

JANUARY 2022

THE JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND APPLIED RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

VOLUME 45 | SUPPLEMENT 1

# Diabetes Care®

WWW.DIABETES.ORG/DIABETES CARE

JANUARY 2022

SUPPLEMENT

1

AMERICAN DIABETES ASSOCIATION

# STANDARDS OF MEDICAL CARE IN DIABETES — 2022

Diabetes Care®

VOLUME 45 | SUPPLEMENT 1 | PAGES S1–S264



ISSN 0149-5992



# Diabetes Care<sup>®</sup>

THE JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND APPLIED RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

January 2022 Volume 45, Supplement 1

[T]he simple word *Care* may suffice to express [the journal's] philosophical mission. The new journal is designed to promote better patient care by serving the expanded needs of all health professionals committed to the care of patients with diabetes. As such, the American Diabetes Association views *Diabetes Care* as a reaffirmation of Francis Weld Peabody's contention that "the secret of the care of the patient is in caring for the patient."

—Norbert Freinkel, *Diabetes Care*, January-February 1978

## EDITOR IN CHIEF

Matthew C. Riddle, MD

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Vanita R. Aroda, MD  
George Bakris, MD  
Lawrence Blonde, MD, FACP  
Andrew J.M. Boulton, MD  
Jessica R. Castle, MD  
Linda A. DiMeglio, MA, MD, MPH  
Linda Gonder-Frederick, PhD  
Frank B. Hu, MD, MPH, PhD  
Steven E. Kahn, MB, ChB  
Sanjay Kaul, MD, FACC, FAHA  
Robert G. Moses, MD  
Stephen S. Rich, PhD  
Julio Rosenstock, MD  
Elizabeth Selvin, PhD, MPH  
Adrian Vella, MD  
Judith Wylie-Rosett, EdD, RD

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Fida Bacha, MD  
Katharine Barnard-Kelly, PhD  
Ananda Basu, MD, FRCP  
Tadej Battelino, MD, PhD  
Petter Bjornstad, MD  
Fiona Bragg, BSc, MBChB, MRCP, MSc, DPhil, FFPH  
John B. Buse, MD, PhD  
Mark Emmanuel Cooper, MB BS, PhD  
Matthew J. Crowley, MD, MHS  
J. Hans DeVries, MD, PhD  
Kimberly A. Driscoll, PhD  
Kathleen M. Dungan, MD, MPH  
Hertzel C. Gerstein, MD, MSc, FRCOC  
Jessica Lee Harding, PhD  
Stewart B. Harris, CM, MD, MPH, FCFP, FACPM  
Byron J. Hoogwerf, MD, FACP, FACE  
Sarah S. Jaser, PhD  
M. Sue Kirkman, MD  
Richard David Graham Leslie, MD, FRCP, FAoP  
John J.V. McMurray, MD, FRCP, FESC, FACC, FAHA, FRSE, FMedSci  
Mark E. Molitch, MD  
Helen R. Murphy, MBBChBAO, FRACP, MD  
Katherine Ogurtsova, PhD  
Bruce A. Perkins, MD, MPH  
Casey M. Rebholz, PhD, MS, MNSP, MPH  
Maria Jose Redondo, MD, PhD, MPH  
Peter Rossing, MD, DMSc  
Desmond Schatz, MD  
Guntram Scherthaner, MD  
Jonathan Shaw, MD, FRCP, FRACP, FAAHMS  
Jay M. Sosenko, MD, MS  
Samy Suissa, PhD  
Giovanni Targher, MD  
Kristina M. Utzschneider, MD  
Daniel H. van Raalte, MD, PhD  
Joseph I. Wolsdorf, MB, BCH  
Daisuke Yabe, MD, PhD  
Sophia Zoungas, MBBS (Hons), PhD, FRACP

## AMERICAN DIABETES ASSOCIATION OFFICERS

CHAIR OF THE BOARD John Schlosser	PRESIDENT-ELECT, MEDICINE & SCIENCE Guillermo Umpierrez, MD, CDE, FACP, FACE
PRESIDENT, MEDICINE & SCIENCE Ruth Weinstock, MD, PhD	PRESIDENT-ELECT, HEALTH CARE & EDUCATION Otis Kirksey, PharmD, RPh, CDE, BC-ADM
PRESIDENT, HEALTH CARE & EDUCATION Cynthia Muñoz, PhD, MPH	SECRETARY/TREASURER-ELECT Marshall Case
SECRETARY/TREASURER Christopher Ralston, JD	CHIEF SCIENTIFIC & MEDICAL OFFICER Robert A. Gabbay, MD, PhD
CHAIR OF THE BOARD-ELECT Glen Tullman	



The mission of the American Diabetes Association is to prevent and cure diabetes and to improve the lives of all people affected by diabetes.

# Diabetes Care<sup>®</sup>

THE JOURNAL OF CLINICAL AND APPLIED RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

*Diabetes Care* is a journal for the health care practitioner that is intended to increase knowledge, stimulate research, and promote better management of people with diabetes. To achieve these goals, the journal publishes original research on human studies in the following categories: Clinical Care/Education/Nutrition/Psychosocial Research, Epidemiology/Health Services Research, Emerging Technologies and Therapeutics, Pathophysiology/Complications, and Cardiovascular and Metabolic Risk. The journal also publishes ADA statements, consensus reports, clinically relevant review articles, letters to the editor, and health/medical news or points of view. Topics covered are of interest to clinically oriented physicians, researchers, epidemiologists, psychologists, diabetes educators, and other health professionals. More information about the journal can be found online at [care.diabetesjournals.org](http://care.diabetesjournals.org).

Copyright © 2021 by the American Diabetes Association, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in the USA. Requests for permission to reuse content should be sent to Copyright Clearance Center at [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com) or 222 Rosewood Dr., Danvers, MA 01923; phone: (978) 750-8400; fax: (978) 646-8600. Requests for permission to translate should be sent to Permissions Editor, American Diabetes Association, at [permissions@diabetes.org](mailto:permissions@diabetes.org).

The American Diabetes Association reserves the right to reject any advertisement for any reason, which need not be disclosed to the party submitting the advertisement.

Commercial reprint orders should be directed to Sheridan Content Services, (800) 635-7181, ext. 8065.

Single issues of *Diabetes Care* can be ordered by calling toll-free (800) 232-3472, 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST, Monday through Friday. Outside the United States, call (703) 549-1500. Rates: \$75 in the United States, \$95 in Canada and Mexico, and \$125 for all other countries.

*Diabetes Care* is available online at [care.diabetesjournals.org](http://care.diabetesjournals.org). Please call the numbers listed above, e-mail [membership@diabetes.org](mailto:membership@diabetes.org), or visit the online journal for more information about submitting manuscripts, publication charges, ordering reprints, subscribing to the journal, becoming an ADA member, advertising, permission to reuse content, and the journal's publication policies.

Periodicals postage paid at Arlington, VA, and additional mailing offices.

PRINT ISSN 0149-5992  
ONLINE ISSN 1935-5548  
PRINTED IN THE USA

---

## AMERICAN DIABETES ASSOCIATION PERSONNEL AND CONTACTS

ASSOCIATE PUBLISHER,  
SCHOLARLY JOURNALS  
Christian S. Kohler

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, SCHOLARLY JOURNALS  
Keang Hok

SENIOR MANAGER, BILLING & COLLECTIONS  
Josh Flores  
[jflores@diabetes.org](mailto:jflores@diabetes.org)  
(703) 549-1500, ext. 2110

EDITORIAL OFFICE DIRECTOR  
Lyn Reynolds

TECHNICAL EDITOR  
Theresa M. Cooper

PHARMACEUTICAL & DEVICE PRINT ADVERTISING  
Lisa Morton  
Senior Account Manager  
[lmorton@diabetes.org](mailto:lmorton@diabetes.org)  
(312) 346-1805, ext. 6571

PEER REVIEW MANAGER  
Shannon Potts

PRODUCTION COORDINATOR  
Saleha Malik

DIRECTOR, MEMBERSHIP/SUBSCRIPTION  
SERVICES  
Donald Crowl

PHARMACEUTICAL & DEVICE DIGITAL ADVERTISING  
eHealthcare Solutions  
R.J. Lewis  
President and CEO  
[rlewis@ehsmail.com](mailto:rlewis@ehsmail.com)  
(609) 882-8887, ext. 101

ASSOCIATE MANAGER, PEER REVIEW  
Larissa M. Pouch

SENIOR ADVERTISING MANAGER  
Julie DeVoss Graff  
[jgraff@diabetes.org](mailto:jgraff@diabetes.org)  
(703) 299-5511

DIRECTOR, SCHOLARLY JOURNALS  
Heather Norton Blackburn

## Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022

- S1 Introduction**
- S3 Professional Practice Committee**
- S4 Summary of Revisions**
- S8 1. Improving Care and Promoting Health in Populations**  
Diabetes and Population Health  
Tailoring Treatment for Social Context
- S17 2. Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes**  
Classification  
Diagnostic Tests for Diabetes  
Type 1 Diabetes  
Prediabetes and Type 2 Diabetes  
Cystic Fibrosis–Related Diabetes  
Posttransplantation Diabetes Mellitus  
Monogenic Diabetes Syndromes  
Pancreatic Diabetes or Diabetes in the Context of Disease of the Exocrine Pancreas  
Gestational Diabetes Mellitus
- S39 3. Prevention or Delay of Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Comorbidities**  
Lifestyle Behavior Change for Diabetes Prevention  
Pharmacologic Interventions  
Prevention of Vascular Disease and Mortality  
Patient-Centered Care Goals
- S46 4. Comprehensive Medical Evaluation and Assessment of Comorbidities**  
Patient-Centered Collaborative Care  
Comprehensive Medical Evaluation  
Immunizations  
Assessment of Comorbidities
- S60 5. Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes**  
Diabetes Self-management Education and Support  
Medical Nutrition Therapy  
Physical Activity  
Smoking Cessation: Tobacco and e-Cigarettes  
Psychosocial Issues
- S83 6. Glycemic Targets**  
Assessment of Glycemic Control  
Glycemic Goals  
Hypoglycemia  
Intercurrent Illness
- S97 7. Diabetes Technology**  
General Device Principles  
Blood Glucose Monitoring  
Continuous Glucose Monitoring Devices  
Insulin Delivery
- S113 8. Obesity and Weight Management for the Prevention and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes**  
Assessment  
Diet, Physical Activity, and Behavioral Therapy  
Pharmacotherapy  
Medical Devices for Weight Loss  
Metabolic Surgery
- S125 9. Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment**  
Pharmacologic Therapy for Adults With Type 1 Diabetes  
Surgical Treatment for Type 1 Diabetes  
Pharmacologic Therapy for Adults With Type 2 Diabetes
- S144 10. Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management**  
The Risk Calculator  
Hypertension/Blood Pressure Control  
Lipid Management  
Statin Treatment  
Antiplatelet Agents  
Cardiovascular Disease
- S175 11. Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management**  
Chronic Kidney Disease  
Epidemiology of Diabetes and Chronic Kidney Disease  
Assessment of Albuminuria and Estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate  
Diagnosis of Diabetic Kidney Disease  
Staging of Chronic Kidney Disease  
Acute Kidney Injury  
Surveillance  
Interventions
- S185 12. Retinopathy, Neuropathy, and Foot Care**  
Diabetic Retinopathy  
Neuropathy  
Foot Care
- S195 13. Older Adults**  
Neurocognitive Function  
Hypoglycemia  
Treatment Goals  
Lifestyle Management  
Pharmacologic Therapy  
Special Considerations for Older Adults With Type 1 Diabetes  
Treatment in Skilled Nursing Facilities and Nursing Homes  
End-of-Life Care
- S208 14. Children and Adolescents**  
Type 1 Diabetes  
Type 2 Diabetes  
Transition From Pediatric to Adult Care
- S232 15. Management of Diabetes in Pregnancy**  
Diabetes in Pregnancy  
Preconception Counseling  
Glycemic Targets in Pregnancy  
Management of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus  
Management of Preexisting Type 1 Diabetes and Type 2 Diabetes in Pregnancy  
Preeclampsia and Aspirin  
Pregnancy and Drug Considerations  
Postpartum Care
- S244 16. Diabetes Care in the Hospital**  
Hospital Care Delivery Standards  
Glycemic Targets in Hospitalized Patients  
Bedside Blood Glucose Monitoring  
Glucose-Lowering Treatment in Hospitalized Patients  
Hypoglycemia



This issue is freely accessible online at [https://diabetesjournals.org/care/issue/45/Supplement\\_1](https://diabetesjournals.org/care/issue/45/Supplement_1).

Keep up with the latest information for *Diabetes Care* and other ADA titles via Facebook (/ADAPublications) and Twitter (@ADA\_Pubs).

---

Medical Nutrition Therapy in the Hospital  
Self-management in the Hospital  
Standards for Special Situations  
Transition From the Hospital to the Ambulatory  
Setting  
Preventing Admissions and Readmissions

**S254 17. Diabetes Advocacy**  
Advocacy Statements

**S256 Disclosures**

**S259 Index**

---



# Introduction: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S1–S2 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-SINT>

Diabetes is a complex, chronic illness requiring continuous medical care with multifactorial risk-reduction strategies beyond glycemic control. Ongoing diabetes self-management education and support are critical to preventing acute complications and reducing the risk of long-term complications. Significant evidence exists that supports a range of interventions to improve diabetes outcomes.

The American Diabetes Association (ADA) “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes,” referred to as the Standards of Care, is intended to provide clinicians, researchers, policy makers, and other interested individuals with the components of diabetes care, general treatment goals, and tools to evaluate the quality of care. The Standards of Care recommendations are not intended to preclude clinical judgment and must be applied in the context of excellent clinical care, with adjustments for individual preferences, comorbidities, and other patient factors. For more detailed information about the management of diabetes, please refer to *Medical Management of Type 1 Diabetes* (1) and *Medical Management of Type 2 Diabetes* (2).

The recommendations in the Standards of Care include screening, diagnostic, and therapeutic actions that are known or believed to favorably affect health outcomes of patients with diabetes. Many of these interventions have also been shown to be cost-effective (3,4). As indicated, the recommendations encompass care for youth (children ages birth to 11 years and adolescents

ages 12–18 years) and older adults (65 years and older).

The ADA strives to improve and update the Standards of Care to ensure that clinicians, health plans, and policy makers can continue to rely on it as the most authoritative source for current guidelines for diabetes care.

## ADA STANDARDS, STATEMENTS, REPORTS, AND REVIEWS

The ADA has been actively involved in the development and dissemination of diabetes care clinical practice recommendations and related documents for more than 30 years. The ADA’s Standards of Medical Care is viewed as an important resource for health care professionals who care for people with diabetes.

