MCBU SBED MANİSA CELAL BAYAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ SAĞLIK BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ DERGİSİ MANISA CELAL BAYAR UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF INSTITUTE OF HEALTH SCIENCE ISSN: 2147-9607____

ARAȘTIRMA MAKALESİ RESEARCH ARTICLE CBU-SBED, 2023, 10 (2): 127-135.

Hipertansiyon Hastası Yönetimi Konusunda Aile Hekimliği Asistan Eğitiminin Değerlendirilmesi

Evaluation of Hypertension Patient Management During Family Medicine Trainee Education

Olgu Aygün^{1*}, Özden Gökdemir², Ediz Yildirim³, Gizem Limnili³, Dilek Güldal³

¹Bozyaka Eğitim Araştırma Hastanesi Aile Hekimliği Izmir, Türkiye.
²İzmir Ekonomi Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dahili Tıp Bölümü Aile Hekimliği, Izmir ,Türkiye.
³Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Tıp Fakultesi Aile Hekimliği, Izmir Türkiye.

e-mail: olgu4780@gmail.com, gokdemirozden@gmail.com, a.ediz.yildirim@gmail.com, gizemkismali@gmail.com, guldal.dilek@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-9767-011X ORCID: 0000-0002-0542-5767 ORCID: 0000-0002-4168-8994 ORCID: 0000-0002-2321-9182 ORCID: 0000-0002-7344-9349 *Sorumlu Yazar / Corresponding Author: Olgu Aygün

> Gönderim Tarihi / Received:17.04.2023 Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 31.05.2023 DOI: 10.34087/cbusbed.1284455

> > Öz

Giriş ve Amaç: Hipertansiyon (HT), yüksek kan basıncı ile ortaya çıkan sistemik bir hastalık olup, toplumda yaygın olarak görülen ve ciddi komplikasyonlara neden olan büyük bir sağlık sorunudur. Kan basıncı düzeylerinin kontrolü, ortaya çıkan komplikasyonları azaltmada önemli bir adımdır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, aile hekimliği asistanlarının HT bilgi ve farkındalığı üzerinde yüz yüze HT eğitiminin etkisini değerlendirmek ve ihtiyaçlarını anlamaktır.

Gereç ve Yöntemler: Çalışmamız, betimleyici-kesitsel araştırma tasarımında planlandı. Yüz yüze eğitimden hemen önce ve sonra, katılımcılara, Türk Hipertansiyon Konsensus Raporları 2019 ve Türkiye Endokrinoloji ve Metabolizma Derneği tarafından 2022 yılında yayınlanan Hipertansiyon Tanı ve Tedavi Kılavuzu temel alınarak araştırmacılar tarafından oluşturulan bir anket verildi.

Bulgular: Çalışmamızda, yüz yüze eğitimin HT ile ilgili 15 alt kategorideki etkisini müdahale araştırma modeli olarak inceledik. Eğitim sonrası değerlendirmede, 15 alt kategorinin 12'si teorik soruları, üçü ise vaka temelli değerlendirme sorularını içeriyordu. Soruların %50 veya daha fazlasını doğru cevaplamak hedeflenmiş olup, eğitim sonrası, 15 alt kategoriden beşinde bu hedefin genel olarak başarıldığı gözlendi.

Sonuç: Yüz yüze eğitim, birincil sağlık hizmetlerinde HT yönetiminin iki önemli unsuru olan bilgi ve farkındalığı artırmada ve değerlendirme kapasitesinde etkilidir. HT ile ilgili 15 alt kategoriye yapılan ayrıntılı inceleme, etki büyüklüğü açısından daha iyi olan kategorileri ortaya çıkardı. Çalışmamız, HT yönetimi ile ilgili alt kategorilere etkileri de ayrıntılı bir şekilde ele alarak (örneğin, birinci basamak HT yönetimine direnç gibi) ilginç ve biraz beklenmedik sonuçlar ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Aile Hekimliği Uzmanlık Eğitimi, Hasta Yönetimi, Hipertansiyon.

Abstract

Objective: Hypertension (HT) is a systemic disease manifested by high blood pressure and is a major health problem, common in the community and the cause of serious complications. Control of blood pressure levels is an essential step in reducing omit complications. The aim of the study is to evaluate the impact of face-to-face HT

training on the HT knowledge and awareness of the family medicine resident doctors and to understand their needs.

Materials and Methods: Our study was planned in a descriptive-cross-sectional research design. Just before and after the face-to-face training, participants were given a questionnaire developed by researchers based on two documents: the Turkish Hypertension Consensus Reports published in 2019, and the Hypertension Diagnosis and Treatment Guidelines published by the Turkish Endocrinology and Metabolism Society in 2022.

Results: In our study, we observed the effect of face-to-face education on 15 sub-categories of HT as an intervention research model. In the post-training evaluation, 12 of the 15 sub-categories involved theoretical questions, and three were case-based evaluation questions. The goal was to answer 50% or more of the questions correctly, and it was observed that, after the training, in five of the fifteen sub-categories, this target was generally achieved.

Conclusion: Face-to-face training is effective in increasing knowledge and awareness, and evaluation capacity, which are two important elements of HT administration in primary care. A detailed examination of 15 subcategories related to HT revealed the categories that were better in terms of effect size. Our study also detailed the effects on sub-categories related to HT management (such as resistance to first-stage HT management), which reveal interesting and somewhat unexpected results.

Keywords: Family Medicine Traininng, Patient Management, Hypertansion

1. Introduction

Hypertension (HT), a systemic disease manifesting as high blood pressure, is a significant and widespread public health problem with serious complications [1]. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that 1.28 billion adults between the ages of 30 and 79 suffer from HT worldwide, primarily in countries with lower and middle socioeconomic status. WHO also indicates that only 42% of patients are aware of their HT and are receiving treatment [2]. According to WHO data, one in four men and one in five women have HT [3]. Various studies conducted in Turkey demonstrate that the prevalence of HT in adults is between 30.3% and 36.5% [1,4].

HT is a major cause of early death globally [2]. As the blood pressure increases, the extent of damage to the cardiovascular system rises significantly. Thus, blood pressure control is essential in reducing HT complications. The early detection and initiation of treatment is crucial, as it provides patients with the necessary information to manage their condition, thereby preventing the development of complications [5,6]. Therefore, family medicine specialist students aiming to work in primary education should have upto-date and accurate information about the illness [6,7].

The curriculum for the training of family physicians specifies the knowledge and skills that physicians need in practice [8,9]. According to WHO, 21st-century diseases should be confronted through primary health care, and better use of existing preventive measures could reduce the global disease burden by up to 70% [9,10]. Therefore, the aim of this study is to evaluate the effect of HT education and to determine practitioners' knowledge levels to identify their requirements.

