



Evaluation of Chronic Disease Care (Diabetes and Hypertension) in Prisons

Muhannad Alruwaili, Saif Alsirhani, Moayad Alharbi, Mohammed Alruwaili, Sanad Alruwaili and Shghr Hawil.

Received : August 17 2025

Revised : September 16, 2025

Accepted : October 22, 2025

Online : October 24, 2025

Abstract

Chronic diseases like diabetes and hypertension are highly prevalent among incarcerated populations, yet managing these conditions in prisons remains challenging due to resource limits, security restrictions, and inconsistent care. This study evaluates diabetes and hypertension care across three state prisons using a mixed-methods approach: medical record review, healthcare provider interviews, and inmate surveys. Findings reveal gaps in guideline adherence, monitoring, medication continuity, and patient education, with systemic barriers including staffing shortages and institutional constraints. Improved chronic disease management was linked to better clinical outcomes, highlighting the need for tailored, multidisciplinary care models incorporating telemedicine and patient education. Enhancing chronic disease care in prisons is vital for inmate health and public health beyond incarceration. [1, 2, 3, 4]

Keywords: Chronic disease care, diabetes management, hypertension control, prison health, correctional healthcare, healthcare evaluation, chronic disease outcomes, incarcerated populations.

1. Introduction

Non-communicable diseases (NCDs) including diabetes and hypertension constitute major drivers of morbidity and mortality worldwide, accounting for over 70% of global deaths annually. These conditions require sustained, multifaceted management involving regular clinical assessments, pharmacotherapy, lifestyle modifications, and ongoing patient education. The challenges compounded by chronic disease management intensify in correctional health systems, where incarcerated populations face higher disease prevalence, fragmented care, and institutional constraints that can hinder optimal disease control.

Epidemiological studies consistently demonstrate a significantly increased prevalence of diabetes and hypertension among prisoners compared to community counterparts.

This elevated burden has roots in upstream social determinants of health including poverty, limited healthcare access pre-incarceration, substance use disorders, mental health comorbidities, and lifestyles shaped by incarceration environments. Compounding these issues are operational barriers within prisons: limited healthcare resources, inadequate infrastructure, security-driven restrictions on patient autonomy and movement, and frequent inmate transfers that disrupt continuity of care. These factors collectively contribute to elevated risks of poorly controlled chronic diseases and related complications such as heart attacks, strokes, kidney failure, and premature mortality.

Chronic disease care in prisons thus represents both a pressing healthcare priority and a nuanced ethical challenge. The prison environment, paradoxically restrictive yet theoretically enabling structured healthcare delivery, demands innovative, resource-conscious strategies that balance institutional security with patients' urgent healthcare needs. However, there remains a void in rigorous, comprehensive evaluations of how prisons implement diabetes and hypertension care protocols.

Publisher's Note:

Pandawa Institute stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright:

© 2025 by the author(s).

Licensee Pandawa Institute, Metro, Indonesia. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike (CC BY-SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

While guidelines from organizations like the American Diabetes Association and the American Heart Association provide clinical blueprints, their practical uptake and effectiveness remain poorly documented in correctional settings.

This study embarks on a detailed investigation into chronic disease care delivery in three geographically and demographically distinct state prisons. It assesses adherence to clinical guidelines, medication management, patient education, healthcare provider perspectives, and outcome measures. By integrating quantitative data capturing care processes and outcomes with qualitative insights from providers and inmates, it aims to generate a richer understanding of existing gaps and opportunities for improvement. Ultimately, the study seeks to inform healthcare policy, clinical practice, and institutional reforms to enhance chronic disease management and outcomes within correctional environments, contributing to health equity and population well-being beyond prison walls. [5, 6, 7, 8]

2. Methodology

This study was designed using a mixed-methods approach to thoroughly evaluate the delivery of chronic disease care for diabetes and hypertension within prison settings. The combination of quantitative and qualitative methods allowed for an in-depth exploration of both measurable care outcomes and the contextual factors shaping healthcare delivery in correctional environments. The integration of these methods aimed to provide a comprehensive view beyond what any one approach could offer alone.

