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Chronic diseases in Europe
Chronic diseases in Europe

- An ageing population with growing life expectancy
- Growing prevalence of (multiple) chronic diseases
- Rising health care costs and a declining labour force

The proportion of those in European countries aged 65 years and older is projected to grow from 15% in 2000 to 23.5% by 2030.

The proportion of those aged 80 years and over is expected to more than double from 3% in 2000 to 6.4% in 2030.
Chronic diseases in Europe

**Fig. 2.1** Worldwide share of deaths by causes and countries within different World Bank income categories (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Communicable, maternal, perinatal and nutritional conditions</th>
<th>Chronic or noncommunicable diseases</th>
<th>Injuries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle income</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper income</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: Suhrcke et al. 2006; Mathers et al. 2003.*
## Chronic diseases in Europe

**Table 2.1** Disease burden and deaths from noncommunicable diseases in the WHO European Region by cause (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of causes</th>
<th>Disease burden</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DALYs (millions)</td>
<td>Proportion from all causes (%)</td>
<td>Number (millions)</td>
<td>Proportion from all causes (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected noncommunicable diseases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular diseases</td>
<td>34.42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuropsychiatric conditions</td>
<td>29.37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer (malignant neoplasms)</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digestive diseases</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory diseases</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense organ diseases</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musculoskeletal diseases</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral conditions</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All noncommunicable diseases</strong></td>
<td><strong>115.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All causes</strong></td>
<td><strong>150.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Singh 2008.*
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Innovation and added value of CAM for CDM

• Is there a professional contribution of CAM to CDM?

• If so, what is its added value for CDM in Europe?
  – Fulfillment of citizens’/ patients’ needs?
  – Positive health outcome & Quality of Life?
  – Positive benefit/risk balance?
  – Cost reduction?
  – ....

• Evidence?
Current status of chronic disease management

The chronic care model

![Chronic Care Model Diagram](image-url)
Current status of chronic disease management
Strategies and main challenges

Relevant characteristics of CAM for innovation of CDM

- Background:
  - Health promotion & Salutogenesis/Sense of coherence approach (*in addition to fighting disease & pathogenesis approach*)
  - Whole system approach (*in addition to biomedical approach*)
Contribution of CAM to CDM
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Current status of chronic disease management
Contribution of CAM to strategies and main challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burden of chronic disease</th>
<th>Strategies for tackling chronic disease</th>
<th>Main challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epidemiologic burden</strong></td>
<td>Prevention and early detection</td>
<td>New pharmaceuticals and medical devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New provider qualifications and settings</td>
<td>Financial incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic burden</strong></td>
<td>Disease management programmes</td>
<td>Cooperation and coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated care models</td>
<td>Information and communication technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Evidence
Evidence: Example 1

- Patients’ need for CAM
  - Review (51 reports, 49 surveys, 15 countries)
  - Outcomes:
    - Estimates of 12-month prevalence of any CAM use (excluding prayer) from surveys:
      - UK (28%, 26%; 1998, 2005); Norway; Sweden (20%; 2000); Italy (29%; 1996/1997)
      - USA (36%, 38%; 2002, 2007) and Australia (49%, 52%, 52%; 1993, 2000, 2004)

> Relatively stable need for CAM

Evidence: Example 1

- Patients’ need for CAM

  - Outcomes:
    - Population: CAM versus conventional medicine (stable throughout studies):
      - More severe and chronic illnesses
      - Younger, more female, higher education

  > Stable population in need for CAM

*e.g. Heiligers et al. BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine 2010, 10:3*
Evidence: Example 1

- Patients’ need for CAM
  - Outcomes:
    - Client satisfaction with AM GPs (conventional versus AM):
    - 2,099 patients from 20 AM GP practices in the Netherlands

> There is a relatively stable group of European patients with chronic diseases that want CAM

Evidence: Example 2

- Salutogenesis/ sense of coherence (SOC) and health
  - Reviews (458 scientific publications & 13 dissertations)
  - Outcomes:
    - SOC was strongly related to perceived health, especially mental health.
    - SOC seemed to have a main, moderating or mediating role in the explanation of health. Furthermore, the SOC seemed to be a predictor of health.
    - The stronger the SOC the better their quality of life.