2. Materials and Methods

This study was planned as an interventional study. Before and after their training, the participant filled out a questionnaire derived from the "Hypertension Diagnosis and Treatment Guidelines", published by the Endocrinology and Metabolism Association of Turkey in 2022, as well as the "Turkish Hypertension Consensus Reports" released in 2019.

The study consisted of 60 medical specialty students from Dokuz Eylül University's (DEU) Department of Family Medicine. These students, who had undertaken an eight-hour in-person Hypertension (HT) course in the university auditorium, participated in this study's Google Survey (distributed via email) both before and after their training. The participants were asked to give themselves a code name, which was used to identify them anonymously in the analyses. The sampling inclusion criteria included students who agreed to take part in the research and who fully completed the online forms sent via email. The items in the survey form were created after an examination of the research literature. In each item, participants were tasked with evaluating the accuracy of data provided by the guidelines regarding the treatment. diagnosis. and management of hypertension, rating each as either correct or incorrect. To guarantee homogeneity, the percentage of items with correct information was calculated. The survey included questions regarding participants' demographic data, as well as queries to assess their understanding of hypertension diagnosis and management.

We performed ROC analysis for sensitivity and specifity of age among the educational success groups

Furhermore we performed a Cut-of analysis Group A; Scores increased Group B; Scores never changed or worsed

Data analysis

Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 21.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY). Parametric and nonparametric analysis methods were selected according to the number and percentage values, normal distribution, and covariance suitability for sociodemographic characteristics. In the data analysis, frequency and percentage distributions, chisquare analysis, and t-test were used. A value of p < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Results

This study examined the effect of in-person education on 15 subcategories related to HT as an interventional research model. In the **post**-training questionnaire, theoretical questions were presented for 12 out of 15 subcategories, while the remaining three subcategories contained case-based questions. Status of our hypothesis acceptance is shown in Table 1.

The participants were divided into two groups based on the pre-education scores, the Before Education = 0 group and the Before Education => 1 group (Those with 0 scores prior to training were considered a separate categorical group, as were those with 1 and above).

We investigated the following: "How does education help those who do not know? How does education help those with a score of 1 or higher.

The group was divided into two age groups: 27 years old or under, and those over 27 ". We performed ROC analysis for sensitivity and specifity of age among the educational success groups (Figure 1).

Table 1. Status of our hypothesis acceptance

Hypothese	s Category
H1.a	A.Knowledge about the causes of the HT (not essential HT)
H2.1.a	B. Secondary Causes of Hypertension (HT)
H3.1.a	C. Knowledge about the HT (Neurological) Complications
H4.1.a	D. Out-of-Office Measurement Indications
H5.1.a	E. Ambulatory Measurement Is Indicated
H6.1.a	F. Knowledge about focus history taking of HT
H7.1.a	G. Case 1. Cardiovascular Evaluation
H.8.1.a	H. Evaluating Treatment Failure Administration
H9.1.a	I. Which circumstances indicate suspicion of Secondary HT?
H10.1.a	J. Assessment of the Treatment-Resistant Patient
H11.1.a	K. Management Hypertensive Syndrome
H12.1.a	L. Knowledge of Home Blood Pressure Monitoring Indications
H13.1.a	M. HT Knowledge of Physical Examination
H14.1.a	O. HT Knowledge of Their Examinations
H15.1.a	R. Knowledge of HT Management During Pregnancy

Furthermore, we performed a Cut-of analysis. The effectiveness of the training measured by scores was analysed according to gender, and age. As a result, the effect size and power increased. Since these elements were important, originality was also included (Table 2).