Three state prisons were carefully selected to represent a range of geographic locations, security levels, inmate population sizes, and healthcare models. These included a high-security urban facility with contracted specialist services, a medium-security rural prison equipped with telemedicine, and a minimum-security institution staffed primarily by full-time nurses and rotating physicians. This diversity permitted the study to examine how different operational contexts affected chronic disease management practices. The study population consisted of all incarcerated individuals -

diagnosed with either diabetes or hypertension who were housed at these institutions between January and December 2024, totaling approximately 450 inmates. A structured data extraction instrument was developed based on established clinical guidelines from the American Diabetes Association and American Heart Association to systematically capture essential data points from inmate medical records. Extracted information covered demographic details such as age, sex, race or ethnicity, sentence duration, and incarceration history. Clinical care indicators included the frequency and timing of HbA1c tests for diabetics, fasting blood glucose measurements, routine blood pressure monitoring for hypertensive inmates, prescribed medication regimens, pharmacy refill histories, documentation of lifestyle counseling—including diet, exercise, and smoking cessation—and clinical outcomes such as lab results, recorded complications, hospitalizations, and mortality associated with chronic disease.

Data abstraction was performed by trained clinical research assistants who underwent comprehensive training to ensure consistent and accurate data collection. To maintain quality control, a portion of medical charts was reviewed by multiple abstractors, and discrepancies were resolved through group discussions to uphold data reliability.

Medication adherence was evaluated by combining objective and subjective measures. Objective data came from pharmacy refill records, where delays longer than seven days between scheduled refills were flagged as potential non-adherence. Subjective data were collected through face-to-face interviews using the 8-item Morisky Medication Adherence Scale (MMAS-8), a validated tool to assess patients' adherence behaviors and challenges. This dual assessment helped provide a more nuanced understanding of medication use patterns within the prison context. To enrich the understanding of system-level and provider-related factors influencing chronic disease care, semi-structured interviews were conducted with twenty healthcare professionals across the three prisons.

Participants included physicians, nurses, pharmacists, mental health counselors, and healthcare administrators to capture diverse perspectives involved in care delivery. Interview questions focused on the burden of chronic diseases among inmates, everyday clinical practices and workflows, perceived barriers such as staffing constraints and limited resources, impacts of security and institutional policies on healthcare accessibility, and suggestions to improve care quality. Interviews were audio recorded, transcribed verbatim, anonymized, and analyzed until thematic saturation was achieved.

Quantitative data were statistically analyzed using SPSS Version 27. Descriptive statistics summarized population characteristics, care process adherence, and health outcomes. Bivariate analyses including chi-square and t-tests explored relationships between adherence to care guidelines and clinical control metrics, such as HbA1c levels and blood pressure readings. Multivariate logistic regression models adjusted for potential confounders including age, gender, and comorbidities to identify independent predictors of successful disease control. Qualitative data from interviews were analyzed thematically using Braun and Clarke's approach, with coding facilitated by NVivo 12 software to identify common themes and patterns relating to facilitators and barriers of chronic disease management. Finally, both quantitative and qualitative findings were integrated through triangulation to provide a comprehensive understanding of the interplay between care practices, institutional challenges, and inmate experiences. Ethical approval was granted by university review boards and correctional authorities. The study ensured voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and data anonymity for inmates and staff, with no coercion involved. [9, 10, 11, 12]

3. Literature Review

The epidemiological landscape of chronic diseases within prison populations reveals a disproportionate burden that markedly exceeds general community prevalence rates. Globally, diabetes prevalence estimates among prisoners range between 6-20% -

with hypertension often exceeding 40% in some cohorts. These heightened rates reflect convergence of social determinants and risk behaviors endemic to correctional populations—factors including low socioeconomic status, psychological stress, food insecurity prior to incarceration, mental illness, and substance use disorders. Clinically, effective management of diabetes and hypertension hinges upon regular biomarker monitoring—HbA1c assays illuminate long-term glycemic control, while standardized blood pressure measurements inform hypertension management. Protocol adherence typically mandates biannual or quarterly monitoring intervals, guideline-concordant medication regimens comprising insulin, oral hypoglycemics, or antihypertensive agents, and comprehensive lifestyle modification counseling encompassing diet and physical activity. Patient education geared toward self-management remains a cornerstone, with proven impacts on adherence and clinical outcomes.

Correctional facilities introduce unique challenges that complicate these ideals. Healthcare resource scarcity prevails, often manifesting as understaffing, limited availability of specialized providers, and inconsistent medication supply chains. Institutional security imperatives impose controlled inmate movement and restrict access to exercise facilities or specialized dietary options aligned with chronic disease management plans. Additionally, episodic custody transitions through transfers or release break continuity of care and impede consistent monitoring.

Mental health comorbidities prevalent among prisoners compound management difficulties, reducing adherence and complicating clinical decision-making. Moreover, stigmatization and low health literacy levels impair understanding and engagement with treatment protocols. Notwithstanding these barriers, some researchers highlight potential advantages of correctional settings for chronic disease management, such as structured schedules conducive to medication adherence and captive audiences for health education.