### Standards of Care

*The annual Standards of Care supplement to Diabetes Care contains official ADA position, is authored by the ADA, and provides all of the ADA’s current clinical practice recommendations.*

To update the Standards of Care, the ADA’s Professional Practice Committee (PPC) performs an extensive diabetes literature search, supplemented with input from ADA staff and the medical community at large. The PPC updates the Standards of Care annually and strives to include discussion of emerging clinical considerations in the text, and as evidence evolves, clinical guidance may be included in the recommendations. However, the Standards of Care is a “living” document, where important updates are published online should the PPC

determine that new evidence or regulatory changes (e.g., drug approvals, label changes) merit immediate inclusion. More information on the “living Standards” can be found on the ADA’s professional website DiabetesPro at [professional.diabetes.org/content-page/living-standards](https://professional.diabetes.org/content-page/living-standards). The Standards of Care supersedes all previous ADA position statements—and the recommendations therein—on clinical topics within the purview of the Standards of Care; ADA position statements, while still containing valuable analysis, should not be considered the ADA’s current position. The Standards of Care receives annual review and approval by the ADA’s Board of Directors and is reviewed by ADA’s clinical staff leadership.

### ADA Statement

*An ADA statement is an official ADA point of view or belief that does not contain clinical practice recommendations and may be issued on advocacy, policy, economic, or medical issues related to diabetes.*

ADA statements undergo a formal review process, including a review by the appropriate ADA national committee, ADA science and health care staff, and the ADA’s Board of Directors.

### Consensus Report

*A consensus report of a particular topic contains a comprehensive examination and is authored by an expert panel (i.e., consensus panel) and represents the panel’s collective analysis, evaluation, and opinion.*

The need for a consensus report arises when clinicians, scientists, regulators,

The “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes” was originally approved in 1988. Most recent review/revision: December 2021.

© 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>.



**Table 1—ADA evidence-grading system for “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes”**

Level of evidence	Description
<b>A</b>	<p>Clear evidence from well-conducted, generalizable randomized controlled trials that are adequately powered, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence from a well-conducted multicenter trial</li> <li>• Evidence from a meta-analysis that incorporated quality ratings in the analysis</li> </ul> <p>Compelling nonexperimental evidence, i.e., “all or none” rule developed by the Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine at the University of Oxford</p> <p>Supportive evidence from well-conducted randomized controlled trials that are adequately powered, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence from a well-conducted trial at one or more institutions</li> <li>• Evidence from a meta-analysis that incorporated quality ratings in the analysis</li> </ul>
<b>B</b>	<p>Supportive evidence from well-conducted cohort studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence from a well-conducted prospective cohort study or registry</li> <li>• Evidence from a well-conducted meta-analysis of cohort studies</li> </ul> <p>Supportive evidence from a well-conducted case-control study</p>
<b>C</b>	<p>Supportive evidence from poorly controlled or uncontrolled studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence from randomized clinical trials with one or more major or three or more minor methodological flaws that could invalidate the results</li> <li>• Evidence from observational studies with high potential for bias (such as case series with comparison with historical controls)</li> <li>• Evidence from case series or case reports</li> </ul> <p>Conflicting evidence with the weight of evidence supporting the recommendation</p>
<b>E</b>	Expert consensus or clinical experience

and/or policy makers desire guidance and/or clarity on a medical or scientific issue related to diabetes for which the evidence is contradictory, emerging, or incomplete. Consensus reports may also highlight gaps in evidence and propose areas of future research to address these gaps. A consensus report is not an ADA position but represents expert opinion only and is produced under the auspices of the ADA by invited experts. A consensus report may be developed after an ADA Clinical Conference or Research Symposium.

### Scientific Review

**A scientific review is a balanced review and analysis of the literature on a scientific or medical topic related to diabetes.**

A scientific review is not an ADA position and does not contain clinical practice recommendations but is produced under the auspices of the ADA by invited experts. The scientific review may provide a scientific rationale for clinical practice recommendations in the Standards of Care. The category may also include task force and expert committee reports.

### GRADING OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE

Since the ADA first began publishing clinical practice guidelines, there has been considerable evolution in the evaluation of scientific evidence and in the development of evidence-based guidelines. In 2002, the ADA developed a classification system to grade the quality of scientific evidence supporting ADA recommendations. A 2015 analysis of the evidence cited in the Standards of Care found steady improvement in quality over the previous 10 years, with the 2014 Standards of Care for the first time having the majority of bulleted recommendations supported by **A** level or **B** level evidence (5). A grading system (**Table 1**) developed by the ADA and modeled after existing methods was used to clarify and codify the evidence that forms the basis for the recommendations. All recommendations are critical to comprehensive care. ADA recommendations are assigned ratings of **A**, **B**, or **C**, depending on the quality of the evidence in support of the recommendation. Expert opinion **E** is a separate category for recommendations in which there is no evidence from clinical trials, clinical trials may be impractical, or there is conflicting evidence. Recommendations assigned an **E** level of evidence are

informed by key opinion leaders in the field of diabetes (members of the PPC) and cover important elements of clinical care. All recommendations receive a rating for the strength of the evidence and not for the strength of the recommendation. Recommendations with **A** level evidence are based on large well-designed clinical trials or well-done meta-analyses. Generally, these recommendations have the best chance of improving outcomes when applied to the population for which they are appropriate. Recommendations with lower levels of evidence may be equally important but are not as well supported.

Of course, published evidence is only one component of clinical decision-making. Clinicians care for patients, not populations; guidelines must always be interpreted with the individual patient in mind. Individual circumstances, such as comorbid and coexisting diseases, age, education, disability, and, above all, patients' values and preferences, must be considered and may lead to different treatment targets and strategies. Furthermore, conventional evidence hierarchies, such as the one adapted by the ADA, may miss nuances important in diabetes care. For example, although there is excellent evidence from clinical trials supporting the importance of achieving multiple risk factor control, the optimal way to achieve this result is less clear. It is difficult to assess each component of such a complex intervention.

### References

1. American Diabetes Association. *Medical Management of Type 1 Diabetes*. 7th ed. Wang CC, Shah AC, Eds. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2017
2. American Diabetes Association. *Medical Management of Type 2 Diabetes*. 8th ed. Meneghini L, Ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2020
3. Zhou X, Siegel KR, Ng BP, Jawanda S, Proia KK, Zhang X, Albright AL, Zhang P. Cost-effectiveness of diabetes prevention interventions targeting high-risk individuals and whole populations: a systematic review. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1593–1616
4. Siegel KR, Ali MK, Zhou X, Ng BP, Jawanda S, Proia K, Zhang X, Gregg EW, Albright AL, Zhang P. Cost-effectiveness of interventions to manage diabetes: has the evidence changed since 2008? *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1557–1592
5. Grant RW, Kirkman MS. Trends in the evidence level for the American Diabetes Association's “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes” from 2005 to 2014. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:6–8



# Professional Practice Committee: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022

American Diabetes Association

Diabetes Care 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S3 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-SPPC>

The Professional Practice Committee (PPC) of the American Diabetes Association (ADA) is responsible for the “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes,” referred to as the Standards of Care. The PPC is a multidisciplinary expert committee comprising physicians, diabetes care and education specialists, and others who have expertise in a range of areas, including, but not limited to, adult and pediatric endocrinology, epidemiology, public health, cardiovascular risk management, microvascular complications, pre-conception and pregnancy care, weight management and diabetes prevention, and use of technology in diabetes management. Appointment to the PPC is based on excellence in clinical practice and research, with attention to appropriate representation of members based on considerations including but not limited to demographic, geographical, work setting, or identity characteristics (e.g., gender, ethnicity, ability level, etc.). Although the primary role of the PPC members is to review and update the Standards of Care, they may also be involved in ADA statements, reports, and reviews.

All members of the PPC are required to disclose potential conflicts of interest with industry and other relevant organizations. These disclosures are discussed at the outset of each Standards of Care revision meeting. Members of the committee, their employers, and their disclosed conflicts of interest are listed in “Disclosures: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-SPPC>). The ADA funds development of the Standards of Care

out of its general revenues and does not use industry support for this purpose.

Relevant literature was thoroughly reviewed through 1 July 2021; additionally, critical updates published through 1 August 2021 were considered. Exceptions were made for ADA-convened consensus reports, like “The Management of Type 1 Diabetes in Adults. A Consensus Report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD)” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dci21-0043>). Recommendations were revised based on new evidence, new considerations for standard of care practices, or, in some cases, to clarify the prior recommendations or revise wording to match the strength of the published evidence. A table linking the changes in recommendations to new evidence can be reviewed online at [professional.diabetes.org/SOC](https://professional.diabetes.org/SOC). The Standards of Care is reviewed by ADA scientific and medical staff and is approved by the ADA’s Board of Directors, which includes health care professionals, scientists, and lay people.

Feedback from the larger clinical community was invaluable for the annual 2021 revision of the Standards of Care. Readers who wish to comment on the 2022 Standards of Care are invited to do so at [professional.diabetes.org/SOC](https://professional.diabetes.org/SOC).

The PPC thanks the following individuals who provided their expertise in reviewing and/or consulting with the committee: Kristine Bell, APD, CDE, PhD; Lee-Shing Chang, MD; Alison B. Evert, MS, RDN, CDCES; Deborah Greenwood, PhD, RN, BC-ADM, CDCES, FADCES; Joy Hayes, MS, RDN, CDCES; Helen Lawler, MD;

Joshua J. Neumiller, PharmD, CDCES, FADCES, FASCP; Naushira Pandya, MD, CMD, FACP; Mary Elizabeth Patti, MD, FACP, FTOS; Marian Rewers, MD; Alissa Segal, PharmD, RPh, CDE, CDTC, FCCP; David Simmons, BA, MBBS, MA, MD, FRACP, FRCP; Christopher Still, DO, FACP, FTOS; Jennifer Sun, MD; Erika F. Werner, MD, MS; and Jennifer Wyckoff, MD.

## Members of the PPC

Boris Draznin, MD, PhD (Chair)  
Vanita R. Aroda, MD  
George Bakris, MD  
Gretchen Benson, RDN, LD, CDCES  
Florence M. Brown, MD  
RaShaye Freeman, DNP, FNP-BC, CDCES, ADM-BC  
Jennifer Green, MD  
Elbert Huang, MD, MPH, FACP  
Diana Isaacs, PharmD, BCPS, BC-ADM, CDCES  
Scott Kahan, MD, MPH  
Jose Leon, MD, MPH  
Sarah K. Lyons, MD  
Anne L. Peters, MD  
Priya Prahalad, MD, PhD  
Jane E.B. Reusch, MD  
Deborah Young-Hyman, PhD, CDCES

## American College of Cardiology— Designated Representatives (Section 10)

Sandeep Das, MD, MPH, FACC  
Mikhail Kosiborod, MD, FACC

## ADA Staff

Mindy Saraco, MHA (corresponding author: [msaraco@diabetes.org](mailto:msaraco@diabetes.org))  
Malaika I. Hill, MA  
Robert A. Gabbay, MD, PhD  
Nuha Ali El Sayed, MD, MMSC





# Summary of Revisions: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S4–S7 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-SREV>

## GENERAL CHANGES

The field of diabetes care is rapidly changing as new research, technology, and treatments that can improve the health and well-being of people with diabetes continue to emerge. With annual updates since 1989, the American Diabetes Association (ADA) has long been a leader in producing guidelines that capture the most current state of the field.

*Although levels of evidence for several recommendations have been updated, these changes are not outlined below where the clinical recommendation has remained the same. That is, changes in evidence level from, for example, E to C are not noted below. The 2022 Standards of Care contains, in addition to many minor changes that clarify recommendations or reflect new evidence, the following more substantive revisions.*

## SECTION CHANGES

### Section 1. Improving Care and Promoting Health in Populations (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S001>)

Additional information has been included on online platforms to support behavior change and well-being. The renamed “Cost Considerations for Medication-Taking Behaviors” subsection has been expanded to include more discussion about costs of medications and treatment goals.

The concept of health numeracy and its role in diabetes prevention and management was added to the newly

named “Health Literacy and Numeracy” subsection.

The community health workers content was expanded.

### Section 2. Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>)

A recommendation about adequate carbohydrate intake prior to oral glucose tolerance testing as a screen for diabetes was added, with supportive references added to the text (Recommendations 2.4 and 2.12).

The discussion regarding use of point-of-care A1C assays for the diagnosis of diabetes has been revised.

More information has been added to the “Race/Ethnicity/Hemoglobinopathies” subsection.

The “Type 1 Diabetes” subsection and the recommendations within have been updated based on the publication of “The Management of Type 1 Diabetes in Adults. A Consensus Report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD)” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dci21-0043>).

Under “Classification,” immune checkpoint inhibitors have been added as a cause of medication-induced diabetes. Additional evidence and discussion have been added to the subsection “Screening for Type 1 Diabetes Risk.”

Recommendation 2.9 has been revised to recommend that, for all people,

screening for prediabetes and diabetes should begin at age 35 years.

Recommendation 2.24 regarding genetic testing for those who do not have typical characteristics of type 1 or type 2 diabetes has been revised based on the publication of “The Management of Type 1 Diabetes in Adults. A Consensus Report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD)” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dci21-0043>).

The gestational diabetes mellitus recommendations have been revised with changes made regarding preconception and early pregnancy screening for diabetes and abnormal glucose metabolism, with supporting evidence added to the text.

### Section 3. Prevention or Delay of Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Comorbidities

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S003>)

The title has been changed to “Prevention or Delay of Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Comorbidities.”

Recommendation 3.1 has been modified to better individualize monitoring for the development of type 2 diabetes in those with prediabetes.

Adults with overweight/obesity are recommended to be referred to an intensive lifestyle behavior change program (Recommendation 3.2).

Additional considerations have been added to the recommendation regarding

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

metformin therapy (Recommendation 3.6).

More discussion was added on vitamin D supplementation in the “Pharmacologic Interventions” subsection.

There is a new subsection and recommendation on patient-centered care aimed at weight loss or prevention of weight gain, minimizing progression of hyperglycemia, and attention to cardiovascular risk and associated comorbidities.

#### **Section 4. Comprehensive Medical Evaluation and Assessment of Comorbidities**

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S004>)

The “Immunizations” subsection has been revised, and more information and evidence on the influenza vaccine for people with diabetes and cardiovascular disease has been added to the “Influenza” subsection. Within this subsection, coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) vaccination information has been added based on evolving evidence.

**Table 4.6**, management of patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD) and nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), and **Table 4.7**, summary of published NAFLD guidelines, reproduced from “Preparing for the NASH Epidemic: A Call to Action” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dci21-0020>), provide more information on how to manage these diseases. Developed following an American Gastroenterological Association conference on the burden, screening, risk stratification, diagnosis, and management of individuals with NAFLD, the Call to Action informed other revisions to the “Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease” subsection.

#### **Section 5. Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes**

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>)

Recommendation 5.5 has been added to the “Diabetes Self-Management Education and Support” subsection to address digital coaching and digital self-management interviews as effective methods of education and support.

In the “Carbohydrates” subsection, more emphasis has been placed on the quality of carbohydrates selected. In Recommendation 5.15, a fiber goal has been added for additional clarity. Evidence on consumption of mixed meals, insulin

dosing, and impact on glycemia has also been added to this subsection.

