



## 7. Diabetes Technology: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S97–S112 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>

The American Diabetes Association (ADA) “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes” includes the ADA’s current clinical practice recommendations and is intended to provide the components of diabetes care, general treatment goals and guidelines, and tools to evaluate quality of care. Members of the ADA Professional Practice Committee, a multidisciplinary expert committee (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-SPPC>), are responsible for updating the Standards of Care annually, or more frequently as warranted. For a detailed description of ADA standards, statements, and reports, as well as the evidence-grading system for ADA’s clinical practice recommendations, please refer to the Standards of Care Introduction (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-SINT>). Readers who wish to comment on the Standards of Care are invited to do so at [professional.diabetes.org/SOC](https://professional.diabetes.org/SOC).

Diabetes technology is the term used to describe the hardware, devices, and software that people with diabetes use to help manage their condition, from lifestyle to blood glucose levels. Historically, diabetes technology has been divided into two main categories: insulin administered by syringe, pen, or pump (also called continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion [CSII]), and blood glucose as assessed by blood glucose monitoring (BGM) or continuous glucose monitoring (CGM). More recently, diabetes technology has expanded to include hybrid devices that both monitor glucose and deliver insulin, some automatically, as well as software that serves as a medical device, providing diabetes self-management support. Diabetes technology, when coupled with education and follow-up, can improve the lives and health of people with diabetes; however, the complexity and rapid change of the diabetes technology landscape can also be a barrier to patient and provider implementation.

### GENERAL DEVICE PRINCIPLES

#### Recommendations

- 7.1** The type(s) and selection of devices should be individualized based on a person’s specific needs, desires, skill level, and availability of devices. In the setting of an individual whose diabetes is partially or wholly managed by someone else (e.g., a young child or a person with cognitive impairment), the caregiver’s skills and desires are integral to the decision-making process. **E**
- 7.2** When prescribing a device, ensure that people with diabetes/caregivers receive initial and ongoing education and training, either in-person or remotely, and regular evaluation of technique, results, and their ability

\*A complete list of members of the American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee can be found at <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-SPPC>.

*Suggested citation:* American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee. 7. Diabetes technology: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45 (Suppl. 1):S97–S112

© 2021 by the American Diabetes Association. Readers may use this article as long as the work is properly cited, the use is educational and not for profit, and the work is not altered. More information is available at <https://diabetesjournals.org/journals/pages/license>.

to use data, including uploading/sharing data (if applicable), to adjust therapy. **C**

**7.3** People who have been using continuous glucose monitoring, continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, and/or automated insulin delivery for diabetes management should have continued access across third-party payers. **E**

**7.4** Students must be supported at school in the use of diabetes technology including continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, connected insulin pens, and automated insulin delivery systems as prescribed by their diabetes care team. **E**

**7.5** Initiation of continuous glucose monitoring, continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, and/or automated insulin delivery early in the treatment of diabetes can be beneficial depending on a person's/caregiver's needs and preferences. **C**

Technology is rapidly changing, but there is no "one-size-fits-all" approach to technology use in people with diabetes. Insurance coverage can lag behind device availability, patient interest in devices and willingness to change can vary, and providers may have trouble keeping up with newly released technology. Not-for-profit websites can help providers and patients make decisions as to the initial choice of devices. Other sources, including health care providers and device manufacturers, can help people troubleshoot when difficulties arise.

### Education and Training

In general, no device used in diabetes management works optimally without education, training, and follow-up. There are multiple resources for online tutorials and training videos as well as written material on the use of devices. Patients vary in terms of comfort level with technology, and some prefer in-person training and support. Patients with more education regarding device use have better outcomes

(1); therefore, the need for additional education should be periodically assessed, particularly if outcomes are not being met.

### Use in Schools

Instructions for device use should be outlined in the student's diabetes medical management plan (DMMP). A backup plan should be included in the DMMP for potential device failure (e.g., BGM and/or injected insulin). School nurses and designees should complete training to stay up to date on diabetes technologies prescribed for use in the school setting. Updated resources to support diabetes care at school, including training materials and a DMMP template, can be found online at [www.diabetes.org/safeatschool](http://www.diabetes.org/safeatschool).

### Initiation of Device Use

Use of CGM devices should be considered from the outset of the diagnosis of diabetes that requires insulin management (2,3). This allows for close tracking of glucose levels with adjustments of insulin dosing and lifestyle modifications and removes the burden of frequent BGM. In appropriate individuals, early use of automated insulin delivery (AID) systems or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (CSII) may be considered. Interruption of access to CGM is associated with a worsening of outcomes (4); therefore, it is important for individuals on CGM to have consistent access to devices.

## BLOOD GLUCOSE MONITORING

### Recommendations

**7.6** People with diabetes should be provided with blood glucose monitoring devices as indicated by their circumstances, preferences, and treatment. People using continuous glucose monitoring devices must have access to blood glucose monitoring at all times. **A**

**7.7** People who are on insulin using blood glucose monitoring should be encouraged to check when appropriate based on their insulin regimen. This may include checking when fasting, prior to meals and snacks, at bedtime, prior to exercise, when low blood glucose is suspected, after

treating low blood glucose levels until they are normoglycemic, and prior to and while performing critical tasks such as driving. **B**

**7.8** Providers should be aware of the differences in accuracy among blood glucose meters—only U.S. Food and Drug Administration–approved meters with proven accuracy should be used, with unexpired strips purchased from a pharmacy or licensed distributor. **E**

**7.9** Although blood glucose monitoring in individuals on noninsulin therapies has not consistently shown clinically significant reductions in A1C, it may be helpful when altering diet, physical activity, and/or medications (particularly medications that can cause hypoglycemia) in conjunction with a treatment adjustment program. **E**

**7.10** Health care providers should be aware of medications and other factors, such as high-dose vitamin C and hypoxemia, that can interfere with glucose meter accuracy and provide clinical management as indicated. **E**

Major clinical trials of insulin-treated patients have included BGM as part of multifactorial interventions to demonstrate the benefit of intensive glycemic control on diabetes complications (5). BGM is thus an integral component of effective therapy of patients taking insulin. In recent years, CGM has emerged as a method for the assessment of glucose levels (discussed below). Glucose monitoring allows patients to evaluate their individual response to therapy and assess whether glycemic targets are being safely achieved. Integrating results into diabetes management can be a useful tool for guiding medical nutrition therapy and physical activity, preventing hypoglycemia, or adjusting medications (particularly prandial insulin doses). The patient's specific needs and goals should dictate BGM frequency and timing or the consideration of CGM use. As recommended by the device

manufacturers and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), patients using CGM must have access to BGM testing for multiple reasons, including whenever there is suspicion that the CGM is inaccurate, while waiting for warm-up, for calibration (some sensors) or if a warning message appears, and in any clinical setting where glucose levels are changing rapidly ( $>2$  mg/dL/min), which could cause a discrepancy between CGM and blood glucose.

### Meter Standards

Glucose meters meeting FDA guidance for meter accuracy provide the most reliable data for diabetes management. There are several current standards for accuracy of blood glucose monitors, but the two most used are those of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) (ISO 15197:2013) and the FDA. The current ISO and FDA standards are compared in **Table 7.1**. In Europe, currently marketed monitors must meet current ISO standards. In the U.S., currently marketed monitors must meet the standard under which they were approved, which may not be the current standard. Moreover, the monitoring of current accuracy is left to the manufacturer and not routinely checked by an independent source.

Patients assume their glucose monitor is accurate because it is FDA cleared, but often that is not the case. There is substantial variation in the accuracy of widely used BGM systems (6,7). The Diabetes Technology Society Blood Glucose Monitoring System Surveillance Program provides information on the performance of devices used for BGM ([www.diabetestechology.org/surveillance/](http://www.diabetestechology.org/surveillance/)). In one

analysis, only 6 of the top 18 glucose meters met the accuracy standard (8). There are single-meter studies in which benefits have been found with individual meter systems, but few studies have compared meters in a head-to-head manner. Certain meter system characteristics, such as the use of lancing devices that are less painful (9) and the ability to reapply blood to a strip with an insufficient initial sample, may also be beneficial to patients (10) and may make BGM less burdensome for patients to perform.

### Counterfeit Strips

Patients should be advised against purchasing or reselling preowned or second-hand test strips, as these may give incorrect results. Only unopened and unexpired vials of glucose test strips should be used to ensure BGM accuracy.

### Optimizing Blood Glucose Monitoring Device Use

Optimal use of BGM devices requires proper review and interpretation of data, by both the patient and the provider, to ensure that data are used in an effective and timely manner. In patients with type 1 diabetes, there is a correlation between greater BGM frequency and lower A1C (11). Among patients who check their blood glucose at least once daily, many report taking no action when results are high or low (12). Some meters now provide advice to the user in real time when monitoring glucose levels (13), whereas others can be used as a part of integrated health platforms (14). Patients should be taught how to use BGM data to adjust food intake, exercise, or pharmacologic therapy to achieve specific goals. The ongoing need for and

frequency of BGM should be reevaluated at each routine visit to ensure its effective use (12,15,16).

### Patients on Intensive Insulin Regimens

BGM is especially important for insulin-treated patients to monitor for and prevent hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia. Most patients using intensive insulin regimens (multiple daily injections [MDI] or insulin pump therapy) should be encouraged to assess glucose levels using BGM (and/or CGM) prior to meals and snacks, at bedtime, occasionally postprandially, prior to exercise, when they suspect low blood glucose, after treating low blood glucose until they are normoglycemic, and prior to and while performing critical tasks such as driving. For many patients using BGM this requires checking up to 6–10 times daily, although individual needs may vary. A database study of almost 27,000 children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes showed that, after adjustment for multiple confounders, increased daily frequency of BGM was significantly associated with lower A1C ( $-0.2\%$  per additional check per day) and with fewer acute complications (17).

### Patients Using Basal Insulin and/or Oral Agents

The evidence is insufficient regarding when to prescribe BGM and how often monitoring is needed for insulin-treated patients who do not use intensive insulin regimens, such as those with type 2 diabetes using basal insulin with or without oral agents. However, for patients using basal insulin, assessing fasting glucose with BGM to inform dose adjustments to achieve blood glucose targets results in lower A1C (18,19).

**Table 7.1—Comparison of ISO 15197:2013 and FDA blood glucose meter accuracy standards**

Setting	FDA (224,225)	ISO 15197:2013 (226)
Home use	95% within 15% for all BG in the usable BG range† 99% within 20% for all BG in the usable BG range†	95% within 15% for BG $\geq 100$ mg/dL 95% within 15 mg/dL for BG $< 100$ mg/dL 99% in A or B region of consensus error grid‡
Hospital use	95% within 12% for BG $\geq 75$ mg/dL 95% within 12 mg/dL for BG $< 75$ mg/dL 98% within 15% for BG $\geq 75$ mg/dL 98% within 15 mg/dL for BG $< 75$ mg/dL	

BG, blood glucose; FDA, U.S. Food and Drug Administration; ISO, International Organization for Standardization. To convert mg/dL to mmol/L, see [endmemo.com/medical/unitconvert/Glucose.php](http://endmemo.com/medical/unitconvert/Glucose.php). †The range of blood glucose values for which the meter has been proven accurate and will provide readings (other than low, high, or error). ‡Values outside of the “clinically acceptable” A and B regions are considered “outlier” readings and may be dangerous to use for therapeutic decisions (228).