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		J	K	ι	M	N	0	Р	Q	R	Ş	Ţ
			Positive if Less Than or		<u>1</u> .	Specificity TNR	LR+	LR-					DOR	ACC	PPV	NPV	F1 Score	ACC+F1	BA
В		TOTAL	Equal To ^a		Specificity		_		TP	FN	TN	FP							
14	46	60	23,00	0,000	,000	1,000	#SAYIO!	1,00	0	14	46		#SAYIO!	0,77	#SAYVO!	0,767	#SAYIO!	#SAYIO!	0,500
14	46	60	24,50	0,000	,043	0,957	· ,0	1,04	0	14	44	2		0,73	- ,00	0,759	#SAYIO!	#SAYIO!	0,479
14	46	60	25,50	0,143	,174	0,826	0,82	1,04	2	12	38	8	1	0,67	0,200	0,760	0,17	0,44	0,485
14	46	60	26,50	0,500	,370	0,630	1,35	0,79	1	7	29	17	2	0,60	0,291	0,805	0,37	0,51	0,565
14	46	60	27,50	0,571	,500	0,500	1,14	0,86	8	6	23	23	1	0,52	0,258	0,793	0,36	0,47	0,536
14	46	60	28,50	,714	,717	0,283	1,00	1,01	10	4	13	33	1	0,38	0,233	0,765	0,35	0,41	0,499
14	46	60	29,50	,857	,783	0,217	1,09	0,66	12	2	10	36	2	0,37	0,250	0,833	0,39	0,43	0,537
14	46	60	30,50	,857	,913	0,087	0,94	1,64	12	2	4	42	1	0,27	0,222	0,667	0,35	0,36	0,472
14	46	60	31,50	,929	,935	0,065	0,99	1,09	13	1	3	43	1	0,27	0,232	0,751	0,37	0,38	0,497
14	46	60	33,00	,929	,957	0,043	0,97	1,65	13	1	2	44	1	0,25	0,228	0,666	0,37	0,37	0,486
14	46	60	34,50	,929	,978	0,022	0,95	3,23	13	1	1	45	0	0,23	0,224	0,504	0,36	0,36	0,476
14	46	60	39,50	1,000	,978	0,022	1,02	- ,0	14		1	45	#SAYIO!	0,25	0,237	1,000	0,38	0,38	0,511
14	46	60	45,00	1,000	1,000	- ,0	1,00	#SAYVO!	14			46	#SAYIO!	0,23	0,233	#SAYIO!	0,38	0,37	0,500
PR= True Po	ositive Rat	te	LR+= Positive Like	elihood Ratio	TP= True Positiv	e		TN= True	Negative		DOR= Dia	gnotic Odds	Ratio	PPV= Posi	ive Predictiv	e Value			
					FN= False Negat	Ne		FP= False	Positive		ACC= Acc	uracy		NPV= Nega	ative Predicti	ve Value			
	B 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	B 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46 14 46	B TOTAL 14 46 60	Positive if Less Than or B TOTAL Equal To ⁸ 14 46 60 23.00 14 46 60 24.50 14 46 60 24.50 14 46 60 26.50 14 46 60 26.50 14 46 60 28.50 14 46 60 29.50 14 46 60 30.50 14 46 60 31.50 14 46 60 33.00 14 46 60 34.50 14 46 60 34.50 14 46 60 34.50 14 46 60 34.50 14 46 60 34.50 14 46 60 45.00 R= True Postive Rate LR= Postive Like R= Hepative Like	Positive if Sensitivity Less Than or Sensitivity TPR B TOTAL Equal To ³ 14 46 60 23,00 0,000 14 46 60 24,50 0,000 14 46 60 25,50 0,143 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 14 46 60 27,50 0,501 14 46 60 28,50 ,714 14 46 60 30,50 ,857 14 46 60 31,50 ,929 14 46 60 33,00 ,929 14 46 60 34,50 ,929 14 46 60 39,50 1,000 14 46 60 39,50 1,000 14 46 60 34,50 ,929 14 46 60 34,50 ,929 14 46 60 39,50 </td <td>Positive if Sensitivity Less Than or TPR 1. B TOTAL Equal To³ Specificity 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 14 46 60 24.50 0.000 .043 14 46 60 25.50 0.143 .174 14 46 60 25.50 0.500 .370 14 46 60 26.50 0.500 .370 14 46 60 29.50 .657 .783 14 46 60 31.50 .929 .935 14 46 60 33.00 .929 .935 14 46 60 33.00 .929 .936 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .936 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .937 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .937 14</td> <td>Positive if Less Than or Sensitivity TRR Specificity TNR B TOTAL Equal To* Specificity 14 46 60 28.00 0.000 0.00 14 46 60 24.50 0.000 0.043 0.957 14 46 60 26.50 0.143 .174 0.826 14 46 60 26.50 0.500 .370 0.630 14 46 60 27.50 0.571 .500 0.500 14 46 60 28.50 .714 .717 0.283 14 46 60 28.50 .714 .717 0.283 14 46 60 30.50 .857 .783 0.217 14 46 60 31.50 .929 .965 0.043 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .978 0.022 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .</td> <td>Positive if Sensitivity Specificity B TOTAL Equal To⁴ Specificity 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 1,000 #SANIO! 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .043 0.957 0 14 46 60 25.50 0.143 .174 0.826 0.82 14 46 60 25.50 0.571 .500 0.500 .135 14 46 60 27.50 0.571 .500 0.500 1.14 14 46 60 29.50 .857 .783 0.217 1.09 14 46 60 31.50 .929 .935 0.065 0.99 14 46 60 33.00 .929 .977 0.043 0.97 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .978 0.022 0.95 14 46 60 34.50</td> <td>Positive if Sensitu/ly Specificity B TOTAL Equal To⁴ Specificity 14 46 60 23:00 0.000 0.000 #SAYI01 1,000 14 46 60 23:00 0.000 0.001 #Specificity #Specificity 14 46 60 23:00 0.000 0.003 #SAYI01 1,00 14 46 60 24:50 0.000 0.043 0,957 -,0 1,04 14 46 60 25:50 0.143 1,74 0,826 0,82 1,04 14 46 60 26:50 0.571 .500 0,500 1,14 0,86 14 46 60 29:50 .857 .783 0,217 1,09 0,66 14 46 60 33:00 .929 .935 0,065 0,99 1,09 14 46 60 34:50 .929 .978 0,022</td> <td>Positive if Sensitivity Less Than or Specificity TPR TNR LR+ LR- TP B TOTAL Equal To⁴ Specificity TNR LR+ LR- TP 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 ,000 1,000 #SAY10! 1,00 0 14 46 60 24.50 0.000 ,043 0,957 - ,0 1,04 0 14 46 60 26.50 0,500 ,370 0,830 1,35 0,79 7 14 46 60 26.50 0,501 ,500 0,500 1,14 0,86 8 14 46 60 28.50 ,714 ,717 0,203 1,00 1,01 10 14 46 60 30.50 ,857 ,783 0,217 1,09 0,68 12 14 46 60 31.50 ,929 ,935 0,043 0,97 1,65 13</td> <td>Positive if Sensitivity Specificity TNR LR+ LR- B TOTAL Equal To³ Specificity TNR LR+ LR- 14 46 60 28.00 0.000 .000 1,000 #SAY107 1,00 0 14 14 46 60 28.00 0.000 .044 0.957 - ,0 1,04 0 14 14 46 60 26.50 0.143 .174 0.826 0.82 1,04 2 12 14 46 60 26.50 0.501 .500 0.630 1,35 0.79 7 7 14 46 60 27.50 0.571 .500 0.630 1,41 0.86 8 6 14 46 60 28.50 .714 .717 0.223 1,00 1,01 10 4 14 46 60 38.50 .929 .935 0.065 0.99</td> <td>Positive if Senstruty Less Than or Specificity TLR TNR LR+ LR- B TOTAL Equal To* Specificity TNR LR+ LR- 14 46 60 23:00 0.000 .000 f.000 #SAY107 1,00 0 14 46 14 46 60 24:50 0.000 .043 0.957 . 0 1,04 0 14 46 14 46 60 26:50 0.143 .174 0.926 0.92 1,04 2 12 38 14 46 60 27:50 0.571 .500 0,500 1,14 0.986 8 6 23 14 46 60 28:50 .714 .717 0.283 1,00 1,01 10 4 13 14 46 60 30:50 .857 .913 0.007 0.94 1,64 12 2 10 14<!--</td--><td>Positive if Sensitivity Specificity B TOTAL Equal To⁸ Specificity TNR LR+ LR- 14 46 60 28,00 0,000 ,000 1,000 #SAVI0! 1,00 0 14 46 - 14 46 60 28,00 0,000 ,043 0,957 - 0 1,04 0 14 46 - 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 ,370 0,630 1,35 0,79 7 7 29 17 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 ,370 0,630 1,35 0,79 7 7 29 17 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 ,370 0,630 1,01 10 4 13 33 14 46 60 30,50 ,657 ,913 0,065 0,99 1,65 13 1 2</td><td>Positive if Serve Luty Less Than or TER Specificity TNR TNR LR+ LR- TP FN TN FP 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 1,000 #SAY101 1,00 0 14 46 - #SAY101 14 46 60 24.50 0.000 .043 0.957 - 0 1,04 0 14 46 - #SAY101 14 46 60 24.50 0.143 .174 0.826 0.82 1,04 2 12 38 8 1 14 46 60 26.50 0.501 .500 0,500 1,14 0.88 8 6 23 23 1 14 46 60 28.50 .714 .717 0.283 1,00 1,01 10 4 13 33 1 14 46 60 30.50 .857 .913 0,027 1,09</td><td>Positive if Sets SUVIV Specificity TNR LR+ LR- TP FN TN FP 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 filler 1.000 #SAN101 1.000 14 46 - #SAN101 0.73 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .044 0.967 - 0 1.04 0 14 46 - #SAN101 0.073 14 46 60 25.50 0.143 .074 0.826 0.92 1.04 2 12 38 8 1 0.67 14 46 60 25.50 0.507 .500 0.500 1.04 0.868 6 23 23 1 0.52 14 46 60 27.50 0.571 .500 0.605 1.04 10 13 33 1 0.38 14 46 60 31.50 .529 .935 0.0</td><td>Positive if Sets SUM Specificity TIR LR+ LR- DOR ACC PPV B TOTAL Equal To⁴ Specificity TIR LR+ LR- TP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN FN TN FN</td><td>Posthe if Senstruity Less Than or Specificity TRR IR+ IR+ IR- IR+ IR- DOR ACC PPV NPV B TOTAL Equal To* Specificity