 mg/dl</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL 100-129 mg/dl</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirable (&lt;100 mg/dl)</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
<td>49 %</td>
<td>49 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average LDL Cholesterol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010 (n=4836)</th>
<th>2011 (n=5045)</th>
<th>2012 (n=5015)</th>
<th>2013 (n=5186)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean LDL</td>
<td>96.64</td>
<td>93.78</td>
<td>94.05</td>
<td>95.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI upper limit</td>
<td>97.053</td>
<td>94.112</td>
<td>95.004</td>
<td>95.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI lower limit</td>
<td>96.227</td>
<td>93.441</td>
<td>93.100</td>
<td>94.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A blank indicates a category not reported on in a given year; FY = Fiscal Year, the year in which data were submitted.
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### Diabetes Audit Results, Portland Area, 2004-2013

#### High-Density Lipoprotein (HDL) Cholesterol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004 (n=3877)</th>
<th>2010 (n=6043)</th>
<th>2011 (n=6343)</th>
<th>2012 (n=6308)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not tested</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL &lt;35 mg/dl</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL 35-45 mg/dl</td>
<td>24 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>27 %</td>
<td>27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL 46-55 mg/dl</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL &gt;55</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average HDL Cholesterol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010 (n=4248)</th>
<th>2011 (n=4383)</th>
<th>2012 (n=4358)</th>
<th>2013 (n=4328)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean HDL</td>
<td>44.77</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>44.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI upper limit</td>
<td>44.940</td>
<td>45.529</td>
<td>45.692</td>
<td>45.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI lower limit</td>
<td>44.604</td>
<td>45.237</td>
<td>44.910</td>
<td>44.604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Triglycerides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TG ≤400 mg/dl</th>
<th>TG &gt;400 mg/dl</th>
<th>Not tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Triglyceride Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean triglycerides</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>95% CI upper limit</th>
<th>95% CI lower limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>225.32</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>229.119</td>
<td>221.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>221.50</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>223.770</td>
<td>219.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>217.56</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>223.138</td>
<td>211.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>217.96</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>223.500</td>
<td>212.412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A blank indicates a category not reported on in a given year; FY = Fiscal Year, the year in which data were submitted.
Diabetes Audit Results, Portland Area, 2004-2013

For the first measure, the following criteria have been met: Hemoglobin A1c < 8.0, LDL < 100, BP <140/<90. For the second measure, these are records with both an eGFR and a quantitative urine protein test.
2013 Diabetes Audit: Dates of Service Jan 1 - Dec 31, 2012

This information is for the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portland Area (n=6400 patients)</th>
<th>All IHS (n=105626 patients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)</td>
<td>105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following report contains information from your clinic’s Annual IHS Diabetes Audit submission. It also includes summary data from all reporting tribal, IHS and urban facilities in the Portland Area. The audit information is displayed side by side so that you can see how your site compares to the overall Portland Area. If you have any questions about the report, please contact the Western Tribal Diabetes Project at (800) 862-5497.

Who is this report about?
Patients identified by local Diabetes Program staff as having type 1 or type 2 diabetes and part of the active patient load, with at least one primary care visit in the calendar year. Only American Indian and Alaska Native patients are included in the audit.

Active Patients with Diabetes in the 2013 IHS Diabetes Audit
Portland Area and Portland Area Sites

Labels show total numbers of active register patients
*The chart audit performed in 2013 covers services delivered in 2012*
2013 Diabetes Audit: Dates of Service Jan 1 - Dec 31, 2012

This information is for the following groups:

- **Portland Area** (n=6400 patients)
  - 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)
- **All IHS** (n=105626 patients)
  - 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Gender of Patients with Diabetes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46 %</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>56 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Distribution of Patients with Diabetes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15 years</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-44 years</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>51 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and older</td>
<td>29 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This information is for the following groups:

**Portland Area (n=6400 patients)**
- 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

**All IHS (n=105626 patients)**
- 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Type of Diabetes Diagnosed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Diabetes</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>98 %</td>
<td>98 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Duration of Diabetes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>49 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td>38 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis date not recorded</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information is for the following groups:

Portland Area (n=6400 patients)
6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