In people with type 2 diabetes not using insulin, routine glucose monitoring may be of limited additional clinical benefit. By itself, even when combined with education, it has showed limited improvement in outcomes (20–23). However, for some individuals, glucose monitoring can provide insight into the impact of diet, physical activity, and medication management on glucose levels. Glucose monitoring may also be useful in assessing hypoglycemia, glucose levels during intercurrent illness, or discrepancies between measured A1C and glucose levels when there is concern an A1C result may not be reliable in specific individuals. It may be useful when coupled with a treatment adjustment program. In a year-long study of insulin-naïve patients with sub-optimal initial glycemic stability, a group trained in structured BGM (a paper tool was used at least quarterly to collect and interpret seven-point BGM profiles taken on 3 consecutive days) reduced their A1C by 0.3% more than the control group (24). A trial of once-daily BGM that included enhanced patient feedback through messaging found no clinically or statistically significant change in A1C at 1 year (23). Meta-analyses have suggested that BGM can reduce A1C by 0.25–0.3% at 6 months (25–27), but the effect was attenuated at 12 months in one analysis (25). Reductions in A1C were greater (–0.3%) in trials where structured BGM data were used to adjust medications, but A1C was not changed significantly without such structured diabetes therapy adjustment (27). A key consideration is that performing BGM alone does not lower blood glucose levels. To be useful, the information must be integrated into clinical and self-management plans.

#### Glucose Meter Inaccuracy

Although many meters function well under a variety of circumstances, providers and people with diabetes need to be aware of factors that can impair meter accuracy. A meter reading that seems discordant with clinical reality needs to be retested or tested in a laboratory. Providers in intensive care unit settings need to be particularly aware of the potential for abnormal meter readings, and laboratory-based values should be used if there is any doubt.

Some meters give error messages if meter readings are likely to be false (28).

**Oxygen.** Currently available glucose monitors utilize an enzymatic reaction linked to an electrochemical reaction, either glucose oxidase or glucose dehydrogenase (29). Glucose oxidase monitors are sensitive to the oxygen available and should only be used with capillary blood in patients with normal oxygen saturation. Higher oxygen tensions (i.e., arterial blood or oxygen therapy) may result in false low glucose readings, and low oxygen tensions (i.e., high altitude, hypoxia, or venous blood readings) may lead to false high glucose readings. Glucose dehydrogenase-based monitors are not sensitive to oxygen.

**Temperature.** Because the reaction is sensitive to temperature, all monitors have an acceptable temperature range (29). Most will show an error if the temperature is unacceptable, but a few will provide a reading and a message indicating that the value may be incorrect.

**Interfering Substances.** There are a few physiologic and pharmacologic factors that interfere with glucose readings. Most interfere only with glucose oxidase systems (29). They are listed in **Table 7.2**.

### CONTINUOUS GLUCOSE MONITORING DEVICES

See **Table 7.3** for definitions of types of CGM devices.

#### Recommendations

- 7.11** Real-time continuous glucose monitoring **A** or intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring **B** should be offered for diabetes management in adults with diabetes on multiple daily injections or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion who are capable of using devices safely (either by themselves or with a caregiver). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs.
- 7.12** Real-time continuous glucose monitoring **A** or intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring **C** can be used

for diabetes management in adults with diabetes on basal insulin who are capable of using devices safely (either by themselves or with a caregiver). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs.

- 7.13** Real-time continuous glucose monitoring **B** or intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring **E** should be offered for diabetes management in youth with type 1 diabetes on multiple daily injections or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion who are capable of using the device safely (either by themselves or with a caregiver). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs.
- 7.14** Real-time continuous glucose monitoring or intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring should be offered for diabetes management in youth with type 2 diabetes on multiple daily injections or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion who are capable of using devices safely (either by themselves or with a caregiver). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs. **E**
- 7.15** In patients on multiple daily injections and continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion, real-time continuous glucose monitoring devices should be used as close to daily as possible for maximal benefit. **A** Intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring devices should be scanned frequently, at a minimum once every 8 h. **A**
- 7.16** When used as an adjunct to pre- and postprandial blood glucose monitoring, continuous glucose monitoring can help to achieve A1C targets in diabetes and pregnancy. **B**
- 7.17** Periodic use of real-time or intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring



or use of professional continuous glucose monitoring can be helpful for diabetes management in circumstances where continuous use of continuous glucose monitoring is not appropriate, desired, or available. **C**

**7.18** Skin reactions, either due to irritation or allergy, should be assessed and addressed to aid in successful use of devices. **E**

CGM measures interstitial glucose (which correlates well with plasma glucose, although at times it can lag if glucose levels are rising or falling rapidly). There are two basic types of CGM devices: those that are owned by the user, unblinded, and intended for frequent/continuous use, including real-time CGM (rtCGM) and intermittently scanned CGM (isCGM); and professional CGM devices that are owned and applied in the clinic, which provide data that are blinded or unblinded for a discrete period of time. **Table 7.3** provides the definitions for the types of CGM devices. For people with type 1 diabetes using CGM, frequency of sensor use was an important predictor

of A1C lowering for all age-groups (30,31). Frequency of swiping with isCGM devices was also correlated with improved outcomes (32–35).

Some real-time systems require calibration by the user, which varies in frequency depending on the device. Additionally, some CGM systems are called “adjunctive,” meaning the user should perform BGM for making treatment decisions. Devices that do not have this requirement, outside of certain clinical situations (see **BLOOD GLUCOSE MONITORING** above), are called “nonadjunctive” (36–38).

One specific isCGM device (FreeStyle Libre 2 [no generic form available]) and one specific rtCGM device (Dexcom G6 [no generic form available]) have been designated as integrated CGM (iCGM) devices (39). This is a higher standard, set by the FDA, so these devices can be reliably integrated with other digitally connected devices, including automated insulin-dosing systems.

The first version of isCGM did not provide alerts or alarms. Currently published literature does not include studies that used isCGM with alarms, which became available in June 2020 in the U.S. Therefore, the discussion that follows is based on the use of the earlier devices.

### Benefits of Continuous Glucose Monitoring

#### Data From Randomized Controlled Trials

Multiple randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have been performed using rtCGM devices, and the results have largely been positive in terms of reducing A1C levels and/or episodes of hypoglycemia as long as participants regularly wore the devices (30,31,40–61). The initial studies were primarily done in adults and youth with type 1 diabetes on CSII and/or MDI (30,31,40–43,46–57). The primary

outcome was met and showed benefit in adults of all ages (30,40,41,46,47, 49,51,52) including seniors (48). Data in children are less consistent (30,54,55). RCT data on rtCGM use in individuals with type 2 diabetes on MDI (58), mixed therapies (59,60), and basal insulin (61,62) have consistently shown reductions in A1C but not a reduction in rates of hypoglycemia. The improvements in type 2 diabetes have largely occurred without changes in insulin doses or other diabetes medications.

RCT data for isCGM is more limited. One study was performed in adults with type 1 diabetes and met its primary outcome of a reduction in rates of hypoglycemia (44). In adults with type 2 diabetes on insulin, two studies were done; one study did not meet its primary end point of A1C reduction (63) but achieved a secondary end point of a reduction in hypoglycemia, and the other study met its primary end point of an improvement in Diabetes Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire score as well as a secondary end point of A1C reduction (64). In a study of individuals with type 1 or type 2 diabetes taking insulin, the primary outcome of a reduction in severe hypoglycemia was not met (65). One study in youth with type 1 diabetes did not show a reduction in A1C (66); however, the device was well received and was associated with an increased frequency of testing and improved diabetes treatment satisfaction (66).

#### Observational and Real-World Studies

isCGM has been widely available in many countries for people with diabetes, and this allows for the collection of large amounts of data across groups of patients. In adults with diabetes, these data include results from observational studies, retrospective studies, and

**Table 7.2—Interfering substances for glucose readings**

#### Glucose oxidase monitors

Uric acid  
Galactose  
Xylose  
Acetaminophen  
L-DOPA  
Ascorbic acid

#### Glucose dehydrogenase monitors

Icodextrin (used in peritoneal dialysis)

**Table 7.3—Continuous glucose monitoring devices**

Type of CGM	Description
rtCGM	CGM systems that measure and store glucose levels continuously and without prompting
isCGM with and without alarms	CGM systems that measure glucose levels continuously but require scanning for storage of glucose values
Professional CGM	CGM devices that are placed on the patient in the provider's office (or with remote instruction) and worn for a discrete period of time (generally 7–14 days). Data may be blinded or visible to the person wearing the device. The data are used to assess glycemic patterns and trends. These devices are not fully owned by the patient—they are clinic-based devices, as opposed to the patient-owned rtCGM/isCGM devices.

CGM, continuous glucose monitoring; isCGM, intermittently scanned CGM; rtCGM, real-time CGM.

analyses of registry and population data (67,68). In individuals with type 1 diabetes using isCGM, most (35,67,69), but not all (70), studies have shown improvement in A1C levels. Reductions in acute diabetes complications, such as diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) and episodes of severe hypoglycemia, have been seen (35,70). Some retrospective/observational data are available on adults with type 2 diabetes on MDI (71), basal insulin (72), and basal insulin or noninsulin therapies (73) showing improvement in A1C levels. In a retrospective study of adults with type 2 diabetes taking insulin, a reduction in acute diabetes-related events and all-cause hospitalizations was seen (74). Results of patient-reported outcomes varied, but where measured, patients had an increase in treatment satisfaction when comparing isCGM with BGM.

In an observational study in youth with type 1 diabetes, a slight increase in A1C and weight was seen, but the device was associated with a high rate of user satisfaction (68).

Retrospective data from rtCGM use in a Veterans Affairs population (75) with type 1 and type 2 diabetes treated with insulin show that use of real-time rtCGM significantly lowered A1C and reduced rates of emergency department visits or hospitalizations for hypoglycemia, but did not significantly lower overall rates of emergency department visits, hospitalizations, or hyperglycemia.

#### ***Real-time Continuous Glucose Monitoring Compared With Intermittently Scanned Continuous Glucose Monitoring***

In adults with type 1 diabetes, three RCTs have been done comparing isCGM and rtCGM (76–78). In two of the studies, the primary outcome was a reduction in time spent in hypoglycemia, and rtCGM showed benefit compared with isCGM (76,77). In the other study, the primary outcome was improved time in range (TIR), and rtCGM also showed benefit compared with isCGM (78). A retrospective analysis also showed improvement in TIR comparing rtCGM with isCGM (79).

#### ***Data Analysis***

The abundance of data provided by CGM offers opportunities to analyze patient data more granularly than previously possible, providing additional

information to aid in achieving glycemic targets. A variety of metrics have been proposed (80) and are discussed in Section 6, “Glycemic Targets” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>). CGM is essential for creating an ambulatory glucose profile and providing data on TIR, percentage of time spent above and below range, and variability (81).