TR IR+ IR- IR FP FN TN FP FN TN PP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FR</td><td>Posthe if Sectificity Less Than or Specificity TR TN FP TN FP DOR ACC PPV NPV FI Score 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 0.00 #SA110 1,00 6 14 46 - #SA110 0,77</td><td>Positive if Securificity Less Trian or TIR LR+ <</td></td>	Positive if Sensitivity Less Than or TPR 1. B TOTAL Equal To ³ Specificity 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 14 46 60 24.50 0.000 .043 14 46 60 25.50 0.143 .174 14 46 60 25.50 0.500 .370 14 46 60 26.50 0.500 .370 14 46 60 29.50 .657 .783 14 46 60 31.50 .929 .935 14 46 60 33.00 .929 .935 14 46 60 33.00 .929 .936 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .936 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .937 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .937 14	Positive if Less Than or Sensitivity TRR Specificity TNR B TOTAL Equal To* Specificity 14 46 60 28.00 0.000 0.00 14 46 60 24.50 0.000 0.043 0.957 14 46 60 26.50 0.143 .174 0.826 14 46 60 26.50 0.500 .370 0.630 14 46 60 27.50 0.571 .500 0.500 14 46 60 28.50 .714 .717 0.283 14 46 60 28.50 .714 .717 0.283 14 46 60 30.50 .857 .783 0.217 14 46 60 31.50 .929 .965 0.043 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .978 0.022 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .	Positive if Sensitivity Specificity B TOTAL Equal To ⁴ Specificity 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 1,000 #SANIO! 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .043 0.957 0 14 46 60 25.50 0.143 .174 0.826 0.82 14 46 60 25.50 0.571 .500 0.500 .135 14 46 60 27.50 0.571 .500 0.500 1.14 14 46 60 29.50 .857 .783 0.217 1.09 14 46 60 31.50 .929 .935 0.065 0.99 14 46 60 33.00 .929 .977 0.043 0.97 14 46 60 34.50 .929 .978 0.022 0.95 14 46 60 34.50	Positive if Sensitu/ly Specificity B TOTAL Equal To ⁴ Specificity 14 46 60 23:00 0.000 0.000 #SAYI01 1,000 14 46 60 23:00 0.000 0.001 #Specificity #Specificity 14 46 60 23:00 0.000 0.003 #SAYI01 1,00 14 46 60 24:50 0.000 0.043 0,957 -,0 1,04 14 46 60 25:50 0.143 1,74 0,826 0,82 1,04 14 46 60 26:50 0.571 .500 0,500 1,14 0,86 14 46 60 29:50 .857 .783 0,217 1,09 0,66 14 46 60 33:00 .929 .935 0,065 0,99 1,09 14 46 60 34:50 .929 .978 0,022	Positive if Sensitivity Less Than or Specificity TPR TNR LR+ LR- TP B TOTAL Equal To ⁴ Specificity TNR LR+ LR- TP 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 ,000 1,000 #SAY10! 1,00 0 14 46 60 24.50 0.000 ,043 0,957 - ,0 1,04 0 14 46 60 26.50 0,500 ,370 0,830 1,35 0,79 7 14 46 60 26.50 0,501 ,500 0,500 1,14 0,86 8 14 46 60 28.50 ,714 ,717 0,203 1,00 1,01 10 14 46 60 30.50 ,857 ,783 0,217 1,09 0,68 12 14 46 60 31.50 ,929 ,935 0,043 0,97 1,65 13	Positive if Sensitivity Specificity TNR LR+ LR- B TOTAL Equal To ³ Specificity TNR LR+ LR- 14 46 60 28.00 0.000 .000 1,000 #SAY107 1,00 0 14 14 46 60 28.00 0.000 .044 0.957 - ,0 1,04 0 14 14 46 60 26.50 0.143 .174 0.826 0.82 1,04 2 12 14 46 60 26.50 0.501 .500 0.630 1,35 0.79 7 7 14 46 60 27.50 0.571 .500 0.630 1,41 0.86 8 6 14 46 60 28.50 .714 .717 0.223 1,00 1,01 10 4 14 46 60 38.50 .929 .935 0.065 0.99	Positive if Senstruty Less Than or Specificity TLR TNR LR+ LR- B TOTAL Equal To* Specificity TNR LR+ LR- 14 46 60 23:00 0.000 .000 f.000 #SAY107 1,00 0 14 46 14 46 60 24:50 0.000 .043 0.957 . 0 1,04 0 14 46 14 46 60 26:50 0.143 .174 0.926 0.92 1,04 2 12 38 14 46 60 27:50 0.571 .500 0,500 1,14 0.986 8 6 23 14 46 60 28:50 .714 .717 0.283 1,00 1,01 10 4 13 14 46 60 30:50 .857 .913 0.007 0.94 1,64 12 2 10 14 </td <td>Positive if Sensitivity Specificity B TOTAL Equal To⁸ Specificity TNR LR+ LR- 14 46 60 28,00 0,000 ,000 1,000 #SAVI0! 1,00 0 14 46 - 14 46 60 28,00 0,000 ,043 0,957 - 0 1,04 0 14 46 - 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 ,370 0,630 1,35 0,79 7 7 29 17 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 ,370 0,630 1,35 0,79 7 7 29 17 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 ,370 0,630 1,01 10 4 13 33 14 46 60 30,50 ,657 ,913 0,065 0,99 1,65 13 1 2</td> <td>Positive if Serve Luty Less Than or TER Specificity TNR TNR LR+ LR- TP FN TN FP 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 1,000 #SAY101 1,00 0 14 46 - #SAY101 14 46 60 24.50 0.000 .043 0.957 - 0 1,04 0 14 46 - #SAY101 14 46 60 24.50 0.143 .174 0.826 0.82 1,04 2 12 38 8 1 14 46 60 26.50 0.501 .500 0,500 1,14 0.88 8 6 23 23 1 14 46 60 28.50 .714 .717 0.283 1,00 1,01 10 4 13 33 1 14 46 60 30.50 .857 .913 0,027 1,09</td> <td>Positive if Sets SUVIV Specificity TNR LR+ LR- TP FN TN FP 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 filler 1.000 #SAN101 1.000 14 46 - #SAN101 0.73 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .044 0.967 - 0 1.04 0 14 46 - #SAN101 0.073 14 46 60 25.50 0.143 .074 0.826 0.92 1.04 2 12 38 8 1 0.67 14 46 60 25.50 0.507 .500 0.500 1.04 0.868 6 23 23 1 0.52 14 46 60 27.50 0.571 .500 0.605 1.04 10 13 33 1 0.38 14 46 60 31.50 .529 .935 0.0</td> <td>Positive if Sets SUM Specificity TIR LR+ LR- DOR ACC PPV B TOTAL Equal To⁴ Specificity TIR LR+ LR- TP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN FN TN FN</td> <td>Posthe if Senstruity Less Than or Specificity TRR IR+ IR+ IR- IR+ IR- DOR ACC PPV NPV B TOTAL Equal To* Specificity TR IR+ IR- IR FP FN TN FP FN TN PP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FR</td> <td>Posthe if Sectificity Less Than or Specificity TR TN FP TN FP DOR ACC PPV NPV FI Score 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 0.00 #SA110 1,00 6 14 46 - #SA110 0,77</td> <td>Positive if Securificity Less Trian or TIR LR+ <</td>	Positive if Sensitivity Specificity B TOTAL Equal To ⁸ Specificity TNR LR+ LR- 14 46 60 28,00 0,000 ,000 1,000 #SAVI0! 1,00 0 14 46 - 14 46 60 28,00 0,000 ,043 0,957 - 0 1,04 0 14 46 - 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 ,370 0,630 1,35 0,79 7 7 29 17 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 ,370 0,630 1,35 0,79 7 7 29 17 14 46 60 26,50 0,500 ,370 0,630 1,01 10 4 13 33 14 46 60 30,50 ,657 ,913 0,065 0,99 1,65 13 1 2	Positive if Serve Luty Less Than or TER Specificity TNR TNR LR+ LR- TP FN TN FP 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 1,000 #SAY101 1,00 0 14 46 - #SAY101 14 46 60 24.50 0.000 .043 0.957 - 0 1,04 0 14 46 - #SAY101 14 46 60 24.50 0.143 .174 0.826 0.82 1,04 2 12 38 8 1 14 46 60 26.50 0.501 .500 0,500 1,14 0.88 8 6 23 23 1 14 46 60 28.50 .714 .717 0.283 1,00 1,01 10 4 13 33 1 14 46 60 30.50 .857 .913 0,027 1,09	Positive if Sets SUVIV Specificity TNR LR+ LR- TP FN TN FP 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .000 filler 1.000 #SAN101 1.000 14 46 - #SAN101 0.73 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 .044 0.967 - 0 1.04 0 14 46 - #SAN101 0.073 14 46 60 25.50 0.143 .074 0.826 0.92 1.04 2 12 38 8 1 0.67 14 46 60 25.50 0.507 .500 0.500 1.04 0.868 6 23 23 1 0.52 14 46 60 27.50 0.571 .500 0.605 1.04 10 13 33 1 0.38 14 46 60 31.50 .529 .935 0.0	Positive if Sets SUM Specificity TIR LR+ LR- DOR ACC PPV B TOTAL Equal To ⁴ Specificity TIR LR+ LR- TP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FD FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN TN FN FN TN FN	Posthe if Senstruity Less Than or Specificity TRR IR+ IR+ IR- IR+ IR- DOR ACC PPV NPV B TOTAL Equal To* Specificity TR IR+ IR- IR FP FN TN FP FN TN PP FN TN FP FN TN FP FN TN FR	Posthe if Sectificity Less Than or Specificity TR TN FP TN FP DOR ACC PPV NPV FI Score 14 46 60 23.00 0.000 0.00 #SA110 1,00 6 14 46 - #SA110 0,77	Positive if Securificity Less Trian or TIR LR+ <