All IHS (n=105626 patients)
105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Weight (Body Mass Index)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal (BMI &lt; 25.0)</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight (BMI 25.0-25.9)</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obese (BMI 30.0 or above)</td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td>68 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height or weight missing</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hemoglobin A1C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c &lt; 7.0</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c 7.0 - 9.9</td>
<td>37 %</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c ≥ 10.0</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbA1c no test or result</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This information is for the following groups:

**Portland Area (n=6400 patients)**
6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

**All IHS (n=105626 patients)**
105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Blood Pressure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal BP control (&lt;120/&lt;70)</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target (120/70 - &lt;130/&lt;80)</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate (130/80 - &lt;140/&lt;90)</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate (140/90 - &lt;160/&lt;95)</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markedly poor (160/95 or higher)</td>
<td>5 %</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP control undetermined</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tobacco Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current tobacco user</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a current tobacco user</td>
<td>64 %</td>
<td>70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco use not documented</td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tobacco Cessation Counseling for Current Tobacco Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Portland Area (n=2240 Patients)</th>
<th>All IHS (n=28519 Patients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELED YES</td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Western Tribal Diabetes Project
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This information is for the following groups:

**Portland Area (n=6400 patients)**
6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)  

**All IHS (n=105626 patients)**
105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Patients with Diabetes-Related Prescriptions

- **Diet and exercise alone**: 22% (Portland Area), 19% (All IHS)
- **One med**: 38% (Portland Area), 38% (All IHS)
- **Two meds**: 29% (Portland Area), 29% (All IHS)
- **Three meds**: 9% (Portland Area), 11% (All IHS)
- **Four or more meds**: 2% (Portland Area), 3% (All IHS)

Note that if no documentation of a prescription is found in the patient's chart, that individual falls under "Diet and Exercise Alone."

### Diabetes Medications, Alone or in Combination

- **Insulin**: 32% (Portland Area), 32% (All IHS)
- **Sulfonylurea (glyburide, glipizide,...)**: 28% (Portland Area), 30% (All IHS)
- **Glinide (Prandin, Starlix)**: 1% (Portland Area), 0% (All IHS)
- **Metformin (Glucophage, others)**: 59% (Portland Area), 55% (All IHS)
- **Acarbose (Precose)/Miglitol (Glyset)**: 0% (Portland Area), 0% (All IHS)
- **Pioglitazone (Actos) or...**: 7% (Portland Area), 9% (All IHS)
- **GLP-1 Med (Byetta, Bydureon,...)**: 0% (Portland Area), 0% (All IHS)
- **DPP4 Inhibitor (Januvia, Onglyza,...)**: 5% (Portland Area), 10% (All IHS)
- **Amylin analogues (Symlin)**: 0% (Portland Area), 0% (All IHS)
- **Bromocriptine (Cycloset)**: 0% (Portland Area), 0% (All IHS)
- **Colesevelam (Welchol)**: 0% (Portland Area), 0% (All IHS)
This information is for the following groups:

**Portland Area (n=6400 patients)**
- 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

**All IHS (n=105626 patients)**
- 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Ace Inhibitor (or ARB) Prescriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE or ARB Rx [overall]</td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td>71 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a % of pts with known hypertension</td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a % of pts with elevated albuminuria</td>
<td>76 %</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anti-Platelet Therapy

Among Patients
- >50 years of age (males) or >60 years of age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASA None (CVD dx)</td>
<td>24 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirin/Antiplatelet Prescription (CVD dx)</td>
<td>76 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information is for the following groups:

Portland Area (n=6400 patients)
- 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

All IHS (n=105626 patients)
- 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

Lipid Lowering Agent Prescribed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single lipid agent</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more lipid agents</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None or refused</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Lipid-Lowering Agent Prescribed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statin (simvastatin, others)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrate (gemfibrozil/Lopid, others)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niacin (Niaspan, OTC niacin)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bile Acid Sequestrant (cholestyramine)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezetimibe (Zetia)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Oil - Rx or OTC</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovaza</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2013 Diabetes Audit: Dates of Service Jan 1 - Dec 31, 2012

This information is for the following groups:

- **Portland Area (n=6400 patients)**
  - 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

- **All IHS (n=105626 patients)**
  - 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

#### Yearly Exams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foot exam - neuro &amp; vasc</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye exam - dilated</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental exam</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Yearly Diabetes Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diet instruction by any provider</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet instruction by RD</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise instruction</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other diabetes education</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any of the listed topics</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information is for the following groups:

**Portland Area** (n=6400 patients)
- 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

**All IHS** (n=105626 patients)
- 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

---

### Immunizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flu Vaccine - yearly</td>
<td>63 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumovax - once</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetanus/Diphtheria (q 10 yrs)</td>
<td>91 %</td>
<td>87 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis B series ever</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Depression Identified as Active Diagnosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depression No</td>
<td>71 %</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression Yes</td>
<td>29 %</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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This information is for the following groups:

- **Portland Area (n=6400 patients)**: 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)
- **All IHS (n=105626 patients)**: 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Of Patients Without Active Depression Diagnosis, Proportion Screened for Depression in Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area (n=4544 Patients)</th>
<th>All IHS (n=82388 Patients)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screened</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>79 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated GFR Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated GFR documented during audit period age &gt;17</td>
<td>88 %</td>
<td>89 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information is for the following groups:

Portland Area (n=6400 patients)
6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

All IHS (n=105626 patients)
105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Estimated GFR results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eGFR ≥ 60</td>
<td>72 %</td>
<td>73 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eGFR 30 - 59</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eGFR 15 - 29</td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eGFR &lt; 15</td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eGFR unknown</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>11 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-HDL Cholesterol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-HDL Cholesterol obtained in the past 12 months</td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-HDL &lt;130 mg/dl</td>
<td>37 %</td>
<td>45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-HDL 130-159 mg/dl</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-HDL &gt; 190 mg/dl</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tested</td>
<td>32 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information is for the following groups:

- Portland Area (n=6400 patients)
  6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

- All IHS (n=105626 patients)
  105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### LDL Cholesterol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDL obtained in the past 12 months</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL &lt;100 mg/dl</td>
<td>49 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL 100-129 mg/dl</td>
<td>21 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL 130-160 mg/dl</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL &gt;160</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tested</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HDL Cholesterol Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDL obtained in the past 12 months (all patients)</td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL ≤ 50 mg/dl</td>
<td>44 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL &gt; 50 mg/dl</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL not done</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information is for the following groups:

Portland Area (n=6400 patients)  All IHS (n=105626 patients)
6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)  105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

HDL Cholesterol Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDL obtained in the past 12 months (all patients)</td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL ≤ 40 mg/dl</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL &gt; 40 mg/dl</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>34 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL not done</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Triglyceride Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triglycerides obtained in the past 12 months</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG ≤ 400 mg/dl</td>
<td>67 %</td>
<td>72 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG &gt;400 mg/dl</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG not tested</td>
<td>27 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information is for the following groups:

Portland Area (n=6400 patients)
- 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)

All IHS (n=105626 patients)
- 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Urinalysis Performed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA yes (%)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA no (%)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of Urine Protein Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Testing</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urine Albumin:Creatinine Ratio (UACR) (%)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urine Protein:Creatinine Ratio (UPCR) (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 hour urine protein (%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microalbumin:creatinine strip (e.g., Clinitek) (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microalbumin only (%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard UA dipstick protein (%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information is for the following groups:
- **Portland Area (n=6400 patients)**
  - 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)
- **All IHS (n=105626 patients)**
  - 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

### Patients diagnosed with CVD

![Graph showing percentage of patients diagnosed with CVD](image)

- **Portland Area**: 33%
- **All IHS**: 31%

### Tuberculosis Status

![Graph showing tuberculosis status](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Description</th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TB test +, INH treatment complete</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB test +, untreated/ incomplete or tx unknown</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB test -, placed after DM diagnosis</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB test -, placed before DM diagnosis</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB test -, date of dx or test date unknown</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB test status unknown</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information is for the following groups:
- **Portland Area** (n=6400 patients)
  - 6400 sampled from 7873 active patients with diabetes (81%)
- **All IHS** (n=105626 patients)
  - 105626 sampled from 141896 active patients with diabetes (74%)

Records meeting ALL of the criteria:
- **A1c < 8.0, LDL < 100, and mean BP <140/<90**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records A1c&lt;8.0, LDL&lt;100, BP&lt;140/&lt;90</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Records with eGFR and quantitative protein test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland Area</th>
<th>All IHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records with eGFR and quantitative protein test</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>