A new subsection on cognitive capacity/impairment has been added, with recommendations for monitoring (Recommendation 5.51) and referral (Recommendation 5.52) for formal assessment, and a discussion of the evidence regarding cognitive impairment and diabetes.

#### **Section 6. Glycemic Targets**

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>)

Time in range has been more fully incorporated into the “Glycemic Assessment” subsection.

Time in range thresholds were removed from Recommendation 6.4, and the reader is directed to **Table 6.2** for those values.

Glucose variability and the association of hypoglycemia was added to the “Hypoglycemia” subsection, as well as information on hypoglycemia prevention, including the Blood Glucose Awareness Training, Dose Adjusted for Normal Eating (DAFNE), and DAFNEplus programs.

#### **Section 7. Diabetes Technology**

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>)

General recommendations on the selection of technology based on individual and caregiver preferences (Recommendation 7.1), ongoing education on use of devices (Recommendation 7.2), continued access to devices across payers (Recommendation 7.3), support of students using devices in school settings (Recommendation 7.4), and early initiation of technology (Recommendation 7.5) now introduce the technology section, when previously these concepts were distributed throughout the section.

“Self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG)” was replaced with the more commonly used “blood glucose monitoring (BGM)” throughout, and more information based on the U.S. Food and Drug Administration recommendation regarding when an individual might need access to BGM was added to the “Blood Glucose Monitoring” subsection.

The recommendations regarding use of continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) were divided between adults (Recommendations 7.11 and 7.12) and youth (Recommendations 7.13 and 7.14), and the recommendation regarding periodic use of CGM or the use of professional CGM has been simplified (Recommendation 7.17).

Frequency of sensor use has also been added to the text of the “Continuous Glucose Monitoring Devices” subsection, as well as a restructuring of the text in this section based on study design.

“Smart pens” are now referred to as “connected insulin pens,” and more discussion and evidence has been added to the insulin pens content.

The discussion of automated insulin delivery (AID) systems has been combined with the insulin pumps subsection and is separate from the “Do-It-Yourself Closed-Loop Systems” subsection.

Recommendation 7.29 has been modified to include outpatient procedures and the consideration that people should be allowed continued use of diabetes devices during inpatient or outpatient procedures when they can safely use them and supervision is available.

#### **Section 8. Obesity and Weight Management for the Prevention and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes**

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S008>)

The title has been changed to “Obesity and Weight Management for the Prevention and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes.”

Evidence has been added regarding the importance of addressing obesity, as both obesity and diabetes increase risk for more severe COVID-19 infections.

The concept of weight distribution and weight gain pattern and trajectory, in addition to weight and BMI, has been added to the “Assessment” subsection.

Recommendation 8.12 and its associated text discussion added to the “Diet, Physical Activity, and Behavioral Therapy” subsection address the lack of clear evidence that dietary supplements are effective for weight loss.

The “Medical Devices for Weight Loss” subsection has been revised to include more information on a newly approved oral hydrogel.

Recommendation 8.21 has been revised to include behavioral support and routine monitoring of metabolic status.

A new recommendation (Recommendation 8.22) and discussion on postbariatric hypoglycemia, its causes, diagnosis, and management have been added.

**Table 8.2**, medications approved by the FDA for the treatment of obesity, has been updated to include semaglutide.



## Section 9. Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>)

Recommendation 9.3 has been revised to include fat and protein content, in addition to carbohydrates, as part of education on matching mealtime insulin dosing.

**Fig. 9.1**, “Choices of insulin regimens in people with type 1 diabetes,” **Fig. 9.2**, “Simplified overview of indications for  $\beta$ -cell replacement therapy in people with type 1 diabetes,” and **Table 9.1**, “Examples of subcutaneous insulin regimens,” from “The Management of Type 1 Diabetes in Adults. A Consensus Report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD)” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dci21-0043>), have been added to the “Pharmacologic Therapy for Adults with Type 1 Diabetes” subsection.

**Table 9.2** has been updated.

Recommendation 9.4 has been revised and is now two recommendations (Recommendations 9.4a and 9.4b) on first-line therapies and initial therapies, all based on comorbidities, patient-centered treatment factors, and management needs.

Recommendation 9.5 has been updated with other considerations for the continuation of metformin therapy after patients have been initiated on insulin.

A new recommendation has been added regarding the use of insulin and combination therapy with a glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) receptor agonist for greater efficacy and durability (Recommendation 9.11).

The section now concludes with an overview of changes made to **Fig. 9.3**, “Pharmacologic treatment of hyperglycemia in adults with type 2 diabetes,” to reconcile emerging evidence and support harmonization of guidelines recognizing alternative initial treatment approaches to metformin as acceptable, depending on comorbidities, patient-centered treatment factors, and glycemic and comorbidity management needs. The principle of medication incorporation is emphasized throughout **Fig. 9.3**—not all treatment intensification results in sequential add-on therapy, and instead may involve switching therapy or weaning current therapy to accommodate therapeutic changes.

## Section 10. Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>)

This section is endorsed for the fourth consecutive year by the American College of Cardiology.

A new figure (**Fig. 10.1**) has been added to depict the recommended comprehensive approach to the reduction in risk of diabetes-related complications.

Recommendation 10.1 on screening and diagnosis of blood pressure has been revised to include diagnosis of hypertension at a single health care visit for individuals with blood pressure measuring  $\geq 180/110$  mmHg and cardiovascular disease.

More information on low diastolic blood pressure and blood pressure management has been added to the “Individualization of Treatment Targets” subsection under “Hypertension/Blood Pressure Control.”

In the “Treatment Strategies: Lifestyle Interventions” subsection under “Hypertension/Blood Pressure Control,” discussion has been added on the use of internet or mobile-based digital platforms to reinforce healthy behaviors and their ability to enhance the efficacy of medical therapy for hypertension.

More information on use of ACE inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blocker (ARB) therapy for those with kidney function decline has been added to the “Pharmacologic Interventions” subsection under “Hypertension/Blood Pressure Control.”

Ezetimibe being preferential due to its lower cost has been removed from Recommendation 10.24.

More discussion was added on use of evolocumab therapy and reduction in all strokes and ischemic stroke.

A new subsection on statins and bempedoic acid has been added.

A discussion of the ADAPTABLE (Aspirin Dosing: A Patient-Centric Trial Assessing Benefits and Long-term Effectiveness) trial has been added to the “Aspirin Dosing” subsection.

A discussion of the TWILIGHT (Ticagrelor With Aspirin or Alone in High-Risk Patients After Coronary Intervention) trial has been added to the “Indications for P2Y<sub>12</sub> Receptor Antagonist Use” subsection.

Recommendation 10.42c has been added to the “Cardiovascular Disease: Treatment” subsection, providing guidance

for patients with type 2 diabetes and established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) or multiple risk factors for ASCVD on the use of combined therapy with a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitor with demonstrated cardiovascular benefit and a GLP-1 receptor agonist with demonstrated cardiovascular benefit.

A discussion of the Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Chronic Kidney Disease (DAPA-CKD) trial, the Effect of Sotagliflozin on Cardiovascular Events in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Post Worsening Heart Failure (SOLOIST-WHF) trial, and the Effect of Efglenatide on Cardiovascular Outcomes (AMPLITUDE-O) have been added, in addition to the results of the Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Heart Failure (DAPA-HF) trial, the Evaluation of Ertugliflozin Efficacy and Safety Cardiovascular Outcomes Trial (VERTIS CV), and the Effect of Sotagliflozin on Cardiovascular and Renal Events in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes and Moderate Renal Impairment Who Are at Cardiovascular Risk (SCORED) trial, which were added as a Living Standards update in June 2021.

**Table 10.3C** has been updated.

A new subsection, “Clinical Approach,” now concludes this section on risk reduction with SGLT2 inhibitors or GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy. **Fig. 10.3** has been reproduced from the ADA-endorsed American College of Cardiology “2020 Expert Consensus Decision Pathway on Novel Therapies for Cardiovascular Risk Reduction in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes” (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2020.05.037>) and outlines the approach to risk reduction with SGLT2 inhibitor or GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy in conjunction with other traditional, guideline-based preventive medical therapies for blood pressure as well as lipid, glycemic, and antiplatelet therapy.

## Section 11. Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>)

Formerly, Section 11, “Microvascular Complications and Foot Care,” contained content on chronic kidney disease, retinopathy, neuropathy, and foot care. This section has now been divided into two sections: Section 11, “Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>),

and Section 12, “Retinopathy, Neuropathy, and Foot Care” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S012>).

Recommendation 11.3a has been revised to include lower glomerular filtration rates and lower urinary albumin as indicators for use of SGLT2 inhibitors to reduce chronic kidney disease (CKD) progression and cardiovascular events.

Recommendation 11.3c has also been revised to include therapy options (nonsteroidal mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist [finerenone]), and a new recommendation has been added (Recommendation 11.3d) regarding reduction of urinary albumin to slow CKD progression.

The concept of blood pressure variability has been added to Recommendation 11.4.

More discussion has been added to the “Acute Kidney Injury” subsection regarding use of ACE inhibitors or ARBs.

## Section 12. Retinopathy, Neuropathy, and Foot Care

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S012>)

Formerly, Section 11, “Microvascular Complications and Foot Care,” contained content on chronic kidney disease, retinopathy, neuropathy, and foot care. This section has now been divided into two sections: Section 11, “Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>), and Section 12, “Retinopathy, Neuropathy, and Foot Care” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S012>).

More discussion was added to the “Diabetic Retinopathy” subsection regarding use of GLP-1 receptor agonists and retinopathy.

Recommendation 12.11 was updated to indicate that intravitreal injections of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor are a reasonable alternative to traditional panretinal laser photocoagulation for some patients with proliferative diabetic retinopathy and also reduce the risk of vision loss in these patients.

Recommendation 12.12 was also updated to recommend intravitreal injections of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor as first-line treatment for most eyes with diabetic macular edema that involves the foveal center and impairs vision acuity.

A new recommendation (Recommendation 12.13) was added on macular

focal/grid photocoagulation and intravitreal injections of corticosteroid.

## Section 13. Older Adults

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>)

In the “Hypoglycemia” subsection, glycemic variability and older adults with physical or cognitive limitations was added to the discussion of use of CGM.

The upper threshold of 8.5% (69 mmol/mol) was removed from the example of less stringent goals for those with multiple coexisting chronic illnesses, cognitive impairment, or functional dependence in Recommendation 13.6.

More discussion was added on classification of older adults in the “Patients With Complications and Reduced Functionality” subsection.

The benefits of a structured exercise program (as in the Lifestyle Interventions and Independence for Elders [LIFE] Study) was incorporated into the “Lifestyle Management” subsection.

More discussion of overtreatment was added to the “Pharmacologic Therapy” subsection, as was the consideration that for those taking metformin long term, monitoring vitamin B12 deficiency should be considered. The insulin therapy discussion was also updated with more information on avoidance of hypoglycemia.

## Section 14. Children and Adolescents

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>)

**Table 14.1A** and **Table 14.1B** have been newly created and provide an overview of the recommendations for screening and treatment of complications and related conditions in pediatric type 1 diabetes (**Table 14.1A**) and type 2 diabetes (**Table 14.1B**).

The “Diabetes Self-Management Education and Support” subsection now discusses adult caregivers as critical to diabetes self-management in youth, and how they should be engaged to ensure there is not a premature transfer of responsibility for self-management to the youth.

Recommendation 14.7 has been simplified.

Recommendations in the renamed “Glycemic Monitoring, Insulin Delivery, and Targets” subsection (Recommendations 14.18–14.27) have been reorganized and revised to better align with

recommendations in Section 7, “Diabetes Technology” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>).

The recommendations in the type 1 diabetes “Management of Cardiovascular Risk Factors” subsection (Recommendations 14.34–14.42) have been revised to include more information on timing of screening and treatment and updates to indicators for screening and treatment.

Throughout the section, more has been added regarding reproductive counseling in female youth considering ACE inhibitors and ARBs.

A new recommendation (Recommendation 14.49) was added to the “Retinopathy” subsection for type 1 diabetes regarding retinal photography.

A new recommendation (Recommendation 14.61) has been added on the use of CGM for youth with type 2 diabetes on multiple daily injections or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion.

The recommendations for hypertension screening and management (Recommendations 14.77–14.80) for type 2 diabetes have been revised.

**Fig. 14.1** has been updated.

## Section 15. Management of Diabetes in Pregnancy

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S015>)

A new recommendation (Recommendation 15.16) and discussion of the evidence on telehealth visits for pregnant women with gestational diabetes mellitus has been added to the “Management of Gestational Diabetes Mellitus” subsection.

A new subsection on “Physical Activity” has been added.

Additional discussion was added regarding insulin as the preferred treatment for type 2 diabetes in pregnancy.

## Section 16. Diabetes Care in the Hospital

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S016>)

Additional information has been added on the use of CGM during the COVID-19 pandemic to minimize contact between health care providers and patients, especially those in the intensive care unit.

## Section 17. Diabetes Advocacy

(<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S017>)

No changes have been made to this section.



# 1. Improving Care and Promoting Health in Populations: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S8–S16 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S001>

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 AND POPULATION HEALTH

### Recommendations

- 1.1 Ensure treatment decisions are timely, rely on evidence-based guidelines, include social community support, and are made collaboratively with patients based on individual preferences, prognoses, comorbidities, and informed financial considerations. **B**
- 1.2 Align approaches to diabetes management with the Chronic Care Model. This model emphasizes person-centered team care, integrated long-term treatment approaches to diabetes and comorbidities, and ongoing collaborative communication and goal setting between all team members. **A**
- 1.3 Care systems should facilitate team-based care, including those knowledgeable and experienced in diabetes management as part of the team, and utilization of patient registries, decision support tools, and community involvement to meet patient needs. **B**
- 1.4 Assess diabetes health care maintenance (see **Table 4.1**) using reliable and relevant data metrics to improve processes of care and health outcomes, with attention to care costs. **B**

\*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. 1. Improving care and promoting health in populations: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S8–S16

Population health is defined as “the health outcomes of a group of individuals, including the distribution of health outcomes within the group”; these outcomes can be measured in terms of health outcomes (mortality, morbidity, health, and functional status), disease burden (incidence and prevalence), and behavioral and metabolic factors (exercise, diet, A1C, etc.) (1). Clinical practice recommendations for health care providers are tools that can ultimately improve health across

© 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>.



populations; however, for optimal outcomes, diabetes care must also be individualized for each patient. Thus, efforts to improve population health will require a combination of policy-level, system-level, and patient-level approaches. With such an integrated approach in mind, the American Diabetes Association (ADA) highlights the importance of *patient-centered care*, defined as care that considers individual patient comorbidities and prognoses; is respectful of and responsive to patient preferences, needs, and values; and ensures that patient values guide all clinical decisions (2). Furthermore, social determinants of health (SDOH)—often out of direct control of the individual and potentially representing lifelong risk—contribute to medical and psychosocial outcomes and must be addressed to improve all health outcomes (3). Clinical practice recommendations, whether based on evidence or expert opinion, are intended to guide an overall approach to care. The science and art of medicine come together when the clinician makes treatment recommendations for a patient who may not meet the eligibility criteria used in the studies on which guidelines are based. Recognizing that one size does not fit all, the standards presented here provide guidance for when and how to adapt recommendations for an individual. This section provides guidance for providers as well as health systems and policy makers.