Figure 1. ROC analysis for sensitivity and specifity of age among the educational success groups

			Man		Wo	men	Gei Str		
			N	<mark>DE ± SS</mark> , <mark>%</mark>	N	DE ± SS, %	N	DE ± SS, <mark>%</mark>	р
Age			28	28.64 ± 3.99	32	27.09 ± 1.82	60	27.82 ± 3.10	0.067
Age group)		9 19	32.0 68.0	15 17	46.8 53.2	24 36	40.0 60.0	0.245
Before Education (BE) score	A. Hypertension (HT) Out of Tension High	BE = 0 BE = > 1		50.0 50.0	18 13	58.1 41.9	30 25	54.5 45.5	0.551
group	B. Secondary Causes of HT	BE= 0 BE = > 1	9 15	37.5 62.5	20 9	69.0 31.0	29 24	54.7 45.3	0.044
	C. Complications	BE = 0 BE = > 1		96.4 3.6	31 1	96.9 3.1	58 2	96.7 3.3	1.000
	D. Out-of- Office Measurement Indications	BE = 0 BE = > 1		70.8 29.2	18 13	58.1 41.9	35 20	63.6 36.4	0.488
	E. Ambulatory Measurement Is Indicated	BE = 0 BE = > 1		75.0 25.0	22 10	68.8 31.3	40 16	71.4 28.6	0.831
	F. Don't Know How to take patient history	BE = 0 BE = > 1	12 15	44.4 55.6	6 24	20.0 80.0	18 39	31.6 68.4	0.09(
	G. Case 1. Cardiovascular Evaluation	BE = 0 BE = > 1	0 26	0.0 100.0	0 31	0.0 100.0	0 57	0.0 100.0	b
	H. Assessing Failure	BE = 0 BE = > 1		0.0 100.0	1 29	3.3 96.7	1 57	1.7 98.3	1.000
	I. Secondary HT Clinic	BE = 0 BE = > 1		0.0 100.0	1 29	3.3 96.7	1 55	1.8 98.2	1.00(
		BE = 0 BE = > 1		0.0 100.0	0 30	0.0 100.0	0 57	0.0 100.0	b

Table 2. Code age, the groups before education encompass the number and demographic characteristics of the participants.

a. Since the data in the analyses differ depending on the suitability of the Cook's and Leverage extreme value study, there are different numbers of groups in the subcategories.

b. Due to some scores of zero, chi-square analysis could not be performed.