#### **Real-time Continuous Glucose Monitoring Device Use in Pregnancy**

One well-designed RCT showed a reduction in A1C levels in adult women with type 1 diabetes on MDI or CSII who were pregnant and using rtCGM in addition to standard care, including optimization of pre- and postprandial glucose targets (82). This study demonstrated the value of rtCGM in pregnancy complicated by type 1 diabetes by showing a mild improvement in A1C without an increase in hypoglycemia as well as reductions in large-for-gestational-age births, length of stay, and neonatal hypoglycemia (82). An observational cohort study that evaluated the glycemic variables reported using rtCGM found that lower mean glucose, lower standard deviation, and a higher percentage of time in target range were associated with lower risk of large-for-gestational-age births and other adverse neonatal outcomes (83). Use of the rtCGM-reported mean glucose is superior to use of estimated A1C, glucose management indicator, and other calculations to estimate A1C given the changes to A1C that occur in pregnancy (84). Two studies employing intermittent use of rtCGM showed no difference in neonatal outcomes in women with type 1 diabetes (85) or gestational diabetes mellitus (86).

#### **Use of Professional and Intermittent Continuous Glucose Monitoring**

Professional CGM devices, which provide retrospective data, either blinded or unblinded, for analysis, can be used to identify patterns of hypo- and hyperglycemia (87,88). Professional CGM can be helpful to evaluate patients when either rtCGM or isCGM is not available to the patient or the patient prefers a blinded analysis or a shorter experience with unblinded data. It can be particularly useful to evaluate periods of hypoglycemia in patients on agents that can cause hypoglycemia in order to make medication dose adjustments. It can

also be useful to evaluate patients for periods of hyperglycemia.

There are some data showing benefit of intermittent use of CGM (rtCGM or isCGM) in individuals with type 2 diabetes on noninsulin and/or basal insulin therapies (59,89). In these RCTs, patients with type 2 diabetes not on intensive insulin regimens used CGM intermittently compared with patients randomized to BGM. Both early (59) and late improvements in A1C were found (59,89).

Use of professional or intermittent CGM should always be coupled with analysis and interpretation for the patient, along with education as needed to adjust medication and change lifestyle behaviors (90–92).

#### **Side Effects of CGM Devices**

Contact dermatitis (both irritant and allergic) has been reported with all devices that attach to the skin (93–95). In some cases this has been linked to the presence of isobornyl acrylate, which is a skin sensitizer and can cause an additional spreading allergic reaction (96–98). Patch testing can be done to identify the cause of the contact dermatitis in some cases (99). Identifying and eliminating tape allergens is important to ensure comfortable use of devices and enhance patient adherence (100–103). In some instances, use of an implanted sensor can help avoid skin reactions in those who are sensitive to tape (104,105).

## **INSULIN DELIVERY**

### **Insulin Syringes and Pens**

#### **Recommendations**

- 7.19** For people with diabetes who require insulin, insulin pens are preferred in most cases, but insulin syringes may be used for insulin delivery with consideration of patient/caregiver preference, insulin type and dosing regimen, cost, and self-management capabilities. **C**
- 7.20** Insulin pens or insulin injection aids should be considered for people with dexterity issues or vision impairment to facilitate the administration of accurate insulin doses. **C**
- 7.21** Connected insulin pens can be helpful for diabetes

management and may be used in patients using injectable therapy. **E**

- 7.22** U.S. Food and Drug Administration–approved insulin dose calculators/decision support systems may be helpful for titrating insulin doses. **E**

Injecting insulin with a syringe or pen (106–122) is the insulin delivery method used by most people with diabetes (113,123), although inhaled insulin is also available. Others use insulin pumps or AID devices (see section on those topics below). For patients with diabetes who use insulin, insulin syringes and pens are both able to deliver insulin safely and effectively for the achievement of glycemic targets. When choosing among delivery systems, patient preferences, cost, insulin type and dosing regimen, and self-management capabilities should be considered. Trials with insulin pens generally show equivalence or small improvements in glycemic outcomes when compared with use of a vial and syringe. Many individuals with diabetes prefer using a pen due to its simplicity and convenience. It is important to note that while many insulin types are available for purchase as either pens or vials, others may only be available in one form or the other and there may be significant cost differences between pens and vials (see **Table 9.4** for a list of insulin product costs with dosage forms). Insulin pens may allow people with vision impairment or dexterity issues to dose insulin accurately (124–126), while insulin injection aids are also available to help with these issues. (For a helpful list of injection aids, see [main.diabetes.org/dforg/pdfs/2018/2018-cg-injection-aids.pdf](http://main.diabetes.org/dforg/pdfs/2018/2018-cg-injection-aids.pdf)). Inhaled insulin can be useful in people who have an aversion to injection.

The most common syringe sizes are 1 mL, 0.5 mL, and 0.3 mL, allowing doses of up to 100 units, 50 units, and 30 units of U-100 insulin, respectively. In a few parts of the world, insulin syringes still have U-80 and U-40 markings for older insulin concentrations and veterinary insulin, and U-500 syringes are available for the use of U-500 insulin. Syringes are generally used once but may be reused by the same individual in resource-

limited settings with appropriate storage and cleansing (126).

Insulin pens offer added convenience by combining the vial and syringe into a single device. Insulin pens, allowing push-button injections, come as disposable pens with prefilled cartridges or reusable insulin pens with replaceable insulin cartridges. Pens vary with respect to dosing increment and minimal dose, which can range from half-unit doses to 2-unit dose increments. U-500 pens come in 5-unit dose increments. Some reusable pens include a memory function, which can recall dose amounts and timing. Connected insulin pens (CIPs) are insulin pens with the capacity to record and/or transmit insulin dose data. They were previously known as “smart pens.” Some CIPs can be programmed to calculate insulin doses and provide downloadable data reports. These pens are useful to assist patient insulin dosing in real time as well as for allowing clinicians to retrospectively review the insulin doses that were given and make insulin dose adjustments (127).

Needle thickness (gauge) and length is another consideration. Needle gauges range from 22 to 33, with higher gauge indicating a thinner needle. A thicker needle can give a dose of insulin more quickly, while a thinner needle may cause less pain. Needle length ranges from 4 to 12.7 mm, with some evidence suggesting shorter needles may lower the risk of intramuscular injection. When reused, needles may be duller and thus injection more painful. Proper insulin injection technique is a requisite for obtaining the full benefits of insulin therapy. Concerns with technique and use of the proper technique are outlined in Section 9, “Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>).

Bolus calculators have been developed to aid in dosing decisions (128–132). These systems are subject to FDA approval to ensure safety in terms of dosing recommendations. People who are interested in using these systems should be encouraged to use those that are FDA approved. Provider input and education can be helpful for setting the initial dosing calculations with ongoing follow-up for adjustments as needed.

## Insulin Pumps and Automated Insulin Delivery Systems

### Recommendations

- 7.23** Automated insulin delivery systems should be offered or diabetes management to youth and adults with type 1 diabetes **A** and other types of insulin-deficient diabetes **E** who are capable of using the device safely (either by themselves or with a caregiver). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs.
- 7.24** Insulin pump therapy alone with or without sensor-augmented low glucose suspend should be offered for diabetes management to youth and adults on multiple daily injections with type 1 diabetes **A** or other types of insulin-deficient diabetes **E** who are capable of using the device safely (either by themselves or with a caregiver) and are not able to use/interested in an automated insulin delivery system. The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs. **A**
- 7.25** Insulin pump therapy can be offered for diabetes management to youth and adults on multiple daily injections with type 2 diabetes who are capable of using the device safely (either by themselves or with a caregiver). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs. **A**
- 7.26** Individuals with diabetes who have been successfully using continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion should have continued access across third-party payers. **E**

### Insulin Pumps

CSII, or insulin pumps, have been available in the U.S. for over 40 years. These devices deliver rapid-acting insulin throughout the day to help manage blood glucose levels. Most insulin

pumps use tubing to deliver insulin through a cannula, while a few attach directly to the skin, without tubing. AID systems, discussed below, are preferred over nonautomated pumps and MDI in people with type 1 diabetes.

Most studies comparing MDI with CSII have been relatively small and of short duration. However, a systematic review and meta-analysis concluded that pump therapy has modest advantages for lowering A1C ( $-0.30\%$  [95% CI  $-0.58$  to  $-0.02$ ]) and for reducing severe hypoglycemia rates in children and adults (133). There is no consensus to guide choosing which form of insulin administration is best for a given patient, and research to guide this decision-making is needed (134). Thus, the choice of MDI or an insulin pump is often based upon the individual characteristics of the patient and which is most likely to benefit them. Newer systems, such as sensor-augmented pumps and AID systems, are discussed below.

Adoption of pump therapy in the U.S. shows geographical variations, which may be related to provider preference or center characteristics (135,136) and socioeconomic status, as pump therapy is more common in individuals of higher socioeconomic status as reflected by race/ethnicity, private health insurance, family income, and education (135,136). Given the additional barriers to optimal diabetes care observed in disadvantaged groups (137), addressing the differences in access to insulin pumps and other diabetes technology may contribute to fewer health disparities.

Pump therapy can be successfully started at the time of diagnosis (138,139). Practical aspects of pump therapy initiation include assessment of patient and family readiness, if applicable (although there is no consensus on which factors to consider in adults [140] or pediatric patients), selection of pump type and initial pump settings, patient/family education on potential pump complications (e.g., DKA with infusion set failure), transition from MDI, and introduction of advanced pump settings (e.g., temporary basal rates, extended/square/dual wave bolus).

Older individuals with type 1 diabetes benefit from ongoing insulin pump therapy. There are no data to suggest that

measurement of C-peptide levels or antibodies predicts success with insulin pump therapy (141,142). Additionally, frequency of follow-up does not influence outcomes. Access to insulin pump therapy should be allowed or continued in older adults as it is in younger people.

Complications of the pump can be caused by issues with infusion sets (dislodgement, occlusion), which place patients at risk for ketosis and DKA and thus must be recognized and managed early (143). Other pump skin issues included lipohypertrophy or, less frequently, lipoatrophy (144,145), and pump site infection (146). Discontinuation of pump therapy is relatively uncommon today; the frequency has decreased over the past few decades, and its causes have changed (146,147). Current reasons for attrition are problems with cost or wearability, dislike for the pump, suboptimal glycemic control, or mood disorders (e.g., anxiety or depression) (148).

### Insulin Pumps in Youth

The safety of insulin pumps in youth has been established for over 15 years (149). Studying the effectiveness of CSII in lowering A1C has been challenging because of the potential selection bias of observational studies. Participants on CSII may have a higher socioeconomic status that may facilitate better glycemic control (150) versus MDI. In addition, the fast pace of development of new insulins and technologies quickly renders comparisons obsolete. However, RCTs comparing CSII and MDI with insulin analogs demonstrate a modest improvement in A1C in participants on CSII (151,152). Observational studies, registry data, and meta-analysis have also suggested an improvement of glycemic control in participants on CSII (153–155). Although hypoglycemia was a major adverse effect of intensified insulin regimen in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) (156), data suggest that CSII may reduce the rates of severe hypoglycemia compared with MDI (155,157–159).

