Appendix Table 1. Cost-Effectiveness of Community-Based Interventions for Hypertension Control, 1995–2015 (N=34) **Provider** ICER/ Net savings (2014 dollar Conclusion by Author, Year, Intervention Country value) authors U.S.-based studies Educational interventions for lifestyle modification A 2-year randomized Non-physician (1) \$58,610/LYS for normal-Cost-effective for Datta et al., trial, along with a weight women, \$120,513/LYS for overweight male and 2010 (nurses) decision model: normal-weight men; normal-weight women (2) \$60,142/LYS for overweight tailored educational information bimonthly men; \$80,839/LYS for for 2 years via overweight women. telephone for hypertensive patients Troyer, 2010 A 1-year randomized Non-physician Cost-effective for (1) \$134,611/QALY for Meals (dietitians) trial: medical nutrition only; meals only or MNT therapy (MNT) or (2) \$59,174/QALY for MNT; only therapeutic meals for (3) \$305,187/QALY for Meals + people aged >60 years **MNT** with hypertension or hyperlipidemia A 1 year observational Non-physician Sacks et al., Net savings \$999/person Cost-saving study: an employer-(laypeople) 2009 sponsored, Internetbased diet and exercise program for patients with cardiovascular conditions (diabetes, hypertension, hyperlipidemia) Finkelstein et A before-and-after Non-physician (1) \$714/1% CHD risk reduction; Cost-effective comparison: educators al., 2006 (laypeople) (2) \$6,683/LYG provide educational services to overweight and obese women

Educational interver	Educational interventions for medication adherence support				
Kulchaitanaroaj et al., 2012	A 6-month randomized trial: A collaborative care program to provide direct patient care, assessment, recommendations and follow-up phone call for patients with hypertension	Physician and non- physician (pharmacist)	(1) \$40/mm Hg drop in SBP;(2) \$103/mm Hg drop in DBP.	Cost-effective	
Nuckols et al., 2011	A 2-year probability tree model: "improved care" of blood pressure management for 4,500 U.S. adults with hypertension	Physician	(1) \$937/person attaining treatment goals for moderate hypertension(2) \$994/person attaining treatment goals for severe hypertension	Cost-effective	
Johannigman et al., 2010	A 1-year before-and- after comparison: a structured medication therapy management (MTM) session and health education for patients with diabetes, hypertension, asthma, heart failure, or hyperlipidemia	Non-physician (pharmacist)	(1) Direct medical savings \$306/person;(2) Total savings \$1,221/person.	Cost-saving	
Bunting et al., 2008	A 6-year before-and- after comparison: risk reduction education; regular, long-term	Non-physician (pharmacist)	Net savings \$109/person annually	Cost-saving	

	follow-ups for patients			
	with hypertension			
Munroe et al., 1997	A 1-year observational study: targeted patient education, feedback and behavior modification, and communicate regularly with patients' physicians to enable early intervention for drug-related problems.	Non-physician (pharmacist)	Net savings \$3,581– \$7,299/person	Cost-saving
Educational interve	ntions for lifestyle modific	cation and medication a	dherence	
Allen et al., 2014	A 3-year randomized trial: tailored educational counselling for lifestyle modification, medication adherence for patients with CVD, type 2 diabetes and hypertension	Non-physician (nurses/com-munity health workers)	(1) \$114/mm Hg drop in SBP; (2) \$236/mm Hg drop in DBP.	Cost-effective
Hollenbeak et al., 2014	A 6-month randomized trial with a Markov model in 10 years: Behavioral support and education through phone calls for African American patients aged 40–75 years with sustained, uncontrolled hypertension	Non-physician (peer coaches)	(1) \$512,510/CHD event; (2) \$62/mm Hg drop in SBP; (3) \$13,986/LYS; (4) \$12,282/QALY.	Cost-effective depending on the WTP

Self- monitoring int	erventions			
Ritzwoller et al., 2013	A 2-year randomized trial: Self-monitoring, and goal-oriented weight loss and blood pressure control intervention with moderate intensity, followed up with phone calls to high risk, low-income, inner city, minority patients who were both hypertensive and obese (71% were black/African American and 13% were Hispanic)	Non-physician	\$727/mmHg drop in SBP	Cost-effective
Trogdon et al., 2012	A 1-year and 10-year cost effectiveness model: patient education through interactive voice response technology and distribution of automated blood pressure monitors to high-risk plan members with uncontrolled hypertension	Non-physician	(1) \$965/person under control; (2) \$52,769/LYG in 1 year; (3) \$2,337/LYG annually in 10 years	Cost-effective