> SOC is associated with better health and better QoL

Evidence: Example 2

- Sense of coherence (SOC) and health
  - Cross-sectional study (20,579 people)
  - Outcomes:
    
    “A strong sense of coherence was associated with a 30% reduction in mortality from all causes (rate ratio = 0.69, \( p < 0.0001 \)), cardiovascular disease (rate ratio = 0.70, \( p = 0.001 \)), and cancer (rate ratio = 0.74, \( p = 0.003 \)), independent of age, sex, and prevalent chronic disease. These associations were consistent by sex, except that no association was observed for cancer mortality in women. The association for all-cause mortality remained after adjustment for cigarette smoking history, social class, body mass index, systolic blood pressure, cholesterol, hostility, and neuroticism (rate ratio = 0.76, \( p = 0.002 \)). Results suggest that a strong sense of coherence may confer some resilience to the risk of chronic disease.”

> SOC is associated with better health and better QoL

Evidence: Example 3

- **Acupuncture for chronic pain (TCM)**
  - Review of 29 RCTs
  - Back and neck pain, osteoarthritis, and chronic headache
  - Outcomes:
    - Acupuncture was superior to both sham and nonacupuncture control for each pain condition
    - Modest specific effects & larger overall effects

> Acupuncture is effective for the treatment of chronic pain and is therefore a reasonable referral option

Evidence: Example 4

- **Mistletoe treatment for cancer (AM)**
  - Two reviews (26 RCTs & 10 non-RCTs/ 41 publications)
  - Cancer
  - Outcomes:
    - Survival: increasing association with better survival
    - QoL: positive impact (most studies) on QoL
    - Safety: good tolerability & no major side effects

> Mistletoe treatment is associated with better survival rates and QoL, good safety and is therefore a reasonable referral option


Evidence: Example 5

- Mind-body interventions (MBI’s) for essential hypertension
  - Review
  - Outcomes:
    - Small yet meaningful reductions in blood pressure (monotherapy or in conjunction with traditional pharmacotherapy).
    - Transcendental meditation and mindfulness-based stress reduction may produce clinically significant reductions in systolic and diastolic blood pressure.

> MBI’s may produce blood pressure reduction and is therefore a reasonable referral option

Evidence: Example 6

- St. John’s wort for depression
  - Reviews (29 trials with 5,984 patients)
  - Major depression
  - Outcomes: the evidence suggests that hypericum extracts:
    - are superior to placebo in patients with major depression;
    - are similarly effective as standard antidepressants;
    - and have fewer side effects than standard antidepressants

> St. John’s wort for depression is associated with equal effects and fewer side effects than standard antidepressants and is therefore a reasonable referral option

Evidence: Example 7

• **Cost-effects**

Evidence: Example 8

**Healthy ageing**

Table 4: Effects of complementary care on mortality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dummy for GP-CAM anthroposophy</th>
<th>Dummy for GP-CAM homeopathy</th>
<th>Dummy for GP-CAM acupuncture</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logit with fixed effects</strong></td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>−0.198</td>
<td>−0.333*</td>
<td>−0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LPM with fixed effects</strong></td>
<td>−0.005*</td>
<td>−0.004</td>
<td>−0.009**</td>
<td>−0.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logit with fixed effects</strong></td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>−0.203</td>
<td>−0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LPM with fixed effects</strong></td>
<td>−0.007*</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>−0.008</td>
<td>−0.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logit with fixed effects</strong></td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>−0.627*</td>
<td>−0.493</td>
<td>−0.291*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LPM with fixed effects</strong></td>
<td>−0.003</td>
<td>−0.014</td>
<td>−0.013**</td>
<td>−0.008**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table is based on models with the following explanatory variables: gender, age, dummies for anthroposophy, homeopathy, and acupuncture (dummy for complementary in the last column); the table reports the coefficients on the latter dummies
LPM regression controls for 4-digit insuree postcode fixed effects
***, **, * indicate a statistical significance at the 1, 5, and 10% level, respectively

Conclusions and future perspectives
Conclusions

• There are professional CAM contributions to CDM

• The innovations and added values of CAM for CDM in Europe:
  – Fulfill a large group of EU citizens’/ patients’ needs
  – Provide positive health outcome & improvement of Quality of Life
  – Provide positive benefit/risk balances
  – Result in lower healthcare costs, and
  – Are more and more evidence-based

• More development of and research on CAM contributions to CDM are required
Future perspectives

- EU research framework should invest in:
  - Improvement of the quality of CAM for CDs & Integrative Medicine in clinical practice
  - Improvement of the quality of research on CAM for CDs
    - Comparative Effectiveness Research > more evidence on added value of CAM for CDM
    - Single-case methodology for further development of individualized diagnostics and treatment
    - Monitoring of safety
  - Further development of whole system approach:
    - Clinical programs
    - A European regulatory framework for medicinal products with a whole system background
    - Research methodology
Thank you for your attention!
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