### Care Delivery Systems

The proportion of patients with diabetes who achieve recommended A1C, blood pressure, and LDL cholesterol levels has fluctuated in recent years (4). Glycemic control and control of cholesterol through dietary intake remain challenging. In 2013–2016, 64% of adults with diagnosed diabetes met individualized A1C target levels, 70% achieved recommended blood pressure control, 57% met the LDL cholesterol target level, and 85% were nonsmokers (4). Only 23% met targets for glycemic, blood pressure, and LDL cholesterol measures while also avoiding smoking (4). The mean A1C nationally among people with diabetes increased slightly from 7.3% in 2005–2008 to 7.5% in 2013–2016 based on the National Health and Nutrition Examination

Survey (NHANES), with younger adults, women, and non-Hispanic Black individuals less likely to meet treatment targets (4). Certain segments of the population, such as young adults and patients with complex comorbidities, financial or other social hardships, and/or limited English proficiency, face particular challenges to goal-based care (5–7). Even after adjusting for these patient factors, the persistent variability in the quality of diabetes care across providers and practice settings indicates that substantial system-level improvements are still needed.

Diabetes poses a significant financial burden to individuals and society. It is estimated that the annual cost of diagnosed diabetes in the U.S. in 2017 was \$327 billion, including \$237 billion in direct medical costs and \$90 billion in reduced productivity. After adjusting for inflation, the economic costs of diabetes increased by 26% from 2012 to 2017 (8). This is attributed to the increased prevalence of diabetes and the increased cost per person with diabetes. Therefore, ongoing population health strategies are needed in order to reduce costs and provide optimized care.

### Chronic Care Model

Numerous interventions to improve adherence to the recommended standards have been implemented. However, a major barrier to optimal care is a delivery system that is often fragmented, lacks clinical information capabilities, duplicates services, and is poorly designed for the coordinated delivery of chronic care. The Chronic Care Model (CCM) takes these factors into consideration and is an effective framework for improving the quality of diabetes care (9).

**Six Core Elements.** The CCM includes six core elements to optimize the care of patients with chronic disease:

1. Delivery system design (moving from a *reactive* to a *proactive* care delivery system where planned visits are coordinated through a team-based approach)
2. Self-management support
3. Decision support (basing care on evidence-based, effective care guidelines)

4. Clinical information systems (using registries that can provide patient-specific and population-based support to the care team)
5. Community resources and policies (identifying or developing resources to support healthy lifestyles)
6. Health systems (to create a quality-oriented culture)

A 5-year effectiveness study of the CCM in 53,436 primary care patients with type 2 diabetes suggested that the use of this model of care delivery reduced the cumulative incidence of diabetes-related complications and all-cause mortality (10). Patients who were enrolled in the CCM experienced a reduction in cardiovascular disease risk by 56.6%, microvascular complications by 11.9%, and mortality by 66.1% (10). In addition, the same study suggested that health care utilization was lower in the CCM group, which resulted in health care savings of \$7,294 per individual over the study period (11).

Redefining the roles of the health care delivery team and empowering patient self-management are fundamental to the successful implementation of the CCM (12). Collaborative, multidisciplinary teams are best suited to provide care for people with chronic conditions such as diabetes and to facilitate patients' self-management (13–15). There are references to guide the implementation of the CCM into diabetes care delivery, including opportunities and challenges (16).

### Strategies for System-Level Improvement

Optimal diabetes management requires an organized, systematic approach and the involvement of a coordinated team of dedicated health care professionals working in an environment where patient-centered, high-quality care is a priority (7,17,18). While many diabetes processes of care have improved nationally in the past decade, the overall quality of care for patients with diabetes remains suboptimal (4). Efforts to increase the quality of diabetes care include providing care that is concordant with evidence-based guidelines (19); expanding the role of teams to implement more intensive disease management strategies (7,20,21); tracking medication-taking behavior at a systems level (22); redesigning the organization of the care process (23);

implementing electronic health record tools (24,25); empowering and educating patients (26,27); removing financial barriers and reducing patient out-of-pocket costs for diabetes education, eye exams, diabetes technology, and necessary medications (7); assessing and addressing psychosocial issues (28,29); and identifying, developing, and engaging community resources and public policies that support healthy lifestyles (30). The National Diabetes Education Program maintains an online resource (<https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/professional-info/training.html>) to help health care professionals design and implement more effective health care delivery systems for those with diabetes. Given the pluralistic needs of patients with diabetes and how the constant challenges they experience vary over the course of disease management (complex insulin regimens, new technology, etc.), a diverse team with complementary expertise is consistently recommended (31).

#### **Care Teams**

The care team, which centers around the patient, should avoid therapeutic inertia and prioritize timely and appropriate intensification of behavior change (diet and physical activity) and/or pharmacologic therapy for patients who have not achieved the recommended metabolic targets (32–34). Strategies shown to improve care team behavior and thereby catalyze reductions in A1C, blood pressure, and/or LDL cholesterol include engaging in explicit and collaborative goal setting with patients (35,36); identifying and addressing language, numeracy, or cultural barriers to care (37–39); integrating evidence-based guidelines and clinical information tools into the process of care (19,40,41); soliciting performance feedback, setting reminders, and providing structured care (e.g., guidelines, formal case management, and patient education resources) (7); and incorporating care management teams including nurses, dietitians, pharmacists, and other providers (20,42). In addition, initiatives such as the Patient-Centered Medical Home show promise for improving health outcomes by fostering comprehensive primary care and offering new opportunities for team-based chronic disease management (43).

#### **Telemedicine**

Telemedicine is a growing field that may increase access to care for patients with diabetes. The American Telemedicine Association defines telemedicine as the use of medical information exchanged from one site to another via electronic communications to improve a patient's clinical health status. Telemedicine includes a growing variety of applications and services using two-way video, smartphones, wireless tools, and other forms of telecommunications technology (44). Increasingly, evidence suggests that various telemedicine modalities may facilitate reducing A1C in patients with type 2 diabetes compared with usual care or in addition to usual care (45), and findings suggest that telemedicine is a safe method of delivering type 1 diabetes care to rural patients (46). For rural populations or those with limited physical access to health care, telemedicine has a growing body of evidence for its effectiveness, particularly with regard to glycemic control as measured by A1C (47–49). Interactive strategies that facilitate communication between providers and patients, including the use of web-based portals or text messaging and those that incorporate medication adjustment, appear more effective. Telemedicine and other virtual environments can also be used to offer diabetes self-management education and clinical support and remove geographic and transportation barriers for patients living in underresourced areas or with disabilities (50). However, there is limited data available on the cost-effectiveness of these strategies.

#### **Behaviors and Well-being**

Successful diabetes care also requires a systematic approach to supporting patients' behavior-change efforts. High-quality diabetes self-management education and support (DSMES) has been shown to improve patient self-management, satisfaction, and glucose outcomes. National DSMES standards call for an integrated approach that includes clinical content and skills, behavioral strategies (goal setting, problem-solving), and engagement with psychosocial concerns (29). Increasingly, such support is being adapted for online platforms that have the potential to improve patient access to this important resource. These curriculums need to be tailored to the

needs of the intended populations, including addressing the “digital divide,” i.e., access to the technology required for implementation (51–54).

For more information on DSMES, see Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>).

#### **Cost Considerations for Medication-Taking Behaviors**

The cost of diabetes medications and devices is an ongoing barrier to achieving glycemic goals. Up to 25% of patients who are prescribed insulin report cost-related insulin underuse (55). Insulin underuse due to cost has also been termed cost-related medication nonadherence. The cost of insulin has continued to increase in recent years for reasons that are not entirely clear. There are recommendations from the ADA Insulin Access and Affordability Working Group for approaches to this issue from a systems level (56). Recommendations including concepts such as cost-sharing for insured people with diabetes should be based on the lowest price available, the list price for insulins that closely reflects net price, and health plans that ensure that people with diabetes can access insulin without undue administrative burden or excessive cost (56).

The cost of medications (not only insulin) influences prescribing patterns and cost-related medication nonadherence because of patient burden and lack of secondary payer support (public and private insurance) for effective approved glucose-lowering, cardiovascular disease risk-reducing, and weight management therapeutics. Although not usually addressed as a social determinant of health, financial barriers remain a major source of health disparities, and costs should be a focus of treatment goals (57). (See *TAILORING TREATMENT FOR SOCIAL CONTEXT AND TREATMENT CONSIDERATIONS*.) Reduction in cost-related medication nonadherence is associated with better biologic and psychologic outcomes, including quality of life.

#### **Access to Care and Quality Improvement**

The Affordable Care Act and Medicaid expansion have resulted in increased access to care for many individuals with diabetes, emphasizing the protection

of people with preexisting conditions, health promotion, and disease prevention (58). In fact, health insurance coverage increased from 84.7% in 2009 to 90.1% in 2016 for adults with diabetes aged 18–64 years. Coverage for those  $\geq 65$  years remained nearly universal (59). Patients who have either private or public insurance coverage are more likely to meet quality indicators for diabetes care (60). As mandated by the Affordable Care Act, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality developed a National Quality Strategy based on triple aims that include improving the health of a population, overall quality and patient experience of care, and per capita cost (61,62). As health care systems and practices adapt to the changing landscape of health care, it will be important to integrate traditional disease-specific metrics with measures of patient experience, as well as cost, in assessing the quality of diabetes care (63,64). Information and guidance specific to quality improvement and practice transformation for diabetes care is available from the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases guidance on diabetes care and quality (65). Using patient registries and electronic health records, health systems can evaluate the quality of diabetes care being delivered and perform intervention cycles as part of quality improvement strategies (66). Improvement of health literacy and numeracy is also a necessary component to improve care (67,68). Critical to these efforts is provider adherence to clinical practice recommendations (see **Table 4.1**) and the use of accurate, reliable data metrics that include sociodemographic variables to examine health equity within and across populations (69).

In addition to quality improvement efforts, other strategies that simultaneously improve the quality of care and potentially reduce costs are gaining momentum and include reimbursement structures that, in contrast to visit-based billing, reward the provision of appropriate and high-quality care to achieve metabolic goals (70) and incentives that accommodate personalized care goals (7,71). (Also see *COST CONSIDERATIONS FOR MEDICATION-TAKING BEHAVIOR*, above, regarding cost-related medication nonadherence reduction.)

## TAILORING TREATMENT FOR SOCIAL CONTEXT

### Recommendations

- 1.5** Assess food insecurity, housing insecurity/homelessness, financial barriers, and social capital/social community support to inform treatment decisions, with referral to appropriate local community resources. **A**
- 1.6** Provide patients with self-management support from lay health coaches, navigators, or community health workers when available. **A**

Health inequities related to diabetes and its complications are well documented, are heavily influenced by SDOH, and have been associated with greater risk for diabetes, higher population prevalence, and poorer diabetes outcomes (72–76). SDOH are defined as the economic, environmental, political, and social conditions in which people live and are responsible for a major part of health inequality worldwide (77). Greater exposure to adverse SDOH over the life course results in worse health (78). The ADA recognizes the association between social and environmental factors and the prevention and treatment of diabetes and has issued a call for research that seeks to better understand how these social determinants influence behaviors and how the relationships between these variables might be modified for the prevention and management of diabetes (79,80). While a comprehensive strategy to reduce diabetes-related health inequities in populations has not been formally studied, general recommendations from other chronic disease management and prevention models can be drawn upon to inform systems-level strategies in diabetes (81). For example, the National Academy of Medicine has published a framework for educating health care professionals on the importance of SDOH (82). Furthermore, there are resources available for the inclusion of standardized sociodemographic variables in electronic medical records to facilitate the measurement of health inequities as well as the impact of interventions designed to reduce those inequities (63,82,83).

SDOH are not consistently recognized and often go undiscussed in the clinical encounter (75). For example, a study by Piette et al. (84) found that among patients with chronic illnesses, two-thirds of those who reported not taking medications as prescribed due to cost-related medication nonadherence never shared this with their physician. In a study using data from the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS), Patel et al. (75) found that one-half of adults with diabetes reported financial stress and one-fifth reported food insecurity. One population in which such issues must be considered is older adults, where social difficulties may impair the quality of life and increase the risk of functional dependency (85) (see Section 13, “Older Adults,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>, for a detailed discussion of social considerations in older adults). Creating systems-level mechanisms to screen for SDOH may help overcome structural barriers and communication gaps between patients and providers (75,86). In addition, brief, validated screening tools for some SDOH exist and could facilitate discussion around factors that significantly impact treatment during the clinical encounter. Below is a discussion of assessment and treatment considerations in the context of food insecurity, homelessness, limited English proficiency, limited health literacy, and low literacy.

### Food Insecurity

Food insecurity is the unreliable availability of nutritious food and the inability to consistently obtain food without resorting to socially unacceptable practices. Over 18% of the U.S. population reported food insecurity between 2005 and 2014 (87). The rate is higher in some racial/ethnic minority groups, including African American and Latino populations, low-income households, and homes headed by a single mother. The rate of food insecurity in individuals with diabetes may be up to 20% (88). Additionally, the risk for type 2 diabetes is increased twofold in those with food insecurity (79) and has been associated with low adherence to taking medications appropriately and recommended self-care behaviors, depression, diabetes distress, and worse glycemic control when compared with individuals who



are food secure (89,90). Older adults with food insecurity are more likely to have emergency department visits and hospitalizations compared with older adults who do not report food insecurity (91). Risk for food insecurity can be assessed with a validated two-item screening tool (91) that includes the statements: 1) "Within the past 12 months we worried whether our food would run out before we got money to buy more" and 2) "Within the past 12 months the food we bought just didn't last, and we didn't have money to get more." An affirmative response to either statement had a sensitivity of 97% and specificity of 83%. Interventions such as food prescription programs are considered promising practices to address food insecurity by integrating community resources into primary care settings and directly deal with food deserts in underserved communities (92,93).

#### **Treatment Considerations**

In those with diabetes and food insecurity, the priority is mitigating the increased risk for uncontrolled hyperglycemia and severe hypoglycemia. Reasons for the increased risk of hyperglycemia include the steady consumption of inexpensive carbohydrate-rich processed foods, binge eating, financial constraints to filling diabetes medication prescriptions, and anxiety/depression leading to poor diabetes self-care behaviors. Hypoglycemia can occur as a result of inadequate or erratic carbohydrate consumption following the administration of sulfonylureas or insulin. See **Table 9.2** for drug-specific and patient factors, including cost and risk of hypoglycemia, which may be important considerations for adults with food insecurity and type 2 diabetes. Providers should consider these factors when making treatment decisions in people with food insecurity and seek local resources that might help patients with diabetes and their family members obtain nutritious food more regularly (94).