Sufficient effect size: 0.5 Enough power: 0.8 and higher accepted.

For these subcategories, the application of education had a significant effect. Sufficient effect was provided in 12 of the 13 subcategories; by the eleventh, enough power had been provided. The highest effect was for J. Case.2. Resistance Evaluation in the evaluation category. Second, E. Ambulatory Measurement is indicated, and as the 3. Case 1.evaluation categories followed.

Regenerate response

After evaluating the additional effect of the gender factor on the outcome of education, the questionnaire scores before and after the education intervention were calculated as the total score for all questions in the HT Knowledge of Physical Examination category. These scores were divided by the total number of questions to obtain the percentage of correct answers. It was also found that the gender factor was significantly effective in this category (F: 209.263; p < 0.001), and Category M (HT Knowledge of Physical Examination); The effect of educational application (Effect Size, Table 3) was higher in the male group (Table 3).

Table 3. The effect of education factor (gender Groups) on scores.

M. Hypertension Knowledge of Physical Examination	% Average Before Education	% Average After Education	F	Т	Р	R	Effect Size	Power
Female	4.91 ± 12.36	30.36 ± 32.81	16.857	_ 4.106	< 0.001	_ 0.006	0.724	0.755
Male	2.74 ± 5.74	26.92 ± 31.12	15.172	_ 3.895	0.001	0.300	0.808	0.738

Considering the additional effect of age on the education evaluation, for category J (Resistance Evaluation), the total questionnaire scores before and after the education intervention were calculated sum the scores for each category group. These scores were divided by the total number of questions to obtain the percentage of correct answers. The age factor was

found to be significantly effective (F: 6.373; p = 0.013), and in the hypothesis table, (table 1) category J was accepted. The effect of the educational application in the 27 and over group (Effect Size, Table 4) was higher than that in the under-27 group (Table 4).

Table 4. Th	e effect of ag	e.Code factor	r (in age groups) on scores.
	c chiect of up	c.couc fuctor	i (in age groups	, on scores.

fore lucation $.45 \pm 7.93$ $.97 \pm 6.99$ Average fore lucation	 % Average After Education 44.59 ± 9.92 45.96 ± 11.89 % Average After Education 	F 103.049 108.810		< 0.001 < 0.001	0.085 - 0.052	2.313	Power 1.000 0.999
.97 ± 6.99 Average fore lucation	45.96 ± 11.89 % Average After	= 108.810	- 10.431	< 0.001	- 0.052		
Average fore ucation	11.89% Average After	è				1.701	0.999
fore	After		t	n			
0.1				Р	R	Effect Size	Power
	89.52 = 19.61	97.561	-9.877	< 0.001	0.004	2.159	1.000
	41.11 ± 20.81	22.612	-4.755	< 0.001	0.034	0.805	0.786
tore	After	F	t	р	R	Effect Size	Power
		32.045	-5.661	<0.001	0.017	1.215	0.973
		5.150	-2.269	0.027	0.402	0.493	0.819
1 1	Average fore ucation 36 ± 10 09 ±	Average%AverageforeAfterucationEducation $36 \pm 59.09 \pm 10$ 35.16 $09 \pm 63.33 \pm 100$	Average fore% Average AfterFucationEducationF $36 \pm 59.09 \\ 10 35.16 32.045$ 32.045 $09 \pm 63.33 \\ 49 30.46 5.150$	Average fore ucationAverage After EducationFt 36 \pm 59.09 \pm 32.045 -5.661 09 \pm 63.33 \pm 5.150 -2.269	Average fore ucationAverage After EducationFtp 36 ± 59.09 10 ± 35.16 ± 32.045 -5.661<0.001	Average % Average fore After F t p R ucation Education F t p R 36 \pm 59.09 \pm 32.045 -5.661 <0.001	Average fore acationAverage After EducationFtpREffect Size 36 \pm 59.09 35.16 \pm 32.045-5.661<0.001

Scores for Category K (Managing Hypertensive Syndrome) were totalled, and the combined questionnaire scores before and after the education intervention were determined. These scores were divided by the total number of questions to obtain the percentage of correct answers. The age factor was found to be significantly effective for this category (F: 16.289; p < 0.001), and in hypothesis table (table 1) category K was accepted. The effect of educational application in the 27 and over- group (Effect Size), (Table 4) was higher than that in the under-27 group. For category O (HT Code Knowledge), the age factor was found to be significantly effective (F: 5.962: p =0.017), and in hypothesis table (table 1) category was accepted. The effect of educational application in the over-27 group (Table 4) was higher than that in the under-27 group. This study also assessed the incremental impact of the educational component, with 'before education = 0' and 'before education =>1', on the results of the education. The total scores for the Knowledge about the Causes of TA Height Other than A.HT group of questions were calculated to determine the questionnaire scores before and after the intervention. In this category (F: 243.977; p <0.001), the education factor was found to be significantly effective, and H1.1.a was accepted. The effect of educational implementation (Effect Size), (Table 5) was higher in the Before Education = 0group than in the Before Education => 1 group. Concerning category B (Secondary Causes of HT), the total questionnaire scores before and after the education intervention were calculated by adding the results of the questions that formed the Knowledge about the Reasons group [S.M.1]. These scores were divided by the total number of questions to obtain the percentage of correct answers. In this category (F: 246.423; p < 0.001), the education factor was found to be significantly effective, and H2.1.a was accepted. The effect of the educational application (Effect Size), (Table 5) was higher in the Before Education = 0 group than in the Before Education =>1 group.

For category E (End of Ambulatory Measurement in the Knowledge), after totalling the results from the questions in the knowledge group, the combined scores from before and after the education intervention were determined. These scores were divided by the total number of questions to obtain the correct answer percentages. The education factor was found to be significantly effective (F: 307.952; p < 0.001), and H5.1.a was accepted. The effect of the educational application (Effect Size), (Table 5) was higher in the Before Education = 0 group than in the Before Education => 1 group.

It was found that the education factor was significantly effective for category F (Knowledge of How to Take an HT Story). The total questionnaire scores before and after the education intervention were calculated by totalling the scores for questions in the Managing Hypertensive Syndrome group. These scores were divided by the total number of questions to obtain the percentage of correct answers (F: 9.231; p = 0.003), and H6.1.a was accepted. The effect of the educational application (Effect Size), (Table 5) was higher in the Before Education = 0.group than in the Before Education => 1 group.