Wang et al., 2012	A 18-month randomized trial: telephone-based intervention groups using home BP tele monitoring for (1) behavioral management, (2) medication management, or (3) combined for patients with hypertension	Non-physician	Cost and effectiveness were not statistically significant between treatment group and control group	Not cost-effective at 18 months
Screening interventi	• •			
Eddy et al., 2011	The 12-year Archimedes Model: individualized guidelines in the context of blood pressure management, followed with drugs, office visits and tests to 15,792 participants aged 45–64 years	Physician	(1) RBR is 1.43 (1.33–1.70); (2) RSR is 1.65 (1.52–2.79); (3) Savings \$1.84 million	Cost-saving
Wang et al., 2011	A lifetime simulation model: Blood pressure screening and treatment in a cohort of 2,065,127 boys and 1,952,694 girls aged ≥15 years	Physician	Finding and treating the adolescents at highest risk (\$21,734/QALY [boys] and \$56,750/QALY [girls])	Cost-effective
Non-U.S. studies				
Educational interver	ntions for lifestyle modific	cation		

Wang et al., 2013, China	A 1-year randomized trial: a customized, guideline-oriented training program including blood pressure measurements, risk factors, new cardiovascular and renal diseases, medical treatments, and lifestyle advices for patients with hypertension	Physician	Net savings \$32/person in urban sites, \$11/person in rural sites	Cost-saving
Barton et al., 2012, UK	A 6-month randomized trial: providing information, advice and support aimed at changing beliefs and behavior to participants aged 18 years with at least one of five CVD risk factors	Non-physician (lay health trainers)	\$17,215/QALY	Cost-effective
Jafar et al., 2011, Pakistan	A randomized trial with a 2*2 factorial design: (1) combined home health education (HHE) plus trained general practitioner (GP); (2) HHE only; and (3) trained GP only to adults	Physician	(1) \$29 (95% CI, \$8–\$125) /mm Hg drop in SBP; \$1,543/ CVD DALY	Cost-effective

	aged ≥40 years with hypertension from middle- to low-income areas in Karac						
Perman et al., 2011, Argentina	A lifetime Markov model: providing personal and telephone contact with patients, support with non-pharmacological treatment such as diet and physical activity to middle-class patients aged ≥65 years	Non-physician (medical students)	\$1,271/LYG	Cost-effective			
Yosefy et al., 2003, Israel	A 1-year before-and- after comparison: enhancing the control of modifiable risk factors and follow up high-risk hypertensive patients	Physician	-\$1,566/QALY; Net savings \$942,608	Cost-saving			
Garcia-Pena et al., 2002, Mexico	A 6-month randomized trial: providing home visits who gave health and lifestyle advice to the subjects aged ≥60 years	Non-physician (nurses)	(1) \$2/mm Hg drop in SBP;(2) \$2/mm Hg drop in DBP.	Cost-effective			
Educational interver	Educational interventions for medication adherence support						
Schroeder et al., 2005, UK	A 1-year randomized trial: A nurse-led adherence support in hypertension for	Non-physician (nurses)	Effectiveness was not statistically significant; More expensive	Not cost-effective			

	women and men with uncontrolled hypertension			
Edwa, 1998, South Africa	A 1-year before-and- after comparison: providing hypertension drug management following treatment guideline to hypertensive patients	Physician and non- physician (pharmacist)	Net savings: \$321,441.	Cost-saving
Educational interven	ntions for lifestyle modific	ation and medication a	dherence	
Gaziano et al., 2014, South Africa	A lifetime Markov model: home visits to increase hypertension adherence for individuals with hypertension and aged 25–74 years	Non-physician (community health workers)	\$321/DALY	Cost-effective
Bai et al., 2013, China	A 1-year before-and- after comparison: conducting educational sessions, supervision, and face-to-face consultation as necessary; standardize drug therapies; conduct follow-up visits to people with hypertension	Physician	\$0.62–\$0.85/mm Hg drop in SBP, \$1.08–\$1.66 /mm Hg drop in DBP.	Cost-effective
Houle et al., 2012, Canada	A 1-year simulation model: a pharmacist- nurse team along with a hypertension education brochure	Non-physician (pharmacist/ nurse)	Net savings \$291/person for 1 year; \$243/person for 6 months	Cost-saving