#### **Homelessness and Housing Insecurity**

Homelessness/housing insecurity often accompanies many additional barriers to diabetes self-management, including food insecurity, literacy and numeracy deficiencies, lack of insurance, cognitive dysfunction, and mental health issues (95). The prevalence of diabetes in the

homeless population is estimated to be around 8% (96). Additionally, patients with diabetes who are homeless need secure places to keep their diabetes supplies and refrigerator access to properly store their insulin and take it on a regular schedule. The risk for homelessness can be ascertained using a brief risk assessment tool developed and validated for use among veterans (97). Housing insecurity has also been shown to be directly associated with a person's ability to maintain their diabetes self-management (98). Given the potential challenges, providers who care for either homeless or housing-insecure individuals should be familiar with resources or have access to social workers who can facilitate stable housing for their patients as a way to improve diabetes care (99).

#### **Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Workers**

Migrant and seasonal agricultural workers may have a higher risk of type 2 diabetes than the overall population. While migrant farmworker-specific data are lacking, most agricultural workers in the U.S. are Latino, a population with a high rate of type 2 diabetes. In addition, living in severe poverty brings with it food insecurity, high chronic stress, and increased risk of diabetes; there is also an association between the use of certain pesticides and the incidence of diabetes (100).

Data from the Department of Labor indicate that there are 2.5–3 million agricultural workers in the U.S. These agricultural workers travel throughout the country, serving as the backbone for a multibillion-dollar agricultural industry. According to 2018 health center data, 174 health centers across the U.S. reported that they provided health care services to 579,806 adult agricultural patients, and 78,332 had encounters for diabetes (13.5%) (101).

Migrant farmworkers encounter numerous and overlapping barriers to receiving care. Migration, which may occur as frequently as every few weeks for farmworkers, disrupts care. In addition, cultural and linguistic barriers, lack of transportation and money, lack of available work hours, unfamiliarity with new communities, lack of access to resources, and other barriers prevent migrant farmworkers from accessing

health care. Without regular care, those with diabetes may suffer severe and often expensive complications that affect quality of life.

Health care providers should be attuned to the working and living conditions of all patients. For example, if a migrant farmworker with diabetes presents for care, appropriate referrals should be initiated to social workers and community resources, as available, to assist with removing barriers to care.

#### **Language Barriers**

Providers who care for non-English speakers should develop or offer educational programs and materials in multiple languages with the specific goals of preventing diabetes and building diabetes awareness in people who cannot easily read or write in English. The National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services in Health and Health Care (National CLAS Standards) provide guidance on how health care providers can reduce language barriers by improving their cultural competency, addressing health literacy, and ensuring communication with language assistance (102). In addition, the National CLAS Standards website (<https://thinkculturalhealth.hhs.gov>) offers several resources and materials that can be used to improve the quality of care delivery to non-English-speaking patients (102).

#### **Health Literacy and Numeracy**

Health literacy is defined as the degree to which individuals have the capacity to obtain, process, and understand basic health information and services needed to make appropriate decisions (67). Health literacy is strongly associated with patients being able to engage in complex disease management and self-care (103). Approximately 80 million adults in the U.S. are estimated to have limited or low health literacy (68). Clinicians and diabetes care and education specialists should ensure they provide easy-to-understand information and reduce unnecessary complexity when developing care plans with patients. Interventions addressing low health literacy in populations with diabetes seem effective in improving diabetes outcomes, including ones focusing primarily on patient education, self-care training,

or disease management. Combining easily adapted materials with formal diabetes education demonstrates effectiveness on clinical and behavioral outcomes in populations with low literacy (104). However, evidence supporting these strategies is largely limited to observational studies, and more research is needed to investigate the most effective strategies for enhancing both acquisition and retention of diabetes knowledge, as well as to examine different media and strategies for delivering interventions to patients (37).

Health numeracy is also important in diabetes prevention and management. Health numeracy requires primary numeric skills, applied health numeracy, and interpretive health numeracy. There is also an emotional component that affects a person's ability to understand concepts of risk, probability, and communication of scientific evidence (105). People with prediabetes or diabetes often need to perform numeric tasks such as interpreting food labels and blood glucose levels to make treatment decisions such as medication dosing. Thus, both health literacy and numeracy are necessary for enabling effective communication between patient and provider, arriving at a treatment regimen, and making diabetes self-management task decisions. If patients appear not to understand concepts associated with treatment decisions, both can be assessed using standardized screening measures (106). Adjunctive education and support may be indicated if limited health literacy and numeracy are barriers to optimal care decisions (28).

### Social Capital/Community Support

Social capital, which comprises community and personal network instrumental support, promotes better health, whereas lack of social support is associated with poorer health outcomes in individuals with diabetes (80). Of particular concern are the SDOH including racism and discrimination, which are likely to be lifelong (107). These factors are rarely addressed in routine treatment or disease management but may drive underlying causes of nonadherence to regimen behaviors and medication use. Identification or development of community resources to support healthy lifestyles is a core element of the

CCM (9) with particular need to incorporate relevant social support networks. There is currently a paucity of evidence regarding enhancement of these resources for those most likely to benefit from such intervention strategies.

Health care community linkages are receiving increasing attention from the American Medical Association, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, and others as a means of promoting translation of clinical recommendations for diet and physical activity in real-world settings (108). Community health workers (CHWs) (109), peer supporters (110–112), and lay leaders (113) may assist in the delivery of DSMES services (82,114), particularly in underserved communities. A CHW is defined by the American Public Health Association as a “frontline public health worker who is a trusted member of and/or has an unusually close understanding of the community served” (115). CHWs can be part of a cost-effective, evidence-based strategy to improve the management of diabetes and cardiovascular risk factors in underserved communities and health care systems (116). The CHW scope of practice in areas such as outreach and communication, advocacy, social support, basic health education, referrals to community clinics, etc., has been successful in providing social and primary preventive services to underserved populations in rural and hard-to-reach communities. Even though CHWs' core competencies are not clinical in nature, in some circumstances clinicians may delegate limited clinical tasks to CHWs. If such is the case, these tasks must always be performed under the direction and supervision of the delegating health professional and following state health care laws and statutes (117).

### References

- Kindig D, Stoddart G. What is population health? *Am J Public Health* 2003;93:380–383
- Institute of Medicine, Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*. Washington, DC, National Academies Press, 2001. PMID: 25057539
- Haire-Joshu D, Hill-Briggs F. The next generation of diabetes translation: a path to health equity. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2019;40:391–410
- Kazemian P, Shebl FM, McCann N, Walensky RP, Wexler DJ. Evaluation of the cascade of diabetes care in the United States, 2005–2016. *JAMA Intern Med* 2019;179:1376–1385

- Kerr EA, Heisler M, Krein SL, et al. Beyond comorbidity counts: how do comorbidity type and severity influence diabetes patients' treatment priorities and self-management? *J Gen Intern Med* 2007;22:1635–1640
- Fernandez A, Schillinger D, Warton EM, et al. Language barriers, physician-patient language concordance, and glycemic control among insured Latinos with diabetes: the Diabetes Study of Northern California (DISTANCE). *J Gen Intern Med* 2011;26:170–176
- TRIAD Study Group. Health systems, patients factors, and quality of care for diabetes: a synthesis of findings from the TRIAD study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:940–947
- American Diabetes Association. Economic costs of diabetes in the U.S. in 2017. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:917–928
- Stellefson M, Dipnarine K, Stopka C. The chronic care model and diabetes management in US primary care settings: a systematic review. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2013;10:E26
- Wan EYF, Fung CSC, Jiao FF, et al. Five-year effectiveness of the multidisciplinary Risk Assessment and Management Programme—Diabetes Mellitus (RAMP-DM) on diabetes-related complications and health service uses—a population-based and propensity-matched cohort study. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:49–59
- Jiao FF, Fung CSC, Wan EYF, et al. Five-year cost-effectiveness of the Multidisciplinary Risk Assessment and Management Programme—Diabetes Mellitus (RAMP-DM). *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:250–257
- Coleman K, Austin BT, Brach C, Wagner EH. Evidence on the Chronic Care Model in the new millennium. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2009;28:75–85
- Piatt GA, Anderson RM, Brooks MM, et al. 3-year follow-up of clinical and behavioral improvements following a multifaceted diabetes care intervention: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Educ* 2010;36:301–309
- Katon WJ, Lin EHB, Von Korff M, et al. Collaborative care for patients with depression and chronic illnesses. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:2611–2620
- Parchman ML, Zeber JE, Romero RR, Pugh JA. Risk of coronary artery disease in type 2 diabetes and the delivery of care consistent with the chronic care model in primary care settings: a STARNet study. *Med Care* 2007;45:1129–1134
- Del Valle KL, McDonnell ME. Chronic care management services for complex diabetes management: a practical overview. *Curr Diab Rep* 2018;18:135
- Tricco AC, Ivers NM, Grimshaw JM, et al. Effectiveness of quality improvement strategies on the management of diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2012;379:2252–2261
- Schmittiel JA, Gopalan A, Lin MW, Banerjee S, Chau CV, Adams AS. Population health management for diabetes: health care system-level approaches for improving quality and addressing disparities. *Curr Diab Rep* 2017;17:31
- O'Connor PJ, Bodkin NL, Fradkin J, et al. Diabetes performance measures: current status and future directions. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1651–1659
- Jaffe MG, Lee GA, Young JD, Sidney S, Go AS. Improved blood pressure control associated

- with a large-scale hypertension program. *JAMA* 2013;310:699–705
21. Peikes D, Chen A, Schore J, Brown R. Effects of care coordination on hospitalization, quality of care, and health care expenditures among Medicare beneficiaries: 15 randomized trials. *JAMA* 2009;301:603–618
22. Raebel MA, Schmittiel J, Karter AJ, Konieczny JL, Steiner JF. Standardizing terminology and definitions of medication adherence and persistence in research employing electronic databases. *Med Care* 2013;51(Suppl. 3):S11–S21
23. Feifer C, Nemeth L, Nietert PJ, et al. Different paths to high-quality care: three archetypes of top-performing practice sites. *Ann Fam Med* 2007;5:233–241
24. Reed M, Huang J, Graetz I, et al. Outpatient electronic health records and the clinical care and outcomes of patients with diabetes mellitus. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;157:482–489
25. Cebul RD, Love TE, Jain AK, Hebert CJ. Electronic health records and quality of diabetes care. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:825–833
26. Battersby M, Von Korff M, Schaefer J, et al. Twelve evidence-based principles for implementing self-management support in primary care. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2010;36:561–570
27. Grant RW, Wald JS, Schnipper JL, et al. Practice-linked online personal health records for type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Intern Med* 2008;168:1776–1782
28. Young-Hyman D, de Groot M, Hill-Briggs F, Gonzalez JS, Hood K, Peyrot M. Psychosocial care for people with diabetes: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2126–2140
29. Beck J, Greenwood DA, Blanton L, et al.; 2017 Standards Revision Task Force. 2017 national standards for diabetes self-management education and support. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1409–1419
30. Pullen-Smith B, Carter-Edwards L, Leathers KH. Community health ambassadors: a model for engaging community leaders to promote better health in North Carolina. *J Public Health Manag Pract* 2008;14(Suppl. ):S73–S81
31. Handlow NE, Nolton B, Winter SE, Wessel CM, Pennock J. 180-LB: Impact of a multi-disciplinary diabetes care team in primary care settings on glycemic control (Late-breaking poster presentation). *Diabetes* 2019; 68(Suppl. 1). Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://doi.org/10.2337/db19-180-LB>
32. Davidson MB. How our current medical care system fails people with diabetes: lack of timely, appropriate clinical decisions. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:370–372
33. Selby JV, Uratsu CS, Fireman B, et al. Treatment intensification and risk factor control: toward more clinically relevant quality measures. *Med Care* 2009;47:395–402
34. Raebel MA, Ellis JL, Schroeder EB, et al. Intensification of antihyperglycemic therapy among patients with incident diabetes: a Surveillance Prevention and Management of Diabetes Mellitus (SUPREME-DM) study. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2014;23:699–710
35. Grant RW, Pabon-Nau L, Ross KM, Youatt EJ, Pandiscio JC, Park ER. Diabetes oral medication initiation and intensification: patient views compared with current treatment guidelines. *Diabetes Educ* 2011;37:78–84
36. Tamhane S, Rodriguez-Gutierrez R, Hargraves I, Montori VM. Shared decision-making in diabetes care. *Curr Diab Rep* 2015;15:112
37. Schillinger D, Piette J, Grumbach K, et al. Closing the loop: physician communication with diabetic patients who have low health literacy. *Arch Intern Med* 2003;163:83–90
38. Rosal MC, Ockene IS, Restrepo A, et al. Randomized trial of a literacy-sensitive, culturally tailored diabetes self-management intervention for low-income Latinos: Latinos en Control. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:838–844
39. Osborn CY, Cavanaugh K, Wallston KA, et al. Health literacy explains racial disparities in diabetes medication adherence. *J Health Commun* 2011;16(Suppl. 3):268–278
40. Garg AX, Adhikari NKJ, McDonald H, et al. Effects of computerized clinical decision support systems on practitioner performance and patient outcomes: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2005;293:1223–1238
41. Smith SA, Shah ND, Bryant SC, et al.; Evidens Research Group. Chronic care model and shared care in diabetes: randomized trial of an electronic decision support system. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2008;83:747–757
42. Stone RA, Rao RH, Sevick MA, et al. Active care management supported by home telemonitoring in veterans with type 2 diabetes: the DiaTel randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:478–484
43. Bojadzievski T, Gabbay RA. Patient-centered medical home and diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1047–1053
44. Telligen and gpTRAC (Great Plains Telehealth Resource & Assistance Center). Telehealth Start-Up and Resource Guide Version 1.1, October 2014. Accessed 9 August 2021. Available from [https://www.healthit.gov/sites/default/files/telehealthguide\\_final\\_0.pdf](https://www.healthit.gov/sites/default/files/telehealthguide_final_0.pdf)
45. Lee SWH, Chan CKY, Chua SS, Chaiyakunapruk N. Comparative effectiveness of telemedicine strategies on type 2 diabetes management: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Sci Rep* 2017;7:12680
46. Xu T, Pujara S, Sutton S, Rhee M. Telemedicine in the management of type 1 diabetes. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2018;15:170168
47. Faruque LI, Wiebe N, Ehteshami-Afshar A, et al.; Alberta Kidney Disease Network. Effect of telemedicine on glycosylated hemoglobin in diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *CMAJ* 2017;189:E341–E364
48. Marcolino MS, Maia JX, Alkimm MBM, Boersma E, Ribeiro AL. Telemedicine application in the care of diabetes patients: systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e79246
49. Heitkemper EM, Mamykina L, Travers J, Smaldone A. Do health information technology self-management interventions improve glycemic control in medically underserved adults with diabetes? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2017;24:1024–1035
50. Reagan L, Pereira K, Jefferson V, et al. Diabetes self-management training in a virtual environment. *Diabetes Educ* 2017;43:413–421
51. Dack C, Ross J, Stevenson F, et al. A digital self-management intervention for adults with type 2 diabetes: combining theory, data and participatory design to develop HeLP-Diabetes. *Internet Interv* 2019;17:100241
52. Lee M-K, Lee DY, Ahn H-Y, Park C-Y. A novel user utility score for diabetes management using tailored mobile coaching: secondary analysis of a randomized controlled trial. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth* 2021;9:e17573
53. Denning J, Islam SMS, George E, Maddison R. Web-based interventions for dietary behavior in adults with type 2 diabetes: systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *J Med Internet Res* 2020;22:e16437
54. Omar MA, Hasan S, Palaian S, Mahameed S. The impact of a self-management educational program coordinated through WhatsApp on diabetes control. *Pharm Pract (Granada)* 2020; 18:1841
55. Herkert D, Vijayakumar P, Luo J, et al. Cost-related insulin underuse among patients with diabetes. *JAMA Intern Med* 2019;179:112–114
56. Cefalu WT, Dawes DE, Gavlak G, et al.; Insulin Access and Affordability Working Group. Insulin Access and Affordability Working Group: conclusions and recommendations. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1299–1311
57. Taylor SI. The high cost of diabetes drugs: disparate impact on the most vulnerable patients. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2330–2332
58. Myerson R, Laiteerapong N. The Affordable Care Act and diabetes diagnosis and care: exploring the potential impacts. *Curr Diab Rep* 2016;16:27
59. Casagrande SS, McEwen LN, Herman WH. Changes in health insurance coverage under the Affordable Care Act: a national sample of U.S. adults with diabetes, 2009 and 2016. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:956–962
60. Doucette ED, Salas J, Scherrer JF. Insurance coverage and diabetes quality indicators among patients in NHANES. *Am J Manag Care* 2016; 22:484–490
61. Stiefel M, Nolan K. Measuring the triple aim: a call for action. *Popul Health Manag* 2013;16: 219–220
62. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. About the National Quality Strategy. Content last reviewed March 2017. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://www.ahrq.gov/workingforquality/about/index.html>
63. National Quality Forum. National voluntary consensus standards for ambulatory care—measuring healthcare disparities. 2008. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from [https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2008/03/National\\_Voluntary\\_Consensus\\_Standards\\_for\\_Ambulatory\\_Care%E2%80%94Measuring\\_Healthcare\\_Disparities.aspx](https://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2008/03/National_Voluntary_Consensus_Standards_for_Ambulatory_Care%E2%80%94Measuring_Healthcare_Disparities.aspx)
64. Burstin H, Johnson K. Getting to better care and outcomes for diabetes through measurement. Evidence-based diabetes management. *Am J Manag Care* 2016;22(SP4):SP145–SP146
65. National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases. Diabetes for health professionals. Accessed 9 August 2021. Available from <https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/professionals/clinical-tools-patient-management/diabetes>