Innovative interventions gaining traction include integrated multidisciplinary chronic care teams, telehealth expansions connecting inmates with specialists, peer-led educational initiatives fostering empowerment and knowledge transfer, and electronic health record systems facilitating continuity and data tracking. Despite this, evaluations quantifying impact and implementation strategies remain fragmented and underdeveloped.

International health agencies, including the World Health Organization and national correctional health commissions, have underscored correctional health disparities and called for equity-driven, evidence-based strategies tailored to correctional settings. Yet, translating these imperatives into operationalized chronic disease programs remains inconsistent. This underscores the critical need for empirical, systematically gathered data evaluating current chronic disease care quality, identifying actionable barriers, and benchmarking care quality within prison environments. [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]

4. Results

The retrospective review of medical records identified a total of 450 inmates diagnosed with diabetes and/or hypertension across the three prisons studied. The demographic profile showed a predominance of male inmates (85%), consistent with the overall inmate population, with ages ranging from 22 to 68 years and an average age of 44.7 years (SD 9.8). Ethnic minorities comprised over half the cohort (56%), reflecting the racial and ethnic composition common in correctional settings.

Analysis of clinical monitoring practices revealed notable deficiencies. Among diabetic inmates, only 62% received HbA1c testing at recommended biannual intervals. The average interval between tests extended to 4.8 months, exceeding guideline recommendations and showing considerable intra- and inter-site variability. Blood pressure monitoring for hypertensive inmates was similarly inconsistent; just 55% underwent the recommended frequency of at least monthly measurements. Some facilities evidenced better adherence rates, correlating with greater staff availability and access to medical supplies, while others suffered from monitoring gaps that extended beyond three months between assessments.

Medication adherence presented additional challenges. Pharmacy refill records indicated a 68% adherence rate, whereas self-reported adherence via the MMAS-8 scale was somewhat lower at 60%, suggesting that timely medication dispensation did not always translate into consistent medication-taking behavior. Qualitative data from inmate surveys highlighted factors contributing to non-adherence including missed doses due to delayed medication delivery by nursing staff, interruptions caused by lockdowns, and forgetfulness or misunderstandings about medication importance.

Documentation of lifestyle counseling was notably sparse. Less than 40% of medical records contained evidence that inmates received regular counseling on critical topics such as smoking cessation, dietary modifications, and physical activity recommendations. Healthcare providers corroborated this finding in interviews, describing limited time for patient education compounded by insufficient training on chronic disease counseling and varying inmate motivation levels. They reported that security priorities and regimented schedules often restricted opportunities for meaningful lifestyle interventions.

Examining health outcomes, over half of diabetic inmates (52%) achieved acceptable glycemic control, defined as HbA1c levels below 7.5%. Similarly, controlled blood pressure (<140/90 mmHg) was observed in 48% of hypertensive inmates. These figures reflect substantial room for improvement in clinical management, as nearly half the population remained outside optimal control ranges, increasing their risk for complications such as retinopathy, cardiovascular events, and renal impairment.

Statistical analysis underscored important associations. Inmates who received more frequent clinical monitoring and documented counseling exhibited significantly better control of both diabetes and hypertension ($p < 0.05$). Medication adherence was also a strong predictor of disease control, reinforcing the critical role of reliable pharmacotherapy access and patient engagement.

the quantitative and qualitative data revealed a fragmented chronic disease care environment in prisons, shaped by institutional resource limits, policy constraints, educational deficits, and patient-level challenges. These conditions create a fertile ground for missed opportunities to improve monitoring, adherence, education, and ultimately health outcomes among incarcerated individuals living with diabetes and hypertension. The results underscore the urgent need for systemic interventions aimed at strengthening care delivery and addressing both provider- and patient-related barriers to chronic disease management in correctional health settings. [19, 20, 21, 22]

5. Discussion

Our comprehensive evaluation aligns with and builds upon prior literature by highlighting systemic inadequacies in diabetes and hypertension care within diverse prison settings. The observed monitoring gaps, medication adherence challenges, and insufficient educational efforts collectively impede attainment of clinical targets and augment risks for adverse outcomes, including cardiovascular events and renal disease.

Importantly, certain prisons' demonstrated adherence to best practice protocols correlated positively with better glycemic and blood pressure control, emphasizing the potent impact of structured process adherence and patient engagement mechanisms. This supports reinforcing clinical protocols and adopting multidisciplinary chronic care models tailored for correctional environments.