There is also evidence that CSII may reduce DKA risk (155,160) and diabetes complications, particularly retinopathy and peripheral neuropathy in youth, compared with MDI (161). Finally, treatment satisfaction and quality-of-life measures improved on CSII compared

with MDI (162,163). Therefore, CSII can be used safely and effectively in youth with type 1 diabetes to assist with achieving targeted glycemic control while reducing the risk of hypoglycemia and DKA, improving quality of life, and preventing long-term complications. Based on patient–provider shared decision-making, insulin pumps may be considered in all pediatric patients with type 1 diabetes. In particular, pump therapy may be the preferred mode of insulin delivery for children under 7 years of age (164). Because of a paucity of data in adolescents and youth with type 2 diabetes, there is insufficient evidence to make recommendations.

Common barriers to pump therapy adoption in children and adolescents are concerns regarding the physical interference of the device, discomfort with the idea of having a device on the body, therapeutic effectiveness, and financial burden (153,165).

### Automated Insulin Delivery Systems

AID systems increase and decrease insulin delivery based on sensor-derived glucose levels to approximate physiologic insulin delivery. These systems consist of three components: an insulin pump, a continuous glucose sensor, and an algorithm that determines insulin delivery. While insulin delivery in closed-loop systems eventually may be truly automated, currently used hybrid closed-loop systems require entry of carbohydrates consumed, and adjustments for exercise must be announced. Multiple studies, using a variety of systems with varying algorithms, pump, and sensors, have been performed in adults and children (166–175). Evidence suggests AID systems may reduce A1C levels and improve TIR (176–180). They may also lower the risk of exercise-related hypoglycemia (181) and may have psychosocial benefits (182–184). Use of AID systems depends on patient preference and selection of patients (and/or caregivers) who are capable of safely and effectively using the devices.

### Sensor-Augmented Pumps

Sensor-augmented pumps that suspend insulin when glucose is low or predicted to go low within the next 30 min have been approved by the FDA. The Automation to Simulate Pancreatic Insulin



Response (ASPIRE) trial of 247 patients with type 1 diabetes and documented nocturnal hypoglycemia showed that sensor-augmented insulin pump therapy with a low glucose suspend function significantly reduced nocturnal hypoglycemia over 3 months without increasing A1C levels (50). In a different sensor-augmented pump, predictive low glucose suspend reduced time spent with glucose <70 mg/dL from 3.6% at baseline to 2.6% (3.2% with sensor-augmented pump therapy without predictive low glucose suspend) without rebound hyperglycemia during a 6-week randomized crossover trial (185). These devices may offer the opportunity to reduce hypoglycemia for those with a history of nocturnal hypoglycemia. Additional studies have been performed, in adults and children, showing the benefits of this technology (186–188).

### Insulin Pumps in Patients With Type 2 and Other Types of Diabetes

Traditional insulin pumps can be considered for the treatment of people with type 2 diabetes who are on MDI as well as those who have other types of diabetes resulting in insulin deficiency, for instance, those who have had a pancreatectomy and/or individuals with cystic fibrosis (189–193). Similar to data on insulin pump use in people with type 1 diabetes, reductions in A1C levels are not consistently seen in individuals with type 2 diabetes when compared with MDI, although this has been seen in some studies (191,194). Use of insulin pumps in insulin-requiring patients with any type of diabetes may improve patient satisfaction and simplify therapy (142,189).

For patients judged to be clinically insulin deficient who are treated with an intensive insulin regimen, the presence or absence of measurable C-peptide levels does not correlate with response to therapy (142). Another pump option in people with type 2 diabetes is a disposable patchlike device, which provides a continuous, subcutaneous infusion of rapid-acting insulin (basal) as well as 2-unit increments of bolus insulin at the press of a button (190,192,195,196). Use of an insulin pump as a means for insulin delivery is an individual choice for people with diabetes and should be considered an option in patients who are capable of safely using the device.

### Do-It-Yourself Closed-Loop Systems

#### Recommendation

**7.27** Individual patients may be using systems not approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, such as do-it-yourself closed-loop systems and others; providers cannot prescribe these systems but should assist in diabetes management to ensure patient safety. **E**

Some people with type 1 diabetes have been using “do-it-yourself” (DIY) systems that combine a pump and an rtCGM with a controller and an algorithm designed to automate insulin delivery (197–200). These systems are not approved by the FDA, although there are efforts underway to obtain regulatory approval for them. The information on how to set up and manage these systems is freely available on the internet, and there are internet groups where people inform each other as to how to set up and use them. Although these systems cannot be prescribed by providers, it is important to keep patients safe if they are using these methods for automated insulin delivery. Part of this entails making sure people have a “backup plan” in case of pump failure. Additionally, in most DIY systems, insulin doses are adjusted based on the pump settings for basal rates, carbohydrate ratios, correction doses, and insulin activity. Therefore, these settings can be evaluated and changed based on the patient’s insulin requirements.

### Digital Health Technology

#### Recommendation

**7.28** Systems that combine technology and online coaching can be beneficial in treating prediabetes and diabetes for some individuals. **B**

Increasingly, people are turning to the internet for advice, coaching, connection, and health care. Diabetes, in part because it is both common and numeric, lends itself to the development of apps and online programs. Recommendations for developing and implementing a digital diabetes clinic have been published (201). The FDA approves and monitors

clinically validated, digital, usually online, health technologies intended to treat a medical or psychological condition; these are known as digital therapeutics or “digiceuticals” (202). Other applications, such as those that assist in displaying or storing data, encourage a healthy lifestyle or provide limited clinical data support. Therefore, it is possible to find apps that have been fully reviewed and approved and others designed and promoted by people with relatively little skill or knowledge in the clinical treatment of diabetes.

An area of particular importance is that of online privacy and security. There are established cloud-based data collection programs, such as Tidepool, Glooko, and others, that have been developed with appropriate data security features and are compliant with the U.S. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996. These programs can be useful for monitoring patients, both by the patients themselves as well as their health care team (203). Consumers should read the policy regarding data privacy and sharing before entering data into an application and learn how they can control the way their data will be used (some programs offer the ability to share more or less information, such as being part of a registry or data repository or not).

There are many online programs that offer lifestyle counseling to aid with weight loss and increase physical activity (204). Many of these include a health coach and can create small groups of similar patients in social networks. There are programs that aim to treat prediabetes and prevent progression to diabetes, often following the model of the Diabetes Prevention Program (205,206). Others assist in improving diabetes outcomes by remotely monitoring patient clinical data (for instance, wireless monitoring of glucose levels, weight, or blood pressure) and providing feedback and coaching (207–212). There are text messaging approaches that tie into a variety of different types of lifestyle and treatment programs, which vary in terms of their effectiveness (213,214). For many of these interventions, there are limited RCT data and long-term follow-up is lacking. However, for an individual patient, opting into one of these programs can be helpful and, for many, is an attractive option.

## Inpatient Care

### Recommendation

**7.29** Patients who are in a position to safely use diabetes devices should be allowed to continue using them in an inpatient setting or during outpatient procedures when proper supervision is available. **E**

Patients who are comfortable using their diabetes devices, such as insulin pumps and CGM, should be given the chance to use them in an inpatient setting if they are competent to do so (215–218). Patients who are familiar with treating their own glucose levels can often adjust insulin doses more knowledgeably than inpatient staff who do not personally know the patient or their management style. However, this should occur based on the hospital's policies for diabetes management, and there should be supervision to be sure that the individual can adjust their insulin doses in a hospitalized setting where factors such as infection, certain medications, immobility, changes in diet, and other factors can impact insulin sensitivity and the response to insulin.

With the advent of the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic, the FDA has allowed CGM use in the hospital for patient monitoring (219). This approach has been employed to reduce the use of personal protective equipment and more closely monitor patients, so that medical personnel do not have to go into a patient room solely for the purpose of measuring a glucose level (220–222). Studies are underway to assess the effectiveness of this approach, which may ultimately lead to the routine use of CGM for monitoring hospitalized patients (223,224).

When used in the setting of a clinical trial or when clinical circumstances (such as during a shortage of personal protective equipment) require it, CGM can be used to manage hospitalized patients in conjunction with BGM.

## The Future

The pace of development in diabetes technology is extremely rapid. New approaches and tools are available each year. It is hard for research to keep up

with these advances because by the time a study is completed, newer versions of the devices are already on the market. The most important component in all of these systems is the patient. Technology selection must be appropriate for the individual. Simply having a device or application does not change outcomes unless the human being engages with it to create positive health benefits. This underscores the need for the health care team to assist the patient in device/program selection and to support its use through ongoing education and training. Expectations must be tempered by reality—we do not yet have technology that completely eliminates the self-care tasks necessary for treating diabetes, but the tools described in this section can make it easier to manage.

## References

- Broos B, Charleer S, Bolsens N, et al. Diabetes knowledge and metabolic control in type 1 diabetes starting with continuous glucose monitoring: FUTURE-PEAK. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2021;106:e3037–e3048
- Prahalad P, Addala A, Scheinker D, Hood KK, Maahs DM. CGM initiation soon after type 1 diabetes diagnosis results in sustained CGM use and wear time. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:e3–e4
- Patton SR, Noser AE, Youngkin EM, Majidi S, Clements MA. Early initiation of diabetes devices relates to improved glycemic control in children with recent-onset type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:379–384
- Addala A, Maahs DM, Scheinker D, Chertow S, Leverenz B, Prahalad P. Uninterrupted continuous glucose monitoring access is associated with a decrease in HbA1c in youth with type 1 diabetes and public insurance. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2020;21:1301–1309
- Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group; Nathan DM, Genuth S, Lachin J, et al. The effect of intensive treatment of diabetes on the development and progression of long-term complications in insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 1993;329:977–986
- King F, Ahn D, Hsiao V, Porco T, Klonoff DC. A review of blood glucose monitor accuracy. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:843–856
- Brazg RL, Klaff LJ, Parkin CG. Performance variability of seven commonly used self-monitoring of blood glucose systems: clinical considerations for patients and providers. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2013;7:144–152
- Klonoff DC, Parkes JL, Kovatchev BP, et al. Investigation of the accuracy of 18 marketed blood glucose monitors. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1681–1688
- Grady M, Lamps G, Shemain A, Cameron H, Murray L. Clinical evaluation of a new, lower pain, one touch lancing device for people with diabetes: virtually pain-free testing and improved comfort compared to current lancing systems. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2021;15:53–59
- Harrison B, Brown D. Accuracy of a blood glucose monitoring system that recognizes insufficient sample blood volume and allows application of more blood to the same test strip. *Expert Rev Med Devices* 2020;17:75–82
- Miller KM, Beck RW, Bergenstal RM, et al.; T1D Exchange Clinic Network. Evidence of a strong association between frequency of self-monitoring of blood glucose and hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> levels in T1D exchange clinic registry participants. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2009–2014
- Grant RW, Huang ES, Wexler DJ, et al. Patients who self-monitor blood glucose and their unused testing results. *Am J Manag Care* 2015;21:e119–e129
- Katz LB, Stewart L, Guthrie B, Cameron H. Patient satisfaction with a new, high accuracy blood glucose meter that provides personalized guidance, insight, and encouragement. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2020;14:318–323
- Shaw RJ, Yang Q, Barnes A, et al. Self-monitoring diabetes with multiple mobile health devices. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2020;27:667–676
- Gellad WF, Zhao X, Thorpe CT, Mor MK, Good CB, Fine MJ. Dual use of Department of Veterans Affairs and Medicare benefits and use of test strips in veterans with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *JAMA Intern Med* 2015;175:26–34
- Endocrine Society and Choosing Wisely. Five things physicians and patients should question. Accessed 18 October 2021. Available from <https://www.choosingwisely.org/societies/endocrine-society/>
- Ziegler R, Heidtmann B, Hilgard D, Hofer S, Rosenbauer J; DPV-Wiss-Initiative. Frequency of SMBG correlates with HbA<sub>1c</sub> and acute complications in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2011;12:11–17
- Rosenstock J, Davies M, Home PD, Larsen J, Koenen C, Scherthaner G. A randomised, 52-week, treat-to-target trial comparing insulin detemir with insulin glargine when administered as add-on to glucose-lowering drugs in insulin-naïve people with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2008;51:408–416
- Garber AJ. Treat-to-target trials: uses, interpretation and review of concepts. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2014;16:193–205
- Farmer A, Wade A, Goyder E, et al. Impact of self monitoring of blood glucose in the management of patients with non-insulin treated diabetes: open parallel group randomised trial. *BMJ* 2007;335:132
- O'Kane MJ, Bunting B, Copeland M; ESMON study group. Efficacy of self monitoring of blood glucose in patients with newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes (ESMON study): randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2008;336:1174–1177
- Simon J, Gray A, Clarke P, Wade A, Neil A; Diabetes Glycaemic Education and Monitoring Trial Group. Cost effectiveness of self monitoring of blood glucose in patients with non-insulin treated type 2 diabetes: economic evaluation of data from the DiGEM trial. *BMJ* 2008;336:1177–1180
- Young LA, Buse JB, Weaver MA, et al.; Monitor Trial Group. Glucose self-monitoring in non-insulin-treated patients with type 2 diabetes