For category (Hypertensive Syndrome Κ Management), the results of the questions in the Managing Hypertensive Syndrome group were summarized and the combined questionnaire scores from before and after the education intervention were determined. These scores were divided by the total number of questions to obtain the percentage of correct answers. The education factor was found to be significantly effective (F: 68.076; p < 0.001), and H11.1.a was accepted. The effect of the educational application (Effect Size), (Table 5) was higher in the Before Education = 0 group than in the Before Education $\Rightarrow 1$ group.

For category L (End of Measurement at the Home Knowledge), the results of the questions comprising the End of Home Measurement: Calculating the combined knowledge group scores yielded the total questionnaire scores before and after the education intervention. These scores were divided by the total number of questions to obtain the percentage of correct answers. The education factor was found to be significantly effective (F: 16.794; p < 0.001), and H12.1.a was accepted (Table 5).

The education factor was found to be significantly effective for category M (Physical Examination Knowledge of HT. The total questionnaire scores before and after the education intervention were determined by totalling the scores of the questions in this category (F: 209.263; p < 0.001), and H13.1.a was accepted. The effect of the educational application (Effect Size), (Table 5) was higher in the Before Education = 0 group than in the Before Education => 1 group.

For category O (Knowledge About the HT Examinations), the education factor was found to be significantly effective (F: 30.284; p < 0.001), and H14.1.a was accepted. The effect of the educational application (Effect Size, Table 14) was higher in the Before Education = 0 group than in the Before Education => 1 group (Table 5).

3.2.Discussion

Using a preliminary and final questionnaire, a previous study reported the effectiveness of small group information literacy instruction for medical students [11]. Another study observed a positive effect for the participatory clinical education model on nursing students' learning perceptions and capacities [12]. In the current study, a similar positive effect on questionnaire scores was found for the HT-related education model.

The Effect of Educatio	on Factor (Befo	ore Education	Groups) o	n Scores				
A. Hypertension (HT) Out of Tension High	% Average Before Education	% Average After Education	F	t	Р	R	Effect Size	Power
Before Education = 0	$\begin{array}{ccc} 00.00 & \pm \\ 0.00 & \end{array}$	6.13 ± 9.66	NS	NS	< 0.001	NS	0.634	0.238
Before Education =>	$\begin{array}{ccc} 13.09 & \pm \\ 4.33 & \end{array}$	15.08 ± 25.87	31.172	- 0.399	0.693	0.213	0.078	0.82
B. Secondary Causes of Hypertension	% Average Before Education	% Average After Education	F	t	Р	R	Effect Size	Power
Before Education = 0	$\begin{array}{c} 00.00 \pm \\ 0.00 \end{array}$	33.10 ± 32.63	NS	NS	< 0.001	NS	1.014	0.856
Before Education =>	30.00 ± 16.68	32.50 ± 5.88	0.223	- 0.473	0.641	0.244	0.153	0.867
E. End of Ambulatory Measurement in the Knowledge	% Average Before Education	% Average After Education	F	t	р	R	Effect Size	Power
Before Education $= 0$	$\begin{array}{ccc} 00.00 & \pm \\ 0.00 & \end{array}$	16.56 ±11.80	NS	NS	< 0.001	NS	1.403	0.999
Before Education =>	16.40 ± 5.98	21.09 ± 12.68	1.788	_ 1.337	0.195	-0.060	0.327	0.804
F. Knowledge of How to Take a Hypertension Story	% Average Before Education	% Average After Education	F	t	р	R	Effect Size	Power
Before Education $= 0$	$\begin{array}{ccc} 00.00 & \pm \\ 0.00 & \end{array}$	11.61 ±13.87	NS	NS	0.002	NS	0.837	0.901
Before Education =>	11.19 ± 10.62	9.09 ± 15.22	0.498	0.706	0.483	0.001	0.113	0.010
K. Management of Hypertension Syndrome	% Average Before Education	% Average After Education	F	t	р	R	Effect Size	Power
Before Education = 0	$\begin{array}{ccc} 00.00 & \pm \\ 0.00 & \end{array}$	63.53 ±31.81	NS	NS	< 0.001	NS	1.997	1.000
Before Education =>	31.00 ± 14.28	57.00 ± 30.90	23.331	- 4.830	< 0.001	0.286	0.863	0.978
L. Knowledge About End of Measurement At the Home	% Mean Before Education	% Mean After Education	F	t	р	R	Effect Size	Power
Before Education =0	$\begin{array}{ccc} 00.00 & \pm \\ 0.00 & \end{array}$	23.68 ±13.96	NS	NS	< 0.001	NS	1.696	0.999
Before Education =>1	$\begin{array}{ccc} 18.02 & \pm \\ 4.61 & \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{rrr}19.37 & \pm\\ 11.46\end{array}$	0.443	_ 0.665	0.509	0.075	0.112	0.759
M. Physical Examination Knowledge of Hypertension	% Average Before Education	% Average After Education	F	Τ	р	R	Effect Size	Power
Before Education = 0	$\begin{array}{ccc} 00.00 & \pm \\ 0.00 & \end{array}$	26.78 ± 32.23	NS	NS	< 0.001	NS	0.830	0.991
Before Education =>	$\begin{array}{ccc} 22.86 & \pm \\ 12.04 & \end{array}$	38.57 ± 29.39	2.447	_ 1564	0.144	-0.269	0453	0.627
D. Knowledge About he Hypertension Examinations	% Average Before Education	% Average After Education	F	t	р	R	Effect Size	Power
Before Education = 0	$\begin{array}{ccc} 00.00 & \pm \\ 0.00 & \end{array}$	50.00 ±39.44	NS	NS	< 0.001	NS	1.785	0.997
Before Education =>	47.15 ± 23.24	66.26 ± 28.01	11.296	- 3.361	0.001	0.158	0.571	0.636

 Table 5. The effect of education factor (in before education groups) on scores

 The Effect of Education Factor (Before Education Groups) on Scores

For problem-based education, positive effects were observed on knowledge, ability, and evaluation scores for standard patients [13]. In this study, similar effects were observed concerning the problem-based training for, and the evaluation of HT cases. Moreover, previously, positive effects on adherence to HT management guidelines resulted from for a structured physician training and feedback system [14]. In one study, education was observed to improve physicians' HT follow-up behaviors [15]. In the current study, the HT evaluation required monitoring and follow-up of hypertensive pregnancy and HT physical examination, focusing on the physicians' adherence to the guidelines, and similar improvement in the post-intervention score was observed.