Yamagishi et	provide cardiovascular risk reduction counseling to hypertensive patients A 24-year observational	Physician and non-	Net savings \$34,915/person	Cost-saving
al., 2012, Japan	study: a nation-wide, community-based intensive hypertension detection and control program in Japan	physician	8 11 % 11	8
Lim et al., 2011, South Korea	A 1-year probability tree model: providing health educations: stop-smoking and drinking, proper nutrition, importance of accurate medication, stress management, and continuous medication to adult patients with hypertension	Physician and non-physician	The net benefit –\$6,185; CBR was 1.3:1.	Not cost-effective
Huang Y, Ren J, 2010, China	A 3-year before-and- after comparison: providing a community-based prevention program to hypertension patients	Physician	CBR: 1:3.6	Cost-effective
•	reening interventions			
Gu et al., 2015, China	A 10-year China CVD policy model: providing hypertension screening, essential medicines program	Physician	(1) Control blood pressure in all persons with CHD /stroke: cost-saving;	Cost-effective for treating all stage II hypertension

	implementation, hypertension control program administration to untreated hypertensive adults aged 35–84 years		(2) Treat all stage II hypertension patients: \$9,000 (\$7,000–\$12,000)/QALY; (3) Treat all stage II and stage I: \$13,000 (\$10,000–\$18,000)/QALY	
Howard et al., 2010, Australia	A lifetime Markov model: providing primary care screening for hypertension (between ages 50 and 69 years) plus intensive blood pressure management	Physician and non-physician	\$613/QALY	Cost-effective
Target outreach scre				
Zhao et al., 2014, Australia	A 10-year observational study with propensity score matching: providing primary care utilization for chronic disease management in remote indigenous communities to indigenous residents aged ≥15 years	Physician and non-physician	\$1,131–\$1,974/YLL for medium level of primary care; \$3,422–\$5,637/YLL for high level of primary care	Cost-effective
Yosefy et al., 2003, Israel	A 2-year before-and- after comparison: examining 12,202 subjects, providing an outreach promotion of health education to	Physician and non- physician	-\$3,257/LYS; CBR: 0.22:1	Cost-saving

3,506 identified patients with one or more CVD risk factors

ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; SBP, systolic blood pressure; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; RBR, relative benefit ratio; RSR, relative savings ratio; CBR, cost-benefit ratio; EI, educational intervention; SM, self-monitoring of blood pressure and follow-up intervention; SI, screening interventions; MNT, medical nutrition therapy; WTP, willingness to pay; LYS, life year saved; LYG, life year gained; QALY, quality-adjusted life years; YLL, years of life lost; DALY, disability-adjusted life years.

Appendix Table 2. Quality of the Cost-effectiveness Studies on Community-based Interventions for Hypertension Control (N=34)

Criteria	Studies, N	Percentage
1. Is the study population clearly described?	34	100.00
2. Are competing alternatives clearly described?	25	73.53
3. Is a well-defined research question posed in answerable form?	34	100.00
4. Is the economic study design appropriate to the stated objective?	23	67.65
5. Is the chosen time horizon appropriate in order to include relevant costs and consequences?	31	91.18
6. Is the actual perspective chosen appropriate?	34	100.00
7. Are all important and relevant costs for each alternative identified?	31	91.18
8. Are all costs measured appropriately in physical units?	34	100.00
9. Are costs valued appropriately?	16	47.06
10. Are all important and relevant outcomes for each alternative identified?	23	67.65
11. Are all outcomes measured appropriately?	34	100.00
12. Are outcomes valued appropriately?	34	100.00
13. Is an incremental analysis of costs and outcomes of alternatives performed?	31	91.18
14. Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?	29	85.29
15. Are all important variables, whose values are uncertain, appropriately subjected to sensitivity analysis?	19	55.88
16. Do the conclusions follow from the data reported?	21	61.76
17. Does the study discuss the generalizability of the results to other settings and patient/client groups?	26	76.47
18. Does the article indicate that there is no potential conflict of interest of study researcher(s) and funder(s)?	16	47.06
19. Are ethical and distributional issues discussed appropriately?	26	76.47