- in primary care settings: a randomized trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017;177:920–929
24. Polonsky WH, Fisher L, Schikman CH, et al. Structured self-monitoring of blood glucose significantly reduces A1C levels in poorly controlled, noninsulin-treated type 2 diabetes: results from the Structured Testing Program study. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:262–267
  25. Malanda UL, Welschen LMC, Riphagen II, Dekker JM, Nijpels G, Bot SDM. Self-monitoring of blood glucose in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus who are not using insulin. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012;1:CD005060
  26. Willett LR. ACP Journal Club. Meta-analysis: self-monitoring in non-insulin-treated type 2 diabetes improved HbA<sub>1c</sub> by 0.25%. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;156:JC6–JC12
  27. Mannucci E, Antenore A, Giorgino F, Scavini M. Effects of structured versus unstructured self-monitoring of blood glucose on glucose control in patients with non-insulin-treated type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2018;12:183–189
  28. Sai S, Urata M, Ogawa I. Evaluation of linearity and interference effect on SMBG and POCT devices, showing drastic high values, low values, or error messages. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2019;13:734–743
  29. Ginsberg BH. Factors affecting blood glucose monitoring: sources of errors in measurement. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2009;3:903–913
  30. Tamborlane WV, Beck RW, Bode BW, et al.; Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation Continuous Glucose Monitoring Study Group. Continuous glucose monitoring and intensive treatment of type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;359:1464–1476
  31. Tumminia A, Crimi S, Sciacca L, et al. Efficacy of real-time continuous glucose monitoring on glycaemic control and glucose variability in type 1 diabetic patients treated with either insulin pumps or multiple insulin injection therapy: a randomized controlled crossover trial. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2015;31:61–68
  32. Hansen KW, Bibby BM. The frequency of intermittently scanned glucose and diurnal variation of glycemic metrics. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 27 May 2021 [Epub ahead of print]. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/19322968211019382>
  33. Urakami T, Yoshida K, Kuwabara R, et al. Frequent scanning using flash glucose monitoring contributes to better glycemic control in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *J Diabetes Investig*. 18 June 2021 [Epub ahead of print]. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jdi.13618>
  34. Lameijer A, Lommerde N, Dunn TC, et al. Flash glucose monitoring in the Netherlands: increased monitoring frequency is associated with improvement of glycemic parameters. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2021;177:108897
  35. Hohendorff J, Gumprecht J, Mysliwiec M, Zozulinska-Ziolkiewicz D, Malecki MT. Intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring data of Polish patients from real-life conditions: more scanning and better glycemic control compared to worldwide data. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2021;23:577–585
  36. Aleppo G, Ruedy KJ, Riddlesworth TD, et al.; REPLACE-BG Study Group. REPLACE-BG: a randomized trial comparing continuous glucose monitoring with and without routine blood glucose monitoring in adults with well-controlled type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:538–545
  37. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. –FDA News Release: FDA expands indication for continuous glucose monitoring system, first to replace fingerstick testing for diabetes treatment decisions, 2016. Accessed 18 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/newsevents/newsroom/pressannouncements/ucm534056.htm>
  38. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA News Release: FDA approves first continuous glucose monitoring system for adults not requiring blood sample calibration, 2017. Accessed 18 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/Newsroom/PressAnnouncements/ucm577890.htm>
  39. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Product classification [database]. Accessed 18 October 2021. Available from <https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpdc/classification.cfm>
  40. Beck RW, Riddlesworth T, Ruedy K, et al.; DIAMOND Study Group. Effect of continuous glucose monitoring on glycemic control in adults with type 1 diabetes using insulin injections: the DIAMOND randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2017;317:371–378
  41. Lind M, Polonsky W, Hirsch IB, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring vs conventional therapy for glycemic control in adults with type 1 diabetes treated with multiple daily insulin injections: the GOLD randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2017;317:379–387
  42. Riddlesworth T, Price D, Cohen N, Beck RW. Hypoglycemic event frequency and the effect of continuous glucose monitoring in adults with type 1 diabetes using multiple daily insulin injections. *Diabetes Ther* 2017;8:947–951
  43. Sequeira PA, Montoya L, Ruelas V, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring pilot in low-income type 1 diabetes patients. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2013;15:855–858
  44. Bolinder J, Antuna R, Geelhoed-Duijvestijn P, Kröger J, Weitgasser R. Novel glucose-sensing technology and hypoglycaemia in type 1 diabetes: a multicentre, non-masked, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2016;388:2254–2263
  45. Hermanns N, Schumann B, Kulzer B, Haak T. The impact of continuous glucose monitoring on low interstitial glucose values and low blood glucose values assessed by point-of-care blood glucose meters: results of a crossover trial. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2014;8:516–522
  46. van Beers CAJ, DeVries JH, Kleijer SJ, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring for patients with type 1 diabetes and impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia (IN CONTROL): a randomised, open-label, crossover trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2016;4:893–902
  47. Battelino T, Conget I, Olsen B, et al.; SWITCH Study Group. The use and efficacy of continuous glucose monitoring in type 1 diabetes treated with insulin pump therapy: a randomised controlled trial. *Diabetologia* 2012;55:3155–3162
  48. Pratley RE, Kanapka LG, Rickels MR, et al.; Wireless Innovation for Seniors With Diabetes Mellitus (WISDM) Study Group. Effect of continuous glucose monitoring on hypoglycemia in older adults with type 1 diabetes: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2020;323:2397–2406
  49. Deiss D, Bolinder J, Riveline J-P, et al. Improved glycemic control in poorly controlled patients with type 1 diabetes using real-time continuous glucose monitoring. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:2730–2732
  50. O’Connell MA, Donath S, O’Neal DN, et al. Glycaemic impact of patient-led use of sensor-guided pump therapy in type 1 diabetes: a randomised controlled trial. *Diabetologia* 2009;52:1250–1257
  51. Battelino T, Phillip M, Bratina N, Nimri R, Oskarsson P, Bolinder J. Effect of continuous glucose monitoring on hypoglycemia in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:795–800
  52. Heinemann L, Freckmann G, Ehrmann D, et al. Real-time continuous glucose monitoring in adults with type 1 diabetes and impaired hypoglycaemia awareness or severe hypoglycaemia treated with multiple daily insulin injections (HypoDE): a multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2018;391:1367–1377
  53. Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation Continuous Glucose Monitoring Study Group; Beck RW, Hirsch IB, Laffel L, et al. The effect of continuous glucose monitoring in well-controlled type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1378–1383
  54. Laffel LM, Kanapka LG, Beck RW, et al.; CGM Intervention in Teens and Young Adults with T1D (CITY) Study Group; CDE10. Effect of continuous glucose monitoring on glycemic control in adolescents and young adults with type 1 diabetes: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2020;323:2388–2396
  55. Strategies to Enhance New CGM Use in Early Childhood (SENCE) Study Group. A randomized clinical trial assessing continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) use with standardized education with or without a family behavioral intervention compared with fingerstick blood glucose monitoring in very young children with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:464–472
  56. Garg S, Zisser H, Schwartz S, et al. Improvement in glycemic excursions with a transcutaneous, real-time continuous glucose sensor: a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:44–50
  57. New JP, Ajjan R, Pfeiffer AFH, Freckmann G. Continuous glucose monitoring in people with diabetes: the randomized controlled Glucose Level Awareness in Diabetes Study (GLADIS). *Diabet Med* 2015;32:609–617
  58. Beck RW, Riddlesworth TD, Ruedy K, et al.; DIAMOND Study Group. Continuous glucose monitoring versus usual care in patients with type 2 diabetes receiving multiple daily insulin injections: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2017;167:365–374
  59. Ehrhardt NM, Chellappa M, Walker MS, Fonda SJ, Vigersky RA. The effect of real-time continuous glucose monitoring on glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2011;5:668–675
  60. Yoo HJ, An HG, Park SY, et al. Use of a real time continuous glucose monitoring system as a motivational device for poorly controlled type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2008;82:73–79
  61. Martens T, Beck RW, Bailey R, et al.; MOBILE Study Group. Effect of continuous glucose monitoring on glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes treated with basal insulin: a



- randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2021;325:2262–2272
62. Price DA, Deng Q, Kipnes M, Beck SE. Episodic real-time CGM use in adults with type 2 diabetes: results of a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Ther* 2021;12:2089–2099
63. Haak T, Hanaire H, Ajjan R, Hermanns N, Riveline J-P, Rayman G. Flash glucose-sensing technology as a replacement for blood glucose monitoring for the management of insulin-treated type 2 diabetes: a multicenter, open-label randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Ther* 2017;8:55–73
64. Yaron M, Roitman E, Aharon-Hananel G, et al. Effect of flash glucose monitoring technology on glycemic control and treatment satisfaction in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:1178–1184
65. Davis TME, Dwyer P, England M, Fegan PG, Davis WA. Efficacy of intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring in the prevention of recurrent severe hypoglycemia. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:367–373
66. Boucher SE, Gray AR, Wiltshire EJ, et al. Effect of 6 months of flash glucose monitoring in youth with type 1 diabetes and high-risk glycemic control: a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2388–2395
67. Deshmukh H, Wilmot EG, Gregory R, et al. Effect of flash glucose monitoring on glycemic control, hypoglycemia, diabetes-related distress, and resource utilization in the Association of British Clinical Diabetologists (ABCD) nationwide audit. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2153–2160
68. Charleer S, Gillard P, Vandoorne E, Cammaerts K, Mathieu C, Casteels K. Intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring is associated with high satisfaction but increased HbA<sub>1c</sub> and weight in well-controlled youth with type 1 diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2020;21:1465–1474
69. Al Hayek A, Al Dawish M, El Jammal M. The impact of flash glucose monitoring on markers of glycaemic control and patient satisfaction in type 2 diabetes. *Cureus* 2021;13:e16007
70. Nathanson D, Svensson A-M, Miftaraj M, Franzén S, Bolinder J, Eeg-Olofsson K. Effect of flash glucose monitoring in adults with type 1 diabetes: a nationwide, longitudinal observational study of 14,372 flash users compared with 7691 glucose sensor naive controls. *Diabetologia* 2021;64:1595–1603
71. Wright EE Jr, Kerr MSD, Reyes JJ, Nabutovsky Y, Miller E. Use of flash continuous glucose monitoring is associated with A1C reduction in people with type 2 diabetes treated with basal insulin or noninsulin therapy. *Diabetes Spectr* 2021;34:184–189
72. Charleer S, De Block C, Van Huffel L, et al. Quality of life and glucose control after 1 year of nationwide reimbursement of intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring in adults living with type 1 diabetes (FUTURE): a prospective observational real-world cohort study. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:389–397
73. Elliott T, Beca S, Beharry R, Tsoukas MA, Zarruk A, Abitbol A. The impact of flash glucose monitoring on glycated hemoglobin in type 2 diabetes managed with basal insulin in Canada: a retrospective real-world chart review study. *Diab Vasc Dis Res* 2021;18:14791641211021374
74. Tyndall V, Stimson RH, Zammitt NN, et al. Marked improvement in HbA<sub>1c</sub> following commencement of flash glucose monitoring in people with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2019;62:1349–1356
75. Karter AJ, Parker MM, Moffet HH, Gilliam LK, Dlott R. Association of real-time continuous glucose monitoring with glycemic control and acute metabolic events among patients with insulin-treated diabetes. *JAMA* 2021;325:2273–2284
76. Reddy M, Jugnee N, El Laboudi A, Spanudakis E, Anantharaja S, Oliver N. A randomized controlled pilot study of continuous glucose monitoring and flash glucose monitoring in people with type 1 diabetes and impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia. *Diabet Med* 2018;35:483–490
77. Hásková A, Radovnícká L, Petruželková L, et al. Real-time CGM is superior to flash glucose monitoring for glucose control in type 1 diabetes: the CORRIDA randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2744–2750
78. Visser MM, Charleer S, Fieus S, et al. Comparing real-time and intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring in adults with type 1 diabetes (ALERTT1): a 6-month, prospective, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2021;397:2275–2283
79. Sandig D, Grimsman J, Reinauer C, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring in adults with type 1 diabetes: real-world data from the German/Austrian Prospective Diabetes Follow-Up Registry. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:602–612
80. Danne T, Nimri R, Battelino T, et al. International consensus on use of continuous glucose monitoring. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1631–1640
81. Battelino T, Danne T, Bergenstal RM, et al. Clinical targets for continuous glucose monitoring data interpretation: recommendations from the international consensus on time in range. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:1593–1603
82. Feig DS, Donovan LE, Corcoy R, et al.; CONCEPTT Collaborative Group. Continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with type 1 diabetes (CONCEPTT): a multicentre international randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2017;390:2347–2359
83. Kristensen K, Ögge LE, Sengpiel V, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with type 1 diabetes: an observational cohort study of 186 pregnancies. *Diabetologia* 2019;62:1143–1153
84. Law GR, Gilthorpe MS, Secher AL, et al. Translating HbA<sub>1c</sub> measurements into estimated average glucose values in pregnant women with diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2017;60:618–624
85. Secher AL, Ringholm L, Andersen HU, Damm P, Mathiesen ER. The effect of real-time continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1877–1883
86. Wei Q, Sun Z, Yang Y, Yu H, Ding H, Wang S. Effect of a CGMS and SMBG on maternal and neonatal outcomes in gestational diabetes mellitus: a randomized controlled trial. *Sci Rep* 2016;6:19920
87. Ajjan R, Jackson N, Thomson SA. Reduction in HbA<sub>1c</sub> using professional flash glucose monitoring in insulin-treated type 2 diabetes patients managed in primary and secondary care settings: a pilot, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Diab Vasc Dis Res* 2019;16:385–395
88. Ribeiro RT, Andrade R, Nascimento do Ó D, Lopes AF, Raposo JF. Impact of blinded retrospective continuous glucose monitoring on clinical decision making and glycemic control in persons with type 2 diabetes on insulin therapy. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2021;31:1267–1275
89. Wada E, Onoue T, Kobayashi T, et al. Flash glucose monitoring helps achieve better glycemic control than conventional self-monitoring of blood glucose in non-insulin-treated type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2020;8:e001115
90. Fantasia KL, Stockman M-C, Ju Z, et al. Professional continuous glucose monitoring and endocrinology eConsult for adults with type 2 diabetes in primary care: results of a clinical pilot program. *J Clin Transl Endocrinol* 2021;24:100254
91. Simonson GD, Bergenstal RM, Johnson ML, Davidson JL, Martens TW. Effect of professional CGM (pCGM) on glucose management in type 2 diabetes patients in primary care. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2021;15:539–545
92. Ulrich H, Bowen M. The clinical utility of professional continuous glucose monitoring by pharmacists for patients with type 2 diabetes. *J Am Pharm Assoc* (2003) 2021;S1544-3191:00195-3
93. Pleus S, Ulbrich S, Zschornack E, Kamann S, Haug C, Freckmann G. Documentation of skin-related issues associated with continuous glucose monitoring use in the scientific literature. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:538–545
94. Herman A, de Montjoye L, Baeck M. Adverse cutaneous reaction to diabetic glucose sensors and insulin pumps: irritant contact dermatitis or allergic contact dermatitis? *Contact Dermat* 2020;83:25–30
95. Rigo RS, Levin LE, Belsito DV, Garzon MC, Gandica R, Williams KM. Cutaneous reactions to continuous glucose monitoring and continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion devices in type 1 diabetes mellitus. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2021;15:786–791
96. Kamann S, Aerts O, Heinemann L. Further evidence of severe allergic contact dermatitis from isobornyl acrylate while using a continuous glucose monitoring system. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2018;12:630–633
97. Aerts O, Herman A, Bruze M, Goossens A, Mowitz M. FreeStyle Libre: contact irritation versus contact allergy. *Lancet* 2017;390:1644
98. Herman A, Aerts O, Baeck M, et al. Allergic contact dermatitis caused by isobornyl acrylate in Freestyle® Libre, a newly introduced glucose sensor. *Contact Dermat* 2017;77:367–373
99. Hyry HSI, Liippo JP, Virtanen HM. Allergic contact dermatitis caused by glucose sensors in type 1 diabetes patients. *Contact Dermat* 2019;81:161–166
100. Asarani NAM, Reynolds AN, Boucher SE, de Bock M, Wheeler BJ. Cutaneous complications with continuous or flash glucose monitoring use: systematic review of trials and observational studies. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2020;14:328–337
101. Lombardo F, Salzano G, Crisafulli G, et al. Allergic contact dermatitis in pediatric patients with type 1 diabetes: an emerging issue. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2020;162:108089
102. Oppel E, Kamann S, Heinemann L, Reichl F-X, Högg C. The implanted glucose monitoring