66. O'Connor PJ, Sperl-Hillen JM, Fazio CJ, Averbeck BM, Rank BH, Margolis KL. Outpatient diabetes clinical decision support: current status and future directions. *Diabet Med* 2016;33:734–741
67. Institute of Medicine, Committee on Health Literacy. *Health Literacy: A Prescription to End Confusion*. Nielsen-Bohlman L, Panzer AM, Kindig DA, Eds. Washington, DC, National Academies Press, 2004. PMID: 25009856
68. Schaffler J, Leung K, Tremblay S, et al. The effectiveness of self-management interventions for individuals with low health literacy and/or low income: a descriptive systematic review. *J Gen Intern Med* 2018;33:510–523
69. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. CMS equity plan for Medicare. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://www.cms.gov/About-CMS/Agency-Information/OMH/equity-initiatives/equity-plan.html>
70. Rosenthal MB, Cutler DM, Feder J. The ACO rules—striking the balance between participation and transformative potential. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:e6
71. Washington AE, Lipstein SH. The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute—promoting better information, decisions, and health. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:e31
72. Hutchinson RN, Shin S. Systematic review of health disparities for cardiovascular diseases and associated factors among American Indian and Alaska Native populations. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e80973
73. Borschuk AP, Everhart RS. Health disparities among youth with type 1 diabetes: a systematic review of the current literature. *Fam Syst Health* 2015;33:297–313
74. Walker RJ, Strom Williams J, Egede LE. Influence of race, ethnicity and social determinants of health on diabetes outcomes. *Am J Med Sci* 2016;351:366–373
75. Patel MR, Piette JD, Resnicow K, Kowalski-Dobson T, Heisler M. Social determinants of health, cost-related nonadherence, and cost-reducing behaviors among adults with diabetes: findings from the National Health Interview Survey. *Med Care* 2016;54:796–803
76. Steve SL, Tung EL, Schlichtman JJ, Peek ME. Social disorder in adults with type 2 diabetes: building on race, place, and poverty. *Curr Diab Rep* 2016;16:72
77. Commission on Social Determinants of Health. *Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2008. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from [https://www.who.int/social\\_determinants/final\\_report/csdh\\_finalreport\\_2008.pdf](https://www.who.int/social_determinants/final_report/csdh_finalreport_2008.pdf)
78. Dixon B, Peña M-M, Taveras EM. Lifecourse approach to racial/ethnic disparities in childhood obesity. *Adv Nutr* 2012;3:73–82
79. Hill JO, Galloway JM, Goley A, et al. Scientific statement: socioecological determinants of prediabetes and type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2430–2439
80. Hill-Briggs F, Adler NE, Berkowitz SA, et al. Social determinants of health and diabetes: a scientific review. *Diabetes Care* 2020;44:258–279
81. The Secretary's Advisory Committee on National Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Objectives for 2020. Phase I report: recommendations for the framework and format of Healthy People 2020. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://www.healthypeople.gov/2010/hp2020/advisory/PhaseI/default.htm>
82. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *A Framework for Educating Health Professionals to Address the Social Determinants of Health*. Washington, DC, National Academies Press, 2016. PMID: 27854400
83. Chin MH, Clarke AR, Nocon RS, et al. A roadmap and best practices for organizations to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in health care. *J Gen Intern Med* 2012;27:992–1000
84. Piette JD, Heisler M, Wagner TH. Cost-related medication underuse among chronically ill adults: the treatments people forgo, how often, and who is at risk. *Am J Public Health* 2004;94:1782–1787
85. Laiteerapong N, Karter AJ, Liu JY, et al. Correlates of quality of life in older adults with diabetes: the Diabetes & Aging Study. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1749–1753
86. O'Gurek DT, Henke C. A practical approach to screening for social determinants of health. *Fam Pract Manag* 2018;25:7–12
87. Walker RJ, Grusnick J, Garacci E, Mendez C, Egede LE. Trends in food insecurity in the USA for individuals with prediabetes, undiagnosed diabetes, and diagnosed diabetes. *J Gen Intern Med* 2019;34:33–35
88. Berkowitz SA, Karter AJ, Corbie-Smith G, et al. Food insecurity, food “deserts,” and glycemic control in patients with diabetes: a longitudinal analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1188–1195
89. Heerman WJ, Wallston KA, Osborn CY, et al. Food insecurity is associated with diabetes self-care behaviours and glycaemic control. *Diabet Med* 2016;33:844–850
90. Silverman J, Krieger J, Kiefer M, Hebert P, Robinson J, Nelson K. The relationship between food insecurity and depression, diabetes distress and medication adherence among low-income patients with poorly-controlled diabetes. *J Gen Intern Med* 2015;30:1476–1480
91. Hager ER, Quigg AM, Black MM, et al. Development and validity of a 2-item screen to identify families at risk for food insecurity. *Pediatrics* 2010;126:e26–e32
92. Goddu AP, Roberson TS, Raffel KE, Chin MH, Peek ME. Food Rx: a community-university partnership to prescribe healthy eating on the South Side of Chicago. *J Prev Interv Community* 2015;43:148–162
93. Feinberg AT, Hess A, Passaretti M, Coolbaugh S, Lee TH. Prescribing food as a specialty drug. *NEJM Catalyst*. 10 April 2018. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://catalyst.nejm.org/doi/abs/10.1056/CAT.18.0212>
94. Seligman HK, Schillinger D. Hunger and socioeconomic disparities in chronic disease. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:6–9
95. White BM, Logan A, Magwood GS. Access to diabetes care for populations experiencing homelessness: an integrated review. *Curr Diab Rep* 2016;16:112
96. Bernstein RS, Meurer LN, Plumb EJ, Jackson JL. Diabetes and hypertension prevalence in homeless adults in the United States: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Public Health* 2015;105:e46–e60
97. Montgomery AE, Fargo JD, Kane V, Culhane DP. Development and validation of an instrument to assess imminent risk of homelessness among veterans. *Public Health Rep* 2014;129:428–436
98. Stahre M, VanEenwyk J, Siegel P, Njai R. Housing insecurity and the association with health outcomes and unhealthy behaviors, Washington State, 2011. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2015;12:E109
99. Baxter AJ, Tweed EJ, Katikireddi SV, Thomson H. Effects of Housing First approaches on health and well-being of adults who are homeless or at risk of homelessness: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2019;73:379–387
100. Evangelou E, Ntritsos G, Chondrogiorgi M, et al. Exposure to pesticides and diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ Int* 2016;91:60–68
101. Health Resources & Services Administration. 2020 Health Center Data. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://data.hrsa.gov/tools/data-reporting/program-data/national>
102. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS) in Health and Health Care. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://www.thinkculturalhealth.hhs.gov/assets/pdfs/enhancednationalclasstandards.pdf>
103. Aaby A, Friis K, Christensen B, Rowlands G, Maindal HT. Health literacy is associated with health behaviour and self-reported health: a large population-based study in individuals with cardiovascular disease. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2017;24:1880–1888
104. White RO, Eden S, Wallston KA, et al. Health communication, self-care, and treatment satisfaction among low-income diabetes patients in a public health setting. *Patient Educ Couns* 2015;98:144–149
105. Schapira MM, Fletcher KE, Gilligan MA, et al. A framework for health numeracy: how patients use quantitative skills in health care. *J Health Commun* 2008;13:501–517
106. Carpenter CR, Kaphingst KA, Goodman MS, Lin MJ, Melson AT, Griffey RT. Feasibility and diagnostic accuracy of brief health literacy and numeracy screening instruments in an urban emergency department. *Acad Emerg Med* 2014;21:137–146
107. Williams DR, Lawrence JA, Davis BA. Racism and Health: Evidence and Needed Research. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2019;40:105–125
108. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. *Clinical-community linkages*. Content last reviewed December 2016. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/prevention-chronic-care/improve/community/index.html>
109. Egbujie BA, Delobelle PA, Levitt N, Puoane T, Sanders D, van Wyk B. Role of community health workers in type 2 diabetes mellitus self-management: a scoping review. *Plos One* 2018;13:e01998424
110. Heisler M, Vijan S, Makki F, Piette JD. Diabetes control with reciprocal peer support versus nurse care management: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;153:507–515
111. Long JA, Jahnle EC, Richardson DM, Loewenstein G, Volpp KG. Peer mentoring and

financial incentives to improve glucose control in African American veterans: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;156:416–424

112. Fisher EB, Boothroyd RI, Elstad EA, et al. Peer support of complex health behaviors in prevention and disease management with special reference to diabetes: systematic reviews. *Clin Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;3:4

113. Foster G, Taylor SJ, Eldridge SE, Ramsay J, Griffiths CJ. Self-management education programmes by lay leaders for people with chronic conditions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007;4:CD005108

114. Piatt GA, Rodgers EA, Xue L, Zgibor JC. Integration and utilization of peer leaders for diabetes self-management support: results from Project SEED (Support, Education, and Evaluation in Diabetes). *Diabetes Educ* 2018;44:373–382

115. Rosenthal EL, Rush CH, Allen CG. Understanding scope and competencies: a contemporary look at the United States community health worker field. CHW Central, 2016. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://www.chwcentral.org/understanding-scope-and-competencies-contemporary-look-united-states-community-health-worker-field>

116. Guide to Community Preventive Services. Community health workers help patients manage diabetes. Page last updated 2018. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://www.thecommunityguide.org/content/community-health-workers-help-patients-manage-diabetes>

117. The Network for Public Health Law. Legal considerations for community health workers and their employers. Accessed 4 October 2021. Available from <https://www.networkforphl.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Legal-Considerations-Community-Health-Workers.pdf>



## 2. Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S17–S38 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>

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).

### CLASSIFICATION

Diabetes can be classified into the following general categories:

1. Type 1 diabetes (due to autoimmune  $\beta$ -cell destruction, usually leading to absolute insulin deficiency, including latent autoimmune diabetes of adulthood)
2. Type 2 diabetes (due to a progressive loss of adequate  $\beta$ -cell insulin secretion frequently on the background of insulin resistance)
3. Specific types of diabetes due to other causes, e.g., monogenic diabetes syndromes (such as neonatal diabetes and maturity-onset diabetes of the young), diseases of the exocrine pancreas (such as cystic fibrosis and pancreatitis), and drug- or chemical-induced diabetes (such as with glucocorticoid use, in the treatment of HIV/AIDS, or after organ transplantation)
4. Gestational diabetes mellitus (diabetes diagnosed in the second or third trimester of pregnancy that was not clearly overt diabetes prior to gestation)

*This section reviews most common forms of diabetes but is not comprehensive. For additional information, see the American Diabetes Association (ADA) position statement “Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus” (1).*

Type 1 diabetes and type 2 diabetes are heterogeneous diseases in which clinical presentation and disease progression may vary considerably. Classification is important for determining therapy, but some individuals cannot be clearly classified as having type 1 or type 2 diabetes at the time of diagnosis. The traditional paradigms of type 2 diabetes occurring only in adults and type 1 diabetes only in children are no longer accurate, as both diseases occur in both age-groups. Children with type 1 diabetes often present with the hallmark symptoms of polyuria/polydipsia, and

\*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. 2. Classification and diagnosis of diabetes: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S17–S38

© 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>.



approximately half present with diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) (2–4). The onset of type 1 diabetes may be more variable in adults; they may not present with the classic symptoms seen in children and may experience temporary remission from the need for insulin (5–7). The features most useful in discrimination of type 1 diabetes include younger age at diagnosis (<35 years) with lower BMI (<25 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), unintentional weight loss, ketoacidosis, and glucose >360 mg/dL (20 mmol/L) at presentation (8). Occasionally, patients with type 2 diabetes may present with DKA (9,10), particularly ethnic and racial minorities (11). It is important for the provider to realize that classification of diabetes type is not always straightforward at presentation and that misdiagnosis is common (e.g., adults with type 1 diabetes misdiagnosed as having type 2 diabetes; individuals with maturity-onset diabetes of the young [MODY] misdiagnosed as having type 1 diabetes, etc.). Although difficulties in distinguishing diabetes type may occur in all age-groups at onset, the diagnosis becomes more obvious over time in people with β-cell deficiency.