Hypertension has a fairly high prevalence in society, meaning relatively high personal and social benefits when adequate HT management is performed in primary care. This study found that the educational training given increased the HT-related to HT?? in almost every category, and that significance was achieved in 13 of the subcategories. Therefore, this educational work can be considered to be generally successful. The percentage of correct post-intervention scores could be considered an indicator of HT management adequacy.

This score could be interpreted as an indication of success in the relevant categories. Clearly, if this level maintained throughout primary were care HT management, it would engender positive results in health management not only from the clinical, but also from the patient and social points of view, leading to more effective treatment.

Another research direction emerging from this study is the observation the influence of specific factors; for example, the findings of future research may suggest that priority should be given to those with before education (BE) scores of 0. Observation of the additional effects of gender and age would also be useful in determining appropriate methods for the implementation of such training in practice.

This study had several limitations. The intervention increased the scores in almost every category, significance was achieved in 13 of the 15 subcategories, and following the training, this was typically achieved in five subcategories, exceeding the target score of at least 50%; however, it is difficult to assess the accuracy of this percentage because we did not use a scale,. Although the target of 50% or more correct answers was achieved in 5 subcategories, upon examining particular cases in these categories, there was a clear distinction between those who scored 50% or higher and those who did not. To better ensure competence in terms of HT management in primary care, future research should evaluate provide individual competence and complementary education to those who have not yet reached the appropriate standard.

In a previous study, it was observed that online education increases the learning capacities of nursing students [16]. 12. Henderson A, Heel A, Twentyman M, Lloyd B: Pre-test and post-test Another stud reported positive results for online occupation therapy training [17]. Moreover, the benefits

of continuous training have been emphasized in the case of DM (diabetes mellitus) [18]. Thus, it is beneficial to disseminate HT-related education via widespread and continuous training, and this could also be provided online.

4. Conclusions

This study illustrated that in-person professional education practice is effective at increasing students' knowledge, awareness, and evaluation capacity, which are important elements of HT management in primary care. In relation to HT, 15 subcategories were examined in detail, revealing the categories that benefited from the education given in terms of the effect size. In addition, a review of factors affecting the usefulness of the education identified the most influential. This study also revealed the detailed effects of education on the subcategories related to HT management, leading to the emergence of original results.

Hypertension remains a highly prevalent health condition globally, and a key focus of medical science. Thus, HT monitoring and management in PC (primary care) is of vital importance. This study has the potential to shed light on clinical applications in this field and to guide future research.

References

- 1. [Hypertension-Manual -2022.pdf [Internet]. [quotation 25 February. (2023)
- https://file.temd.org.tr/Uploads/publications/guides/documents/Hipe rtansiyon-Kilavuzu-2022.pdf.
- 2. [Hypertension [Internet]. [quotation 25 February. (2023). https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/hypertension.
- (2023). 3. Hypertension [Internet]. [quotation 25 February. https://www.who.int/health-topics/hypertension.
- 4. Satman I, Omer B, Tutuncu Y, et al.: Twelve-year trends in the prevalence and risk factors of diabetes and prediabetes in Turkish adults. Eur J Epidemiol. 2013, 28:169-80. 10.1007/s10654-013-9771-5
- 5. Li X, Krumholz HM, Yip W, et al.: Quality of primary health care in China: challenges and recommendations. Lancet. 2020, 395:1802-12. 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30122-7
- 6. Mogueo A, Defo BK: Patients' and family caregivers' experiences and perceptions about factors hampering or facilitating patient empowerment for self-management of hypertension and diabetes in Cameroon. BMC Health Serv Res. 2022, 22:1381. 10.1186/s12913-022-08750-4
- 7. Yan C, Yuan Y, Zhao D, et al.: Family Doctor Contract Services and Awareness of Blood Pressure Measurement Among Hypertension Patients: A Cross-Sectional Study in Rural Shandong, China. Front Public Health. 2022, 10:757481. 10.3389/fpubh.2022.757481
- 8. Rakel AGAIN: Family Medicine Textbook E-Book. Elsevier Health Sciences, 2007
- Ö.THE ROLE AND 9. İyişenyürek IMPORTANCE OF HYPERTENSION DISEASE OF FAMILY HEALTH CENTERS: https://acikerisim.medipol.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.125 11/7420/%C4%B0yisenyurek-Omer-2018.pdf?sequence=1&....
- 10. Primary health care services [Internet]. [excerpt from February 27. (2023). https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/primaryhealth-care.
- additional 11. McClurg C, Powelson S, Lang E, Aghajafari F, Edworthy S: Evaluating effectiveness of small group information literacy instruction for Undergraduate Medical Education students using a pre- and post-survey study design. Health Info Libr J. 2015, 32:120-30. 10.1111/hir.12098
 - evaluation of students' perceptions of a collaborative clinical education model on the learning environment. Aust J Adv Nurs. 2006. 23:8-13.

- Davis P, Kvern B, Donen N, Andrews E, Nixon O Evaluation of a problem-based learning workshop using pre- and post-test objective structured clinical examinations and standardized patients. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2000, 20:164-70. 10.1002/chp.1340200305
- Lüders S, Schrader J, Schmieder RE, Smolka W, Wegscheider K, Bestehorn K: Improvement of hypertension management by structured physician education and feedback system: cluster randomized trial. Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil. 2010, 17:271-9. 10.1097/HJR.0b013e328330be62
- Tu K, Davis D Can we alter physician behavior by educational methods? Lessons learned from studies of the management and follow-up of hypertension. J Contin Educ Health Prof. 2002, 22:11-22. 10.1002/chp.1340220103
- Ryan C, Young L, McAllister M The impact of an online learning platform about nursing education on enrolled nurse preceptor teaching capabilities: a pre-post-test evaluation. Contemp Nurse. 2017, 53:335-47. 10.1080/10376178.2017.1347512
- Vander Kaay S, Letts L, Jung B, Moll SE On-line ethics education for occupational therapy clinician-educators: a single-group pre-/post-test study. Disabil Rehabil. 2019, 41:2841-53. 10.1080/09638288.2018.1473510
- Lim SC, Mustapha FI, Aagaard-Hansen J, Calopietro M, Aris T, Bjerre-Christensen U Impact of continuing medical education for primary healthcare providers in Malaysia on diabetes knowledge, attitudes, skills and clinical practices. Med Educ Online. 2020, 25:1710330. 10.1080/10872981.2019.1710330

http://edergi.cbu.edu.tr/ojs/index.php/cbusbed isimli yazarın CBU-SBED başlıklı eseri bu Creative Commons Alıntı-Gayriticari4.0 Uluslararası Lisansı ile lisanslanmıstır.