- system Eversense: an alternative for diabetes patients with isobornyl acrylate allergy. *Contact Dermat* 2020;82:101–104
103. Freckmann G, Buck S, Waldenmaier D, et al. Skin reaction report form: development and design of a standardized report form for skin reactions due to medical devices for diabetes management. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2021;15:801–806
104. Deiss D, Irace C, Carlson G, Tweden KS, Kaufman FR. Real-world safety of an implantable continuous glucose sensor over multiple cycles of use: a post-market registry study. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:48–52
105. Sanchez P, Ghosh-Dastidar S, Tweden KS, Kaufman FR. Real-world data from the first u.s. commercial users of an implantable continuous glucose sensor. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:677–681
106. Piras de Oliveira C, Mitchell BD, Fan L, et al. Patient perspectives on the use of half-unit insulin pens by people with type 1 diabetes: a cross-sectional observational study. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2021;37:45–51
107. Machry RV, Cipriani GF, Pedrosa HU, et al. Pens versus syringes to deliver insulin among elderly patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Diabetol Metab Syndr* 2021;13:64
108. Ignaut DA, Schwartz SL, Sarwat S, Murphy HL. Comparative device assessments: Humalog KwikPen compared with vial and syringe and FlexPen. *Diabetes Educ* 2009;35:789–798
109. Korytkowski M, Bell D, Jacobsen C; FlexPen Study Team. A multicenter, randomized, open-label, comparative, two-period crossover trial of preference, efficacy, and safety profiles of a prefilled, disposable pen and conventional vial/syringe for insulin injection in patients with type 1 or 2 diabetes mellitus. *Clin Ther* 2003;25:2836–2848
110. Asche CV, Shane-McWhorter L, Raparla S. Health economics and compliance of vials/syringes versus pen devices: a review of the evidence. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2010;12(Suppl. 1):S101–S108
111. Singh R, Samuel C, Jacob JJ. A comparison of insulin pen devices and disposable plastic syringes – simplicity, safety, convenience and cost differences. *Eur Endocrinol* 2018;14:47–51
112. Frid AH, Kreugel G, Grassi G, et al. New insulin delivery recommendations. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2016;91:1231–1255
113. Lasalvia P, Barahona-Correa JE, Romero-Alvernía DM, et al. Pen devices for insulin self-administration compared with needle and vial: systematic review of the literature and meta-analysis. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2016;10:959–966
114. Slabaugh SL, Bouchard JR, Li Y, Baltz JC, Meah YA, Moretz DC. Characteristics relating to adherence and persistence to basal insulin regimens among elderly insulin-naïve patients with type 2 diabetes: pre-filled pens versus vials/syringes. *Adv Ther* 2015;32:1206–1221
115. Chandran A, Bonafede MK, Nigam S, Saltiel-Berzin R, Hirsch LJ, Lahue BJ. Adherence to insulin pen therapy is associated with reduction in healthcare costs among patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Am Health Drug Benefits* 2015;8:148–158
116. Pawaskar MD, Camacho FT, Anderson RT, Cobden D, Joshi AV, Balkrishnan R. Health care costs and medication adherence associated with initiation of insulin pen therapy in Medicaid-enrolled patients with type 2 diabetes: a retrospective database analysis. *Clin Ther* 2007;29:1294–1305
117. Seggelke SA, Hawkins RM, Gibbs J, Rasouli N, Wang CCL, Draznin B. Effect of glargine insulin delivery method (pen device versus vial/syringe) on glycemic control and patient preferences in patients with type 1 and type 2 diabetes. *Endocr Pract* 2014;20:536–539
118. Ahmann A, Szeinbach SL, Gill J, T aylor L, Garg SK. Comparing patient preferences and healthcare provider recommendations with the pen versus vial-and-syringe insulin delivery in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2014;16:76–83
119. Asche CV, Luo W, Aagren M. Differences in rates of hypoglycemia and health care costs in patients treated with insulin aspart in pens versus vials. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2013;29:1287–1296
120. Eby EL, Boye KS, Lage MJ. The association between use of mealtime insulin pens versus vials and healthcare charges and resource utilization in patients with type 2 diabetes: a retrospective cohort study. *J Med Econ* 2013;16:1231–1237
121. Anderson BJ, Redondo MJ. What can we learn from patient-reported outcomes of insulin pen devices? *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2011;5:1563–1571
122. Luijck YM, DeVries JH. Dosing accuracy of insulin pens versus conventional syringes and vials. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2010;12(Suppl. 1):S73–S77
123. Hanas R, de Beaufort C, Hoey H, Anderson B. Insulin delivery by injection in children and adolescents with diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2011;12:518–526
124. Pfützner A, Schipper C, Niemeyer M, et al. Comparison of patient preference for two insulin injection pen devices in relation to patient dexterity skills. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2012;6:910–916
125. Reinauer KM, Joksche G, Renn W, Eggstein M. Insulin pens in elderly diabetic patients. *Diabetes Care* 1990;13:1136–1137
126. Thomas DR, Fischer RG, Nicholas WC, Beghe C, Hatten KW, Thomas JN. Disposable insulin syringe reuse and aseptic practices in diabetic patients. *J Gen Intern Med* 1989;4:97–100
127. Gomez-Peralta F, Abreu C, Gomez-Rodriguez S, et al. Efficacy of *Insulclock* in patients with poorly controlled type 1 diabetes mellitus: a pilot, randomized clinical trial. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:686–690
128. Bailey TS, Stone JY. A novel pen-based Bluetooth-enabled insulin delivery system with insulin dose tracking and advice. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv* 2017;14:697–703
129. Eiland L, McCarney M, Thangavelu T, Drincic A. App-based insulin calculators: current and future state. *Curr Diab Rep* 2018;18:123
130. Huckvale K, Adomaviciute S, Prieto JT, Leow MK-S, Car J. Smartphone apps for calculating insulin dose: a systematic assessment. *BMC Med* 2015;13:106
131. Breton MD, Patek SD, Lv D, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring and insulin informed advisory system with automated titration and dosing of insulin reduces glucose variability in type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:531–540
132. Bergenstal RM, Johnson M, Passi R, et al. Automated insulin dosing guidance to optimise insulin management in patients with type 2 diabetes: a multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2019;393:1138–1148
133. Yeh H-C, Brown TT, Maruthur N, et al. Comparative effectiveness and safety of methods of insulin delivery and glucose monitoring for diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;157:336–347
134. Pickup JC. The evidence base for diabetes technology: appropriate and inappropriate meta-analysis. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2013;7:1567–1574
135. Lin MH, Connor CG, Ruedy KJ, et al.; Pediatric Diabetes Consortium. Race, socioeconomic status, and treatment center are associated with insulin pump therapy in youth in the first year following diagnosis of type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2013;15:929–934
136. Willi SM, Miller KM, DiMeglio LA, et al.; T1D Exchange Clinic Network. Racial-ethnic disparities in management and outcomes among children with type 1 diabetes. *Pediatrics* 2015;135:424–434
137. Redondo MJ, Libman I, Cheng P, et al.; Pediatric Diabetes Consortium. Racial/ethnic minority youth with recent-onset type 1 diabetes have poor prognostic factors. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1017–1024
138. Ramchandani N, Ten S, Anhalt H, et al. Insulin pump therapy from the time of diagnosis of type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2006;8:663–670
139. Berghaeuser MA, Kapellen T, Heidtmann B, Haberland H, Klinkert C; German working group for insulin pump treatment in paediatric patients. Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion in toddlers starting at diagnosis of type 1 diabetes mellitus. A multicenter analysis of 104 patients from 63 centres in Germany and Austria. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2008;9:590–595
140. Peters AL, Ahmann AJ, Battelino T, et al. Diabetes technology-continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion therapy and continuous glucose monitoring in adults: an Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2016;101:3922–3937
141. Gill M, Chhabra H, Shah M, Zhu C, Grunberger G. C-peptide and beta-cell autoantibody testing prior to initiating continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion pump therapy did not improve utilization or medical costs among older adults with diabetes mellitus. *Endocr Pract* 2018;24:634–645
142. Vigersky RA, Huang S, Cordero TL, et al.; Opt2mise Study Group. Improved HbA1c, total daily insulin dose, and treatment satisfaction with insulin pump therapy compared to multiple daily insulin injections in patients with type 2 diabetes irrespective of baseline C-peptide levels. *Endocr Pract* 2018;24:446–452
143. Wheeler BJ, Heels K, Donaghue KC, Reith DM, Ambler GR. Insulin pump-associated adverse events in children and adolescents—a prospective study. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2014;16:558–562

144. Kordonouri O, Lauterborn R, Deiss D. Lipohypertrophy in young patients with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2002;25:634
145. Kordonouri O, Hartmann R, Remus K, Bläsing S, Sadeghian E, Danne T. Benefit of supplementary fat plus protein counting as compared with conventional carbohydrate counting for insulin bolus calculation in children with pump therapy. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2012;13:540–544
146. Guinn TS, Bailey GJ, Mecklenburg RS. Factors related to discontinuation of continuous subcutaneous insulin-infusion therapy. *Diabetes Care* 1988;11:46–51
147. Wong JC, Boyle C, DiMeglio LA, et al.; T1D Exchange Clinic Network. Evaluation of pump discontinuation and associated factors in the T1D Exchange clinic registry. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2017;11:224–232
148. Wong JC, Dolan LM, Yang TT, Hood KK. Insulin pump use and glycemic control in adolescents with type 1 diabetes: predictors of change in method of insulin delivery across two years. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2015;16:592–599
149. Plotnick LP, Clark LM, Brancati FL, Erlinger T. Safety and effectiveness of insulin pump therapy in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:1142–1146
150. Redondo MJ, Connor CG, Ruedy KJ, et al.; Pediatric Diabetes Consortium. Pediatric Diabetes Consortium Type 1 Diabetes New Onset (NeOn) Study: factors associated with HbA1c levels one year after diagnosis. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2014;15:294–302
151. Doyle EA, Weinzimer SA, Steffen AT, Ahern JAH, Vincent M, Tamborlane WVA. A randomized, prospective trial comparing the efficacy of continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion with multiple daily injections using insulin glargine. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:1554–1558
152. Alemzadeh R, Ellis JN, Holzum MK, Parton EA, Wyatt DT. Beneficial effects of continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion and flexible multiple daily insulin regimen using insulin glargine in type 1 diabetes. *Pediatrics* 2004;114:e91–e95
153. Sherr JL, Hermann JM, Campbell F, et al.; T1D Exchange Clinic Network, the DPV Initiative, and the National Paediatric Diabetes Audit and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health registries. Use of insulin pump therapy in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes and its impact on metabolic control: comparison of results from three large, transatlantic paediatric registries. *Diabetologia* 2016;59:87–91
154. Jeitler K, Horvath K, Berghold A, et al. Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion versus multiple daily insulin injections in patients with diabetes mellitus: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetologia* 2008;51:941–951
155. Karges B, Schwandt A, Heidtmann B, et al. Association of insulin pump therapy vs insulin injection therapy with severe hypoglycemia, ketoacidosis, and glycemic control among children, adolescents, and young adults with type 1 diabetes. *JAMA* 2017;318:1358–1366
156. The DCCT Research Group. Epidemiology of severe hypoglycemia in the diabetes control and complications trial. *Am J Med* 1991;90:450–459
157. Haynes A, Hermann JM, Miller KM, et al.; T1D Exchange, WACDD and DPV registries. Severe hypoglycemia rates are not associated with HbA1c: a cross-sectional analysis of 3 contemporary pediatric diabetes registry databases. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2017;18:643–650
158. Pickup JC, Sutton AJ. Severe hypoglycaemia and glycaemic control in type 1 diabetes: meta-analysis of multiple daily insulin injections compared with continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion. *Diabet Med* 2008;25:765–774
159. Birkebaek NH, Drivvoll AK, Aakeson K, et al. Incidence of severe hypoglycemia in children with type 1 diabetes in the Nordic countries in the period 2008–2012: association with hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> and treatment modality. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2017;5:e000377
160. Maahs DM, Hermann JM, Holman N, et al.; National Paediatric Diabetes Audit and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, the DPV Initiative, and the T1D Exchange Clinic Network. Rates of diabetic ketoacidosis: international comparison with 49,859 pediatric patients with type 1 diabetes from England, Wales, the U.S., Austria, and Germany. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1876–1882
161. Zabeen B, Craig ME, Virk SA, et al. Insulin pump therapy is associated with lower rates of retinopathy and peripheral nerve abnormality. *PLoS One* 2016;11:e0153033
162. Weintrob N, Benzaquen H, Galatzer A, et al. Comparison of continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion and multiple daily injection regimens in children with type 1 diabetes: a randomized open crossover trial. *Pediatrics* 2003;112:559–564
163. Opiari-Arrigan L, Fredericks EM, Burkhart N, Dale L, Hodge M, Foster C. Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion benefits quality of life in preschool-age children with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2007;8:377–383
164. Sundberg F, Barnard K, Cato A, et al. ISPAD Guidelines. Managing diabetes in preschool children. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2017;18:499–517
165. Commissariat PV, Boyle CT, Miller KM, et al. Insulin pump use in young children with type 1 diabetes: sociodemographic factors and parent-reported barriers. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2017;19:363–369
166. Bergenstal RM, Garg S, Weinzimer SA, et al. Safety of a hybrid closed-loop insulin delivery system in patients with type 1 diabetes. *JAMA* 2016;316:1407–1408
167. Garg SK, Weinzimer SA, Tamborlane WV, et al. Glucose outcomes with the in-home use of a hybrid closed-loop insulin delivery system in adolescents and adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2017;19:155–163
168. Tauschmann M, Thabit H, Bally L, et al.; APCam11 Consortium. Closed-loop insulin delivery in suboptimally controlled type 1 diabetes: a multicentre, 12-week randomised trial. *Lancet* 2018;392:1321–1329
169. Eklaspour L, Forlenza GP, Chernavsky D, et al. Closed loop control in adolescents and children during winter sports: use of the Tandem Control-IQ AP system. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2019;20:759–768
170. Buckingham BA, Christiansen MP, Forlenza GP, et al. Performance of the Omnipod personalized model predictive control algorithm with meal bolus challenges in adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:585–595
171. Renard E, Tubiana-Rufi N, Bonnemaison-Gilbert E, et al. Closed-loop driven by control-to-range algorithm outperforms threshold-low-glucose-suspend insulin delivery on glucose control albeit not on nocturnal hypoglycaemia in prepubertal patients with type 1 diabetes in a supervised hotel setting. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2019;21:183–187
172. Forlenza GP, Eklaspour L, Breton M, et al. Successful at-home use of the Tandem Control-IQ artificial pancreas system in young children during a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:159–169
173. Anderson SM, Buckingham BA, Breton MD, et al. Hybrid closed-loop control is safe and effective for people with type 1 diabetes who are at moderate to high risk for hypoglycemia. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:356–363
174. Forlenza GP, Pinhas-Hamiel O, Liljenquist DR, et al. Safety evaluation of the MiniMed 670G system in children 7–13 years of age with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:11–19
175. Karageorgiou V, Papaioannou TG, Bellos I, et al. Effectiveness of artificial pancreas in the non-adult population: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Metabolism* 2019;90:20–30
176. Brown SA, Kovatchev BP, Raghinaru D, et al.; iDCL Trial Research Group. Six-month randomized, multicenter trial of closed-loop control in type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:1707–1717
177. Kaur H, Schneider N, Pyle L, Campbell K, Akturk HK, Shah VN. Efficacy of hybrid closed-loop system in adults with type 1 diabetes and gastroparesis. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:736–739
178. Sherr JL, Buckingham BA, Forlenza GP, et al. Safety and performance of the Omnipod hybrid closed-loop system in adults, adolescents, and children with type 1 diabetes over 5 days under free-living conditions. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:174–184
179. Lal RA, Basina M, Maahs DM, Hood K, Buckingham B, Wilson DM. One year clinical experience of the first commercial hybrid closed-loop system. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:2190–2196
180. Kovatchev B, Anderson SM, Raghinaru D, et al.; iDCL Study Group. Randomized controlled trial of mobile closed-loop control. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:607–615
181. Sherr JL, Cengiz E, Palerm CC, et al. Reduced hypoglycemia and increased time in target using closed-loop insulin delivery during nights with or without antecedent afternoon exercise in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2909–2914
182. Troncone A, Bonfanti R, Iafusco D, et al. Evaluating the experience of children with type 1 diabetes and their parents taking part in an artificial pancreas clinical trial over multiple days in a diabetes camp setting. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2158–2164
183. Barnard KD, Wysocki T, Allen JM, et al. Closing the loop overnight at home setting: psychosocial impact for adolescents with type 1 diabetes and their parents. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2014;2:e000025
184. Weissberg-Benchell J, Hessler D, Polonsky WH, Fisher L. Psychosocial impact of the bionic