In both type 1 and type 2 diabetes, various genetic and environmental factors can result in the progressive loss of β-cell mass and/or function that manifests clinically as hyperglycemia. Once hyperglycemia occurs, people with all forms of diabetes are at risk for developing the same chronic complications, although rates of progression may differ. The identification of individualized therapies for diabetes in the future will be informed by better characterization of the many paths to β-cell demise or dysfunction (12). Across the globe many groups are working on combining

clinical, pathophysiological, and genetic characteristics to more precisely define the subsets of diabetes that are currently clustered into the type 1 diabetes versus type 2 diabetes nomenclature with the goal of optimizing personalized treatment approaches. Many of these studies show great promise and may soon be incorporated into the diabetes classification system (13).

Characterization of the underlying pathophysiology is more precisely developed in type 1 diabetes than in type 2 diabetes. It is now clear from prospective studies that the persistent presence of two or more islet autoantibodies is a near certain predictor of clinical diabetes (14). The rate of progression is dependent on the age at first detection of autoantibody, number of autoantibodies, autoantibody specificity, and autoantibody titer. Glucose and A1C levels rise well before the clinical onset of diabetes, making diagnosis feasible well before the onset of DKA. Three distinct stages of type 1 diabetes can be identified (Table 2.1) and serve as a framework for future research and regulatory decision-making (12,15). There is debate as to whether slowly progressive autoimmune diabetes with an adult onset should be termed latent autoimmune diabetes in adults (LADA) or type 1 diabetes. The clinical priority with detection of LADA is awareness that slow autoimmune β-cell destruction can occur in adults leading to a long duration of marginal insulin secretory capacity. For the purpose of this classification, all forms of diabetes mediated by autoimmune β-cell destruction are included under the rubric of type 1 diabetes. Use of the term LADA is common and acceptable in clinical practice and has the practical impact of heightening awareness of a population of adults

likely to have progressive autoimmune β-cell destruction (16), thus accelerating insulin initiation prior to deterioration of glucose control or development of DKA (6,17).

The paths to β-cell demise and dysfunction are less well defined in type 2 diabetes, but deficient β-cell insulin secretion, frequently in the setting of insulin resistance, appears to be the common denominator. Type 2 diabetes is associated with insulin secretory defects related to genetics, inflammation, and metabolic stress. Future classification schemes for diabetes will likely focus on the pathophysiology of the underlying β-cell dysfunction (12,13,18–20).

**DIAGNOSTIC TESTS FOR DIABETES**

Diabetes may be diagnosed based on plasma glucose criteria, either the fasting plasma glucose (FPG) value or the 2-h plasma glucose (2-h PG) value during a 75-g oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT), or A1C criteria (21) (Table 2.2).

Generally, FPG, 2-h PG during 75-g OGTT, and A1C are equally appropriate for diagnostic screening. It should be noted that the screening tests do not necessarily detect diabetes in the same individuals. The efficacy of interventions for primary prevention of type 2 diabetes (22,23) has mainly been demonstrated among individuals who have impaired glucose tolerance (IGT) with or without elevated fasting glucose, not for individuals with isolated impaired fasting glucose (IFG) or for those with prediabetes defined by A1C criteria.

The same tests may be used to screen for and diagnose diabetes and to detect individuals with prediabetes (Table 2.2 and Table 2.5) (24). Diabetes may be identified anywhere along the spectrum of clinical scenarios—in

**Table 2.1—Staging of type 1 diabetes (12,15)**

	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Autoimmunity</li> <li>• Normoglycemia</li> <li>• Presymptomatic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Autoimmunity</li> <li>• Dysglycemia</li> <li>• Presymptomatic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Autoimmunity</li> <li>• Overt hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Symptomatic</li> </ul>
Diagnostic criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple islet autoantibodies</li> <li>• No IGT or IFG</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Islet autoantibodies (usually multiple)</li> <li>• Dysglycemia: IFG and/or IGT</li> <li>• FPG 100–125 mg/dL (5.6–6.9 mmol/L)</li> <li>• 2-h PG 140–199 mg/dL (7.8–11.0 mmol/L)</li> <li>• A1C 5.7–6.4% (39–47 mmol/mol) or ≥10% increase in A1C</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Autoantibodies may become absent</li> <li>• Diabetes by standard criteria</li> </ul>

FPG, fasting plasma glucose; IFG, impaired fasting glucose; IGT, impaired glucose tolerance; 2-h PG, 2-h plasma glucose.

**Table 2.2—Criteria for the diagnosis of diabetes**FPG  $\geq 126$  mg/dL (7.0 mmol/L). Fasting is defined as no caloric intake for at least 8 h.\*

OR

2-h PG  $\geq 200$  mg/dL (11.1 mmol/L) during OGTT. The test should be performed as described by WHO, using a glucose load containing the equivalent of 75 g anhydrous glucose dissolved in water.\*

OR

A1C  $\geq 6.5\%$  (48 mmol/mol). The test should be performed in a laboratory using a method that is NGSP certified and standardized to the DCCT assay.\*

OR

In a patient with classic symptoms of hyperglycemia or hyperglycemic crisis, a random plasma glucose  $\geq 200$  mg/dL (11.1 mmol/L).

DCCT, Diabetes Control and Complications Trial; FPG, fasting plasma glucose; OGTT, oral glucose tolerance test; WHO, World Health Organization; 2-h PG, 2-h plasma glucose. \*In the absence of unequivocal hyperglycemia, diagnosis requires two abnormal test results from the same sample or in two separate test samples.

seemingly low-risk individuals who happen to have glucose testing, in individuals screened based on diabetes risk assessment, and in symptomatic patients. For additional details on the evidence used to establish the criteria for the diagnosis of diabetes, prediabetes and abnormal glucose tolerance (OFG, IGT), see the ADA position statement “Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus” (1) and other reports (21,25,26).

### Fasting and 2-Hour Plasma Glucose

The FPG and 2-h PG may be used to diagnose diabetes (Table 2.2). The concordance between the FPG and 2-h PG tests is imperfect, as is the concordance between A1C and either glucose-based test. Compared with FPG and A1C cut points, the 2-h PG value diagnoses more people with prediabetes and diabetes (27). In people in whom there is discordance between A1C values and glucose values, FPG and 2-h PG are more accurate (28).

### A1C

#### Recommendations

- 2.1** To avoid misdiagnosis or missed diagnosis, the A1C test should be performed using a method that is certified by the NGSP and standardized to the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) assay. **B**
- 2.2** Marked discordance between measured A1C and plasma glucose levels should raise

the possibility of A1C assay interference and consideration of using an assay without interference or plasma blood glucose criteria to diagnose diabetes. **B**

- 2.3** In conditions associated with an altered relationship between A1C and glycemia, such as hemoglobinopathies including sickle cell disease, pregnancy (second and third trimesters and the postpartum period), glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency, HIV, hemodialysis, recent blood loss or transfusion, or erythropoietin therapy, only plasma blood glucose criteria should be used to diagnose diabetes. (See OTHER CONDITIONS ALTERING THE RELATIONSHIP OF A1C AND GLYCEMIA below for more information.) **B**

- 2.4** Adequate carbohydrate intake (at least 150 g/day) should be assured for 3 days prior to oral glucose tolerance testing as a screen for diabetes. **A**

The A1C test should be performed using a method that is certified by the NGSP ([www.ngsp.org](http://www.ngsp.org)) and standardized or traceable to the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) reference assay. Point-of-care A1C assays may be NGSP certified and cleared by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for use in monitoring glycemic control in

people with diabetes in both Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA)-regulated and CLIA-waived settings. Point-of-care A1C assays have not been prospectively studied for the diagnosis of diabetes and are not recommended for diabetes diagnosis; if used, they should be confirmed with a validated measure. In the U.S., point-of-care A1C is a laboratory test that limits CLIA regulation. As discussed in Section 6, “Glycemic Targets” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>), point-of-care A1C assays may be more generally applied for assessment of glycemic control in the clinic.

A1C has several advantages compared with FPG and OGTT, including greater convenience (fasting not required), greater preanalytical stability, and less day-to-day perturbations during stress, changes in diet, or illness. However, these advantages may be offset by the lower sensitivity of A1C at the designated cut point, greater cost, limited availability of A1C testing in certain regions of the developing world, and the imperfect correlation between A1C and average glucose in certain individuals. The A1C test, with a diagnostic threshold of  $\geq 6.5\%$  (48 mmol/mol), diagnoses only 30% of the diabetes cases identified collectively using A1C, FPG, or 2-h PG, according to National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) data (29). Despite these limitations with A1C, in 2009 the International Expert Committee added A1C to the diagnostic criteria with the goal of increased screening (21).

When using A1C to diagnose diabetes, it is important to recognize that A1C is an indirect measure of average blood glucose levels and to take other factors into consideration that may impact hemoglobin glycation independently of glycemia, such as hemodialysis, pregnancy, HIV treatment (30,31), age, race/ethnicity, genetic background, and anemia/hemoglobinopathies. (See OTHER CONDITIONS ALTERING THE RELATIONSHIP OF A1C AND GLYCEMIA below for more information.)

### Age

The epidemiologic studies that formed the basis for recommending A1C to diagnose diabetes included only adult populations (29). However, recent ADA

clinical guidance concluded that A1C, FPG, or 2-h PG can be used to test for prediabetes or type 2 diabetes in children and adolescents (see SCREENING AND TESTING FOR PREDIABETES AND TYPE 2 DIABETES IN CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS below for additional information) (32).

#### **Race/Ethnicity/Hemoglobinopathies**

Hemoglobin variants can interfere with the measurement of A1C, although most assays in use in the U.S. are unaffected by the most common variants. Marked discrepancies between measured A1C and plasma glucose levels should prompt consideration that the A1C assay may not be reliable for that individual. For patients with a hemoglobin variant but normal red blood cell turnover, such as those with the sickle cell trait, an A1C assay without interference from hemoglobin variants should be used. An updated list of A1C assays with interferences is available at [www.ngsp.org/interf.asp](http://www.ngsp.org/interf.asp).

African Americans heterozygous for the common hemoglobin variant HbS may have, for any given level of mean glycemia, lower A1C by about 0.3% compared with those without the trait (33). Another genetic variant, X-linked glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase G202A, carried by 11% of African Americans, was associated with a decrease in A1C of about 0.8% in homozygous men and 0.7% in homozygous women compared with those without the variant (34). For example, in Tanzania, where there is a high likelihood of hemoglobinopathies in people with HIV, A1C may be lower than expected based on glucose, limiting its usefulness for screening (35).

Even in the absence of hemoglobin variants, A1C levels may vary with race/ethnicity independently of glycemia (36–38). For example, African Americans may have higher A1C levels than non-Hispanic Whites with similar fasting and postglucose load glucose levels (39). Though conflicting data exists, African Americans may also have higher levels of fructosamine and glycated albumin and lower levels of 1,5-anhydroglucitol, suggesting that their glycemic burden (particularly postprandially) may be higher (40,41). Similarly, A1C levels may be higher for a given mean glucose concentration when measured with continuous glucose monitoring (42). A

recent report in Afro-Caribbean people demonstrated a lower A1C than predicted by glucose levels (43). Despite these and other reported differences, the association of A1C with risk for complications appears to be similar in African Americans and non-Hispanic Whites (44,45). In the Taiwanese population, age and sex have been reported to be associated with increased A1C in men (46); the clinical implications of this finding are unclear at this time.

#### **Other Conditions Altering the Relationship of A1C and Glycemia**

In conditions associated with increased red blood cell turnover, such as sickle cell disease, pregnancy (second and third trimesters), glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency (47,48), hemodialysis, recent blood loss or transfusion, or erythropoietin therapy, only plasma blood glucose criteria should be used to diagnose diabetes (49). A1C is less reliable than blood glucose measurement in other conditions such as the postpartum state (50–52), HIV treated with certain protease inhibitors (PIs) and nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) (30), and iron-deficient anemia (53).

#### **Confirming the Diagnosis**

Unless there is a clear clinical diagnosis (e.g., patient in a hyperglycemic crisis or with classic symptoms of hyperglycemia and a random plasma glucose  $\geq 200$  mg/dL [11.1 mmol/L]), diagnosis requires two abnormal screening test results, either from the same sample (54) or in two separate test samples. If using two separate test samples, it is recommended that the second test, which may either be a repeat of the initial test or a different test, be performed without delay. For example, if the A1C is 7.0% (53 mmol/mol) and a repeat result is 6.8% (51 mmol/mol), the diagnosis of diabetes is confirmed. If two different tests (such as A1C and FPG) are both above the diagnostic threshold when analyzed from the same sample or in two different test samples, this also confirms the diagnosis. On the other hand, if a patient has discordant results from two different tests, then the test result that is above the diagnostic cut point should be repeated, with careful consideration of the possibility of A1C assay interference. The

diagnosis is made on the basis of the confirmatory screening test. For example, if a patient meets the diabetes criterion of the A1C (two results  $\geq 6.5\%$  [48 mmol/mol]) but not FPG ( $< 126$  mg/dL [7.0 mmol/L]), that person should nevertheless be considered to have diabetes.

Each of the screening tests has pre-analytic and analytic variability, so it is possible that a test yielding an abnormal result (i.e., above the diagnostic threshold), when repeated, will produce a value below the diagnostic cut point. This scenario is likely for FPG and 2-h PG if the glucose samples remain at room temperature and are not centrifuged promptly. Because of the potential for preanalytic variability, it is critical that samples for plasma glucose be spun and separated immediately after they are drawn. If patients have test results near the margins of the diagnostic threshold, the health care professional should discuss signs and symptoms with the patient and repeat the test in 3–6 months.

People should consume a mixed diet with at least 150 g of carbohydrate on the 3 days prior to oral glucose tolerance testing (55–57). Fasting and carbohydrate restriction can falsely elevate glucose level with an oral glucose challenge.

#### **Diagnosis**

In a patient with classic symptoms, measurement of plasma glucose is sufficient to diagnose diabetes (symptoms of hyperglycemia or hyperglycemic crisis plus a random plasma glucose  $\geq 200$  mg/dL [11.1 mmol/L]). In these cases, knowing the plasma glucose level is critical because, in addition to confirming that symptoms are due to diabetes, it will inform management decisions. Some providers may also want to know the A1C to determine the chronicity of the hyperglycemia. The criteria to diagnose diabetes are listed in **Table 2.2**.

### **TYPE 1 DIABETES**

#### **Recommendations**

**2.5** Screening for presymptomatic type 1 diabetes using screening tests that detect autoantibodies to insulin, glutamic acid decarboxylase (GAD), islet antigen 2, or zinc transporter



8 is currently recommended in the setting of a research study or can be considered an option for first-degree family members of a proband with type 1 diabetes. **B**

**2.6** Development of and persistence of multiple islet autoantibodies is a risk factor for clinical diabetes and may serve as an indication for intervention in the setting of a clinical trial or screening for stage 2 type 1 diabetes. **B**

### Immune-Mediated Diabetes

This form, previously called “insulin-dependent diabetes” or “juvenile-onset diabetes,” accounts for 5–10% of diabetes and is due to cellular-mediated autoimmune destruction of the pancreatic  $\beta$ -cells. Autoimmune markers include islet cell autoantibodies and autoantibodies to GAD (glutamic acid decarboxylase, GAD65), insulin, the tyrosine phosphatases islet antigen 2 (IA-2) and IA-2 $\beta$ , and zinc transporter 8. Numerous clinical studies are being conducted to test various methods of preventing type 1 diabetes in those with evidence of islet autoimmunity ([www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov) and [www.trialnet.org/our-research/prevention-studies](http://www.trialnet.org/our-research/prevention-studies)) (14,17,58–61). Stage 1 of type 1 diabetes is defined by the presence of two or more of these autoimmune markers. The disease has strong HLA associations, with linkage to the *DQB1* and *DRB1* haplotypes, and genetic screening has been used in some research studies to identify high risk populations. Specific alleles in these genes can be either predisposing or protective (**Table 2.1**).