The predominant barriers—chronic understaffing, unreliable medication supply chains, restrictive lifestyle conditions, and limited health literacy—underscore the multifactorial nature of care challenges, requiring multi-tiered responses. Reinforcing staffing levels with specialized chronic disease management training, stabilizing pharmaceutical procurement, and innovatively adapting prison policy to accommodate safe physical activity and dietary modifications could substantively enhance care.

Telemedicine holds considerable promise in mitigating specialist shortages, providing continuous education, and facilitating complex clinical consultations without breaching institutional security. Investments in robust, interoperable electronic health records would ensure continuity during transfers and post-release transitions, mitigating treatment interruptions.

Finally, the public health imperative extends beyond prison boundaries as effective chronic disease management during incarceration can reduce healthcare burdens on communities reintegrating former inmates with poorly controlled conditions. Study limitations include reliance on retrospective data and the inherent challenges of accurately measuring medication adherence via self-reporting. Future work should focus on longitudinal interventions and randomized trials evaluating correctional chronic care models and their long-term impact. [23, 24]

6. Conclusion

This study reveals profound and multifaceted shortcomings in the management of chronic diseases, specifically diabetes and hypertension, within state prison healthcare systems. Despite the theoretically favorable aspects of correctional settings for chronic disease management—such as regimented schedules, controlled medication distribution, and captive patient populations—the reality unveiled by our findings paints a far more complex and sobering picture. Across three diverse prison institutions, it became clear that chronic disease care remains inconsistent, often failing to meet clinical guidelines and standards of care that are routinely applied in community settings. These gaps manifest in inadequate clinical monitoring, insufficient medication adherence support, limited and sporadic patient education, and a constrained ability to foster lifestyle modifications that are critical to managing chronic conditions effectively.

The implications of these deficiencies are significant, both at the individual and system levels. For incarcerated individuals, poor disease control translates into an increased risk of acute complications such as hypoglycemia, hypertensive crises, cardiovascular events, renal dysfunction-

and other long-term sequelae that compromise quality of life and may lead to premature mortality. These outcomes are not confined to prison walls; they ripple outward into communities upon prisoner release, exacerbating health disparities already prevalent among socially disadvantaged populations. From a systems perspective, poorly managed chronic diseases escalate healthcare costs through emergency interventions, hospitalizations, and the need for more intensive medical treatments. Such resource-intensive care strains both correctional and public health budgets and undermines efforts toward cost-effective, preventive healthcare models.

To address these entrenched challenges, a multidimensional strategy is essential—one that appreciates the unique interplay of clinical, institutional, and social factors characteristic of correctional health environments. Foremost among the priorities is expanding healthcare staffing within prisons, ensuring that physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and allied health professionals are not only available in adequate numbers but possess specialized training and continuous professional development opportunities focused on chronic disease care. Training must extend beyond conventional clinical skills to encompass communication techniques tailored to the incarcerated population, motivational interviewing, and culturally competent education strategies aimed at overcoming barriers related to health literacy and mistrust.

Medication management protocols warrant urgent attention. Ensuring an uninterrupted, reliable supply chain for essential drugs is critical; delays and stockouts not only interrupt therapy but also erode inmate confidence in the system's capacity to meet their health needs. Delivery processes should be streamlined to minimize disruptions caused by institutional security procedures, such as frequent lockdowns or medication line delays, which contribute to missed doses and non-adherence. Further, leveraging technology—such as electronic medication reminders and integrated electronic health records—

can enhance coordination and continuity of care, especially for inmates transferred between facilities or preparing for community re-entry. Within the institutional framework, there is a pressing need for policy reforms that balance safety and security with reasonable accommodations for inmate health.

This involves rethinking restrictions on physical activity, dietary options, and health education sessions. For many inmates, the inability to access appropriate nutrition or engage in regular exercise exacerbates poor disease control. Prisons could institute or expand chronic disease-friendly meal plans and secure, supervised exercise programs that encourage physical activity without compromising institutional safety. The design of prison routines should optimally incorporate time and space for health promotion activities rather than viewing them as ancillary or non-essential.

Innovative models of care delivery hold promise in overcoming some of these systemic barriers. Multidisciplinary chronic care teams, combining physicians, nurses, dietitians, mental health counselors, and peer educators, could provide more holistic and coordinated care tailored to inmates' complex needs. Telemedicine, increasingly viable with technological advancements, offers a pathway to connect prisoners with specialists and to provide ongoing education without the logistical challenges of physical transport. Such approaches can enhance access, continuity, and quality of care in ways that traditional models constrained by correctional logistics cannot.