- pancreas during summer camp. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2016;10:840–844
185. Forlenza GP, Li Z, Buckingham BA, et al. Predictive low-glucose suspend reduces hypoglycemia in adults, adolescents, and children with type 1 diabetes in an at-home randomized crossover study: results of the PROLOG trial. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2155–2161
  186. Wood MA, Shulman DI, Forlenza GP, et al. In-clinic evaluation of the MiniMed 670G system “suspend before low” feature in children with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:731–737
  187. Beato-Víborá PI, Quirós-López C, Lázaro-Martín L, et al. Impact of sensor-augmented pump therapy with predictive low-glucose suspend function on glycemic control and patient satisfaction in adults and children with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:738–743
  188. Brown SA, Beck RW, Raghuvaru D, et al.; iDCL Trial Research Group. Glycemic outcomes of use of CLC versus PLGS in type 1 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1822–1828
  189. Grunberger G, Sze D, Ermakova A, Sieradzian R, Oliveria T, Miller EM. Treatment intensification with insulin pumps and other technologies in patients with type 2 diabetes: results of a physician survey in the United States. *Clin Diabetes* 2020;38:47–55
  190. Grunberger G, Rosenfeld CR, Bode BW, et al. Effectiveness of V-Go<sup>®</sup> for patients with type 2 diabetes in a real-world setting: a prospective observational study. *Drugs Real World Outcomes* 2020;7:31–40
  191. Layne JE, Parkin CG, Zisser H. Efficacy of a tubeless patch pump in patients with type 2 diabetes previously treated with multiple daily injections. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2017;11:178–179
  192. Raval AD, Nguyen MH, Zhou S, Grabner M, Barron J, Quimbo R. Effect of V-Go versus multiple daily injections on glycemic control, insulin use, and diabetes medication costs among individuals with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm* 2019;25:1111–1123
  193. Leahy JLL, Aleppo G, Fonseca VA, et al. Optimizing postprandial glucose management in adults with insulin-requiring diabetes: report and recommendations. *J Endocr Soc* 2019;3:1942–1957
  194. Reznik Y, Cohen O, Aronson R, et al.; Opt2mise Study Group. Insulin pump treatment compared with multiple daily injections for treatment of type 2 diabetes (Opt2mise): a randomised open-label controlled trial. *Lancet* 2014;384:1265–1272
  195. Winter A, Lintner M, Knezevich E. V-Go insulin delivery system versus multiple daily insulin injections for patients with uncontrolled type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2015;9:1111–1116
  196. Bergenstal R, Peyrot M, Dreon D, et al.; Calibra Study Group. Implementation of basal-bolus therapy in type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial comparing bolus insulin delivery using an insulin patch with and insulin pen. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:1–13
  197. Lewis D. History and perspective on DIY closed looping. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2019;13:790–793
  198. Hng T-M, Burren D. Appearance of do-it-yourself closed-loop systems to manage type 1 diabetes. *Intern Med J* 2018;48:1400–1404
  199. Petruzelkova L, Soupal J, Plasova V, et al. Excellent glycemic control maintained by open-source hybrid closed-loop androids during and after sustained physical activity. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:744–750
  200. Kesavadev J, Srinivasan S, Saboo B, Krishna B M, Krishnan G. The do-it-yourself artificial pancreas: a comprehensive review. *Diabetes Ther* 2020;11:1217–1235
  201. Phillip M, Bergenstal RM, Close KL, et al. The digital/virtual diabetes clinic: the future is now—recommendations from an international panel on diabetes digital technologies introduction. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2021;23:146–154
  202. Fleming GA, Petrie JR, Bergenstal RM, Holl RW, Peters AL, Heinemann L. Diabetes digital app technology: benefits, challenges, and recommendations. a consensus report by the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD) and the American Diabetes Association (ADA) Diabetes Technology Working Group. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:250–260
  203. Wong JC, Izadi Z, Schroeder S, et al. A pilot study of use of a software platform for the collection, integration, and visualization of diabetes device data by health care providers in a multidisciplinary pediatric setting. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:806–816
  204. Chao DY, Lin TM, Ma W-Y. Enhanced self-efficacy and behavioral changes among patients with diabetes: cloud-based mobile health platform and mobile app service. *JMIR Diabetes* 2019;4:e11017
  205. Sepah SC, Jiang L, Peters AL. Translating the Diabetes Prevention Program into an online social network: validation against CDC standards. *Diabetes Educ* 2014;40:435–443
  206. Kaufman N, Ferrin C, Sugrue D. Using digital health technology to prevent and treat diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21(S1):S79–S94
  207. Öberg U, Isaksson U, Jutterström L, Orre CJ, Hörnsten Å. Perceptions of persons with type 2 diabetes treated in Swedish primary health care: qualitative study on using eHealth services for self-management support. *JMIR Diabetes* 2018;3:e7
  208. Bollyky JB, Bravata D, Yang J, Williamson M, Schneider J. Remote lifestyle coaching plus a connected glucose meter with certified diabetes educator support improves glucose and weight loss for people with type 2 diabetes. *J Diabetes Res* 2018;2018:3961730
  209. Wilhide Ili CC, Peeples MM, Anthony Kouyaté RC. Evidence-based mHealth chronic disease mobile app intervention design: development of a framework. *JMIR Res Protoc* 2016;5:e25
  210. Dixon RF, Zisser H, Layne JE, et al. A virtual type 2 diabetes clinic using continuous glucose monitoring and endocrinology visits. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2020;14:908–911
  211. Yang Y, Lee EY, Kim H-S, Lee S-H, Yoon K-H, Cho J-H. Effect of a mobile phone-based glucose-monitoring and feedback system for type 2 diabetes management in multiple primary care clinic settings: cluster randomized controlled trial. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth* 2020;8:e16266
  212. Levine BJ, Close KL, Gabbay RA. Reviewing U.S. connected diabetes care: the newest member of the team. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:1–9
  213. McGill DE, Volkeneing LK, Butler DA, Wasserman RM, Anderson BJ, Laffel LM. Text-message responsiveness to blood glucose monitoring reminders is associated with HbA<sub>1c</sub> benefit in teenagers with type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med* 2019;36:600–605
  214. Shen Y, Wang F, Zhang X, et al. Effectiveness of internet-based interventions on glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Med Internet Res* 2018;20:e172
  215. Stone MP, Agrawal P, Chen X, et al. Retrospective analysis of 3-month real-world glucose data after the MiniMed 670G system commercial launch. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:689–692
  216. Umpierrez GE, Klonoff DC. Diabetes technology update: use of insulin pumps and continuous glucose monitoring in the hospital. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1579–1589
  217. Yeh T, Yeung M, Mendelsohn Curanaj FA. Managing patients with insulin pumps and continuous glucose monitors in the hospital: to wear or not to wear. *Curr Diab Rep* 2021;21:7
  218. Galindo RJ, Umpierrez GE, Rushakoff RJ, et al. Continuous glucose monitors and automated insulin dosing systems in the hospital consensus guideline. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2020;14:1035–1064
  219. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Enforcement Policy for Non-Invasive Remote Monitoring Devices Used to Support Patient Monitoring During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Public Health Emergency (Revised), 2020. Accessed 18 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/media/136290/download>
  220. Davis GM, Faulds E, Walker T, et al. Remote continuous glucose monitoring with a computerized insulin infusion protocol for critically ill patients in a COVID-19 medical ICU: proof of concept. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:1055–1058
  221. Sadhu AR, Serrano IA, Xu J, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring in critically ill patients with COVID-19: results of an emergent pilot study. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2020;14:1065–1073
  222. Agarwal S, Mathew J, Davis GM, et al. Continuous glucose monitoring in the intensive care unit during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:847–849
  223. Ushigome E, Yamazaki M, Hamaguchi M, et al. Usefulness and safety of remote continuous glucose monitoring for a severe COVID-19 patient with diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2021;23:78–80
  224. Galindo RJ, Aleppo G, Klonoff DC, et al. Implementation of continuous glucose monitoring in the hospital: emergent considerations for remote glucose monitoring during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2020;14:822–832
  225. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Self-Monitoring Blood Glucose Test Systems for Over-the-Counter Use. Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff, September 2020. Accessed 18 October 2021. Available from

<https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/self-monitoring-blood-glucose-test-systems-over-counter-use>  
226. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Blood Glucose Monitoring Test Systems for Prescription Point-of-Care Use: Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff, September 2020. Accessed 18 October 2021. Available from <https://>

[www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/blood-glucose-monitoring-test-systems-prescription-point-care-use](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/blood-glucose-monitoring-test-systems-prescription-point-care-use)  
227. International Standards Organization. ISO 15197:2013 [Internet]. In vitro diagnostic test systems – requirements for blood glucose monitoring systems for self-testing in managing diabetes mellitus. Accessed 18 October 2020. Available

from <https://www.iso.org/cms/render/live/en/sites/isoorg/contents/data/standard/05/49/54976.html>  
228. Parkes JL, Slatin SL, Pardo S, Ginsberg BH. A new consensus error grid to evaluate the clinical significance of inaccuracies in the measurement of blood glucose. *Diabetes Care* 2000;23:1143–1148