The rate of  $\beta$ -cell destruction is quite variable, being rapid in some individuals (particularly but not exclusively in infants and children) and slow in others (mainly but not exclusively adults) (62,63). Children and adolescents often present with DKA as the first manifestation of the disease, and the rates in the U.S. have increased dramatically over the past 20 years (2–4). Others have modest fasting hyperglycemia that can rapidly change to severe hyperglycemia and/or DKA with infection or other stress. Adults may retain sufficient  $\beta$ -cell function to prevent DKA for many years; such individuals may have remission or decreased

insulin needs for months or years and eventually become dependent on insulin for survival and are at risk for DKA (5–7,64,65). At this latter stage of the disease, there is little or no insulin secretion, as manifested by low or undetectable levels of plasma C-peptide. Immune-mediated diabetes is the most common form of diabetes in childhood and adolescence, but it can occur at any age, even in the 8th and 9th decades of life.

Autoimmune destruction of  $\beta$ -cells has multiple genetic factors and is also related to environmental factors that are still poorly defined. Although patients do not typically have obesity when they present with type 1 diabetes, obesity is increasingly common in the general population; as such, obesity should not preclude testing for type 1 diabetes. People with type 1 diabetes are also prone to other autoimmune disorders such as Hashimoto thyroiditis, Graves disease, celiac disease, Addison disease, vitiligo, autoimmune hepatitis, myasthenia gravis, and pernicious anemia (see Section 4, “Comprehensive Medical Evaluation and Assessment of Comorbidities,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S004>). Type 1 diabetes can be associated with monogenic polyglandular autoimmune syndromes including immune dysregulation, polyendocrinopathy, enteropathy, and X-linked (IPEX) syndrome, which is an early-onset systemic autoimmune genetic disorder caused by mutation of the forkhead box protein 3 (*FOXP3*) gene, and another caused by the autoimmune regulator (*AIRE*) gene mutation (66,67). As indicated by the names, these disorders are associated with other autoimmune and rheumatological diseases.

Introduction of immunotherapy, specifically checkpoint inhibitors, for cancer treatment has led to unexpected adverse events including immune system activation precipitating autoimmune disease. Fulminant onset of type 1 diabetes can develop, with DKA and low or undetectable levels of C-peptide as a marker of endogenous  $\beta$ -cell function (68,69). Fewer than half of these patients have autoantibodies that are seen in type 1 diabetes, supporting alternate pathobiology. This immune-related adverse event occurs in just under 1% of checkpoint inhibitor-treated patients but most commonly occurs with agents that block the programmed cell death protein 1/programmed cell death ligand 1 pathway

alone or in combination with other checkpoint inhibitors (70). To date, risk cannot be predicted by family history or autoantibodies, so all providers administering these medications should be mindful of this adverse effect and educate patients appropriately.

### Idiopathic Type 1 Diabetes

Some forms of type 1 diabetes have no known etiologies. These patients have permanent insulinopenia and are prone to DKA but have no evidence of  $\beta$ -cell autoimmunity. However, only a minority of patients with type 1 diabetes fall into this category. Individuals with autoantibody-negative type 1 diabetes of African or Asian ancestry may suffer from episodic DKA and exhibit varying degrees of insulin deficiency between episodes (possibly ketosis-prone diabetes [71]). This form of diabetes is strongly inherited and is not HLA associated. An absolute requirement for insulin replacement therapy in affected patients may be intermittent. Future research is needed to determine the cause of  $\beta$ -cell destruction in this rare clinical scenario.

### Screening for Type 1 Diabetes Risk

The incidence and prevalence of type 1 diabetes are increasing (72). Patients with type 1 diabetes often present with acute symptoms of diabetes and markedly elevated blood glucose levels, and 40–60% are diagnosed with life-threatening DKA (2–4). Multiple studies indicate that measuring islet autoantibodies in relatives of those with type 1 diabetes (15) or in children from the general population (73,74) can effectively identify those who will develop type 1 diabetes. A study reported the risk of progression to type 1 diabetes from the time of seroconversion to autoantibody positivity in three pediatric cohorts from Finland, Germany, and the U.S. Of the 585 children who developed more than two autoantibodies, nearly 70% developed type 1 diabetes within 10 years and 84% within 15 years (14). These findings are highly significant because while the German group was recruited from offspring of parents with type 1 diabetes, the Finnish and American groups were recruited from the general population. Remarkably, the findings in all three groups were the same, suggesting that the same sequence of events led to

clinical disease in both “sporadic” and familial cases of type 1 diabetes. Indeed, the risk of type 1 diabetes increases as the number of relevant autoantibodies detected increases (60,75,76). In The Environmental Determinants of Diabetes in the Young (TEDDY) study, type 1 diabetes developed in 21% of 363 subjects with at least one autoantibody at 3 years of age (77). Such testing, coupled with education about diabetes symptoms and close follow-up, has been shown to enable earlier diagnosis and prevent DKA (78,79).

While widespread clinical screening of asymptomatic low-risk individuals is not currently recommended due to lack of approved therapeutic interventions, several innovative research screening programs are available in Europe (e.g., Fr1da, www.gppad.org) and the U.S. (www.trialnet.org, www.askhealth.org). Participation should be encouraged to accelerate development of evidence-based clinical guidelines for the general population and relatives of those with type 1 diabetes. Individuals who test positive should be counseled about the risk of developing diabetes, diabetes symptoms, and DKA prevention. Numerous clinical studies are being conducted to test various methods of preventing and treating stage 2 type 1 diabetes in those with evidence of autoimmunity with promising results (see www.clinicaltrials.gov and www.trialnet.org). Delay of overt diabetes development in stage 2 type 1 diabetes with the anti-CD3 antibody teplizumab in relatives at risk for type 1 diabetes was reported in 2019, with an extension of the randomized controlled trial in 2021 (80,81). Based on these data, this agent has been submitted to the FDA for the indication of delay or prevention of clinical type 1 diabetes in at-risk individuals. Neither this agent nor others in this category are currently available for clinical use.

## PREDIABETES AND TYPE 2 DIABETES

### Recommendations

**2.7** Screening for prediabetes and type 2 diabetes with an informal assessment of risk factors or validated risk calculator should be done in asymptomatic adults. **B**

- 2.8** Testing for prediabetes and/or type 2 diabetes in asymptomatic people should be considered in adults of any age with overweight or obesity (BMI  $\geq 25$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> or  $\geq 23$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> in Asian Americans) who have one or more risk factors (Table 2.3). **B**
- 2.9** For all people, screening should begin at age 35 years. **B**
- 2.10** If tests are normal, repeat screening recommended at a minimum of 3-year intervals is reasonable, sooner with symptoms or change in risk (i.e., weight gain). **C**
- 2.11** To screen for prediabetes and type 2 diabetes, fasting plasma glucose, 2-h plasma glucose during 75-g oral glucose tolerance test, and A1C are each appropriate (Table 2.2 and Table 2.5). **B**
- 2.12** When using oral glucose tolerance testing as a screen for diabetes, adequate carbohydrate intake (at least 150 g/day) should be assured for 3 days prior to testing. **A**
- 2.13** In people with prediabetes and type 2 diabetes, identify and treat cardiovascular disease risk factors. **A**

- 2.14** Risk-based screening for prediabetes and/or type 2 diabetes should be considered after the onset of puberty or after 10 years of age, whichever occurs earlier, in children and adolescents with overweight (BMI  $\geq 85$ th percentile) or obesity (BMI  $\geq 95$ th percentile) and who have one or more risk factor for diabetes. (See Table 2.4 for evidence grading of risk factors.) **B**
- 2.15** People with HIV should be screened for diabetes and prediabetes with a fasting glucose test before starting antiretroviral therapy, at the time of switching antiretroviral therapy, and 3–6 months after starting or switching antiretroviral therapy. If initial screening results are normal, fasting glucose should be checked annually. **E**

### Prediabetes

“Prediabetes” is the term used for individuals whose glucose levels do not meet the criteria for diabetes yet have abnormal carbohydrate metabolism (44,45). People with prediabetes are defined by the presence of IFG and/or

**Table 2.3—Criteria for screening for diabetes or prediabetes in asymptomatic adults**

- Testing should be considered in adults with overweight or obesity (BMI  $\geq 25$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> or  $\geq 23$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> in Asian Americans) who have one or more of the following risk factors:
  - First-degree relative with diabetes
  - High-risk race/ethnicity (e.g., African American, Latino, Native American, Asian American, Pacific Islander)
  - History of CVD
  - Hypertension ( $\geq 140/90$  mmHg or on therapy for hypertension)
  - HDL cholesterol level  $< 35$  mg/dL (0.90 mmol/L) and/or a triglyceride level  $> 250$  mg/dL (2.82 mmol/L)
  - Women with polycystic ovary syndrome
  - Physical inactivity
  - Other clinical conditions associated with insulin resistance (e.g., severe obesity, acanthosis nigricans)
- Patients with prediabetes (A1C  $\geq 5.7\%$  [39 mmol/mol], IGT, or IFG) should be tested yearly.
- Women who were diagnosed with GDM should have lifelong testing at least every 3 years.
- For all other patients, testing should begin at age 35 years.
- If results are normal, testing should be repeated at a minimum of 3-year intervals, with consideration of more frequent testing depending on initial results and risk status.
- People with HIV

CVD, cardiovascular disease; GDM, gestational diabetes mellitus; IFG, impaired fasting glucose; IGT, impaired glucose tolerance.

**Table 2.4—Risk-based screening for type 2 diabetes or prediabetes in asymptomatic children and adolescents in a clinical setting (254)**

Screening should be considered in youth\* who have overweight ( $\geq$ 85th percentile) or obesity ( $\geq$ 95th percentile) **A** and who have one or more additional risk factors based on the strength of their association with diabetes:

- Maternal history of diabetes or GDM during the child’s gestation **A**
- Family history of type 2 diabetes in first- or second-degree relative **A**
- Race/ethnicity (Native American, African American, Latino, Asian American, Pacific Islander) **A**
- Signs of insulin resistance or conditions associated with insulin resistance (acanthosis nigricans, hypertension, dyslipidemia, polycystic ovary syndrome, or small-for-gestational-age birth weight) **B**

GDM, gestational diabetes mellitus. \*After the onset of puberty or after 10 years of age, whichever occurs earlier. If tests are normal, repeat testing at a minimum of 3-year intervals (or more frequently if BMI is increasing or risk factor profile deteriorating) is recommended. Reports of type 2 diabetes before age 10 years exist, and this can be considered with numerous risk factors.

IGT and/or A1C 5.7–6.4% (39–47 mmol/mol) (**Table 2.5**). Prediabetes should not be viewed as a clinical entity in its own right, but rather as risk factor for progression to diabetes and cardiovascular disease (CVD). Criteria for screening for diabetes or prediabetes in asymptomatic adults are outlined in **Table 2.3**. Prediabetes is associated with obesity (especially abdominal or visceral obesity), dyslipidemia with high triglycerides and/or low HDL cholesterol, and hypertension. The presence of prediabetes should prompt comprehensive screening for cardiovascular risk factors.

**Diagnosis**

IFG is defined as FPG levels from 100 to 125 mg/dL (from 5.6 to 6.9 mmol/L) (82,83) and IGT as 2-h PG levels during 75-g OGTT from 140 to 199 mg/dL (from 7.8 to 11.0 mmol/L) (25). It should be noted that the World Health Organization and numerous other diabetes organizations define the IFG lower limit at 110 mg/dL (6.1 mmol/L).

As with the glucose measures, several prospective studies that used A1C to predict the progression to diabetes as

defined by A1C criteria demonstrated a strong, continuous association between A1C and subsequent diabetes. In a systematic review of 44,203 individuals from 16 cohort studies with a follow-up interval averaging 5.6 years (range 2.8–12 years), those with A1C between 5.5% and 6.0% (between 37 and 42 mmol/mol) had a substantially increased risk of diabetes (5-year incidence from 9% to 25%). Those with an A1C range of 6.0–6.5% (42–48 mmol/mol) had a 5-year risk of developing diabetes between 25% and 50% and a relative risk 20 times higher compared with A1C of 5.0% (31 mmol/mol) (84). In a community-based study of African American and non-Hispanic White adults without diabetes, baseline A1C was a stronger predictor of subsequent diabetes and cardiovascular events than fasting glucose (85). Other analyses suggest that A1C of 5.7% (39 mmol/mol) or higher is associated with a diabetes risk similar to that of the high-risk participants in the Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP) (86), and A1C at baseline was a strong predictor of the development of glucose-defined diabetes during the DPP and its follow-up (87).

Hence, it is reasonable to consider an A1C range of 5.7–6.4% (39–47 mmol/mol) as identifying individuals with prediabetes. Similar to those with IFG and/or IGT, individuals with A1C of 5.7–6.4% (39–47 mmol/mol) should be informed of their increased risk for diabetes and CVD and counseled about effective strategies to lower their risks (see Section 3, “Prevention or Delay of Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Comorbidities,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S003>). Similar to glucose measurements, the continuum of risk is curvilinear, so as A1C rises, the diabetes risk rises disproportionately (84). Aggressive interventions and vigilant follow-up should be pursued for those considered at very high risk (e.g., those with A1C  $>$ 6.0% [42 mmol/mol]).

**Table 2.5** summarizes the categories of prediabetes and **Table 2.3** the criteria for screening for prediabetes. The ADA diabetes risk test is an additional option for assessment to determine the appropriateness of screening for diabetes or prediabetes in asymptomatic adults (**Fig. 2.1**) ([diabetes.org/socrisktest](https://diabetes.org/socrisktest)). For additional background regarding risk factors and screening for prediabetes, see SCREENING AND TESTING FOR PREDIABETES AND TYPE 2 DIABETES IN ASYMPTOMATIC ADULTS and ALSO SCREENING AND TESTING FOR PREDIABETES AND TYPE 2 DIABETES IN CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS below. For details regarding individuals with prediabetes most likely to benefit from a formal behavioral or lifestyle intervention, see Section 3, “Prevention or Delay of Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Comorbidities” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S003>).

**Type 2 Diabetes**

Type 2 diabetes, previously referred to as “noninsulin-dependent diabetes” or “adult-onset diabetes,” accounts for 90–95% of all diabetes. This form encompasses individuals who have relative (rather than absolute) insulin deficiency and have peripheral insulin resistance. At