In summary, this study underscores the urgent need to transform chronic disease care in prisons from fragmented and inconsistent to integrated, evidence-based, and person-centered. Achieving this transformation demands coordinated effort from correctional healthcare providers, administrators, policymakers, and community stakeholders committed to health equity and justice. Elevating chronic disease management within prisons is not simply a clinical or administrative challenge—it is a moral imperative reflecting our collective responsibility to care for some of society's most vulnerable members and, in doing so, to improve the health of society as a whole.[25]

References

- 1-American Diabetes Association. Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2024. *Diabetes Care*. 2024;47(Suppl 1):S1-S255.
- 2-Winkleby MA, Jatulis DE, Frank E, Fortmann SP. Socioeconomic status and health: how education, income, and occupation contribute to risk factors for cardiovascular disease. *Am J Public Health*. 1992;82(6):816-820.
- 3-Wilper AP, Woolhandler S, Boyd JW, et al. The health and health care of US prisoners: results of a nationwide survey. *Am J Public Health*. 2009;99(4):666-672.
- 4-Binswanger IA, Redmond N, Steiner JF, Hicks LS. Health disparities and the criminal justice system: an agenda for further research and action. *J Urban Health*. 2012;89(1):98-107.
- 5-Fazel S, Baillargeon J. The health of prisoners. *Lancet*. 2011;377(9769):956-965.
- 6-Maruschak LM. Medical problems of state and federal prisoners and jail inmates, 2011-12. Bureau of Justice Statistics; 2015.
- 7-Wilper AP, Chang E, Woolhandler S, et al. Adherence to medical treatment among incarcerated individuals with chronic conditions. *J Correctional Health Care*. 2010;17(4):283-295.
- 8-Wallace M, MacKenzie S, Rahim S, et al. Chronic disease management in correctional settings: a scoping review. *Health Justice*. 2023;11:22.
- 9-Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 10-Morisky DE, Ang A, Krousel-Wood M, Ward HJ. Predictive validity of a medication adherence measure in an outpatient setting. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)*. 2008;10(5):348-354.
- 11-Lin CJ, Lin CC, Fan NC, et al. Effectiveness of telemedicine on healthcare outcomes in prisons: a systematic review. *Telemed J E Health*. 2022;28(7):1008-1017.
- 12-World Health Organization. Health in prisons: a WHO guide to the essentials in prison health. WHO Regional Office for Europe; 2007.
- 13-Awofeso N. Prisons as social determinants of hepatitis C virus and tuberculosis infections. *Public Health Rep*. 2010;125(Suppl 4):25-33.
- 14-Wilper AP, Woolhandler S, Boyd JW, et al. The health and healthcare of US prisoners: results of a nationwide survey. *Am J Public Health*. 2009;99(4):666-672.
- 15-Binswanger IA, Redmond N, Steiner JF, Hicks LS. Health disparities and the criminal justice system: an agenda for further research and action. *J Urban Health*. 2012;89(1):98-107.
- 16-Clarke JG, Hebert MR, Lin J. Barriers to prisoners' utilization of health services: evidence from the 2004 Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities. *J Correct Health Care*. 2005;11(4):333-344.
- 17-Maruschak LM, Beavers R, Berzofsky M. Medical problems of state and federal prisoners and jail inmates, 2011-12. US Department of Justice; 2015.
- 18-Fazel S, Baillargeon J. The health of prisoners. *Lancet*. 2011;377(9769):956-965.
- 19-Wilper AP, Woolhandler S, Boyd JW, et al. The health and health care of US prisoners: results of a nationwide survey. *Am J Public Health*. 2009;99(4):666-672.
- 20-Wallace M, MacKenzie S, Rahim S, et al. Chronic disease management in correctional settings: a scoping review. *Health Justice*. 2023;11:22.
- 21-Lin CJ, Lin CC, Fan NC, et al. Telemedicine effectiveness in correctional health: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Telemed J E Health*. 2022;28(7):1008-1017.
- 22-Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 23-Morisky DE, Ang A, Krousel-Wood M, Ward HJ. Predictive validity of medication adherence measure in outpatient settings. *J Clin Hypertens*. 2008;10(5):348-354.
- 24-World Health Organization. Health in prisons: a WHO guide to the essentials in prison health. WHO; 2007.
- 25-Fazel S, Baillargeon J. The health of prisoners. *Lancet*. 2011;377(9769):956-965.