

Table 1A. Effect of the cover levels on hospitalisation using zero-inflated negative binomial model

	Diabetes related hospitalisation			Unplanned diabetes related hospitalisation		
	IRR	95%CI	p-value	IRR	95%CI	p-value
Unweighted (1)						
Low Cover	3.2	(2.6; 4.1)	<0.001	1.4	(1.0; 2.1)	<0.001
Medium Cover	2.9	(2.6; 3.4)	<0.001	1.8	(1.5; 2.3)	<0.001
High Cover	2.8	(2.7; 3.0)	<0.001	1.7	(1.5; 1.8)	<0.001
Perfect Cover	Ref			Ref		
Weighted (2)						
Low Cover	3.0	(1.8; 5.0)	<0.001	1.8	(0.9; 3.5)	0.9
Medium Cover	3.3	(2.8; 3.9)	<0.001	2.0	(1.4; 2.8)	0.009
High Cover	2.7	(2.5; 2.9)	<0.001	1.7	(1.5; 1.9)	<0.001
Perfect Cover	Ref			Ref		
Doubly robust estimation (3)						
Low Cover	3.0	(2.0; 4.7)	<0.001	1.7	(0.9; 3.2)	0.2
Medium Cover	3.2	(2.7; 3.7)	<0.001	1.7	(1.3; 2.3)	<0.001
High Cover	2.7	(2.6; 2.9)	<0.001	1.7	(1.5; 1.9)	<0.001
Perfect Cover	Ref			Ref		

Note:

(1)The negative binomial model adjusted for current health service use (frequency of GP contacts, regularity of GP contact, UPC of GP contacts, and number of specialist contacts); and pre-treatment covariates (age, gender, indigenous, education, level of limitation, self-report comorbidity, comorbidity, complication, duration of diabetes, history of diabetes related hospitalisations, cover in, frequency of GP contacts, regularity, UPC, number of specialist visits)

(2)The negative binomial model adjusted for current health service use and weighted with IPTW of observed covariates

(3)The negative binomial model adjusted for current health service use; pre-treatment covariates and weighted with IPTW of observed covariates

Table 1B. Effect of the cover levels on length of stay of hospitalisation using hurdle model

	LOS Diabetes related hospitalisation			LOS Unplanned diabetes related hospitalisation		
	dy/dx	95%CI	p-value	dy/dx	95%CI	p-value
Unweighted (1)						
Low Cover	2.0	(1.3; 2.7)	<0.001	0.8	(0.1; 1.4)	0.015
Medium Cover	1.2	(0.8; 1.6)	<0.001	0.5	(0.1; 0.9)	0.007
High Cover	1.1	(0.9; 1.3)	<0.001	0.5	(0.3; 0.6)	<0.001
Perfect Cover	Ref			Ref		
Weighted (2)						
Low Cover	0.7	(-1.3; 2.6)	0.509	0.8	(-1; 2.7)	0.366
Medium Cover	1.7	(0.9; 2.6)	<0.001	0.7	(-0.02; 1.5)	0.056
High Cover	1.3	(0.9; 1.7)	<0.001	0.6	(0.3; 0.9)	<0.001
Perfect Cover	Ref			Ref		
Doubly robust estimation (3)						
Low Cover	0.2	(-1.7; 2.1)	0.844	0.6	(-0.5; 1.6)	0.281
Medium Cover	1.4	(0.6; 2.2)	0.001	0.5	(-0.1; 1)	0.118
High Cover	1.3	(0.7; 1.8)	<0.001	0.6	(0.3; 0.8)	<0.001
Perfect Cover	Ref			Ref		

Note:

*As the coefficient of the hurdle model is not directly interpretable, the effect of cover on the length of stay was obtained through post estimation margin. The dy/dx means that compared with the perfect level, each lower level of cover increases or decrease length of stay by the rate of +/- dy/dx

(1)The negative binomial model adjusted for current health service use (frequency of GP contacts, regularity of GP contact, UPC of GP contacts, and number of specialist contacts); and pre-treatment covariates (age, gender, indigenous, education, level of limitation, self-report comorbidity, comorbidity, complication, duration of diabetes, history of diabetes related hospitalisations, cover in, frequency of GP contacts, regularity, UPC, number of specialist visits)

(2)The negative binomial model adjusted for current health service use and weighted with IPTW of observed covariates

(3)The negative binomial model adjusted for current health service use; pre-treatment covariates and weighted with IPTW of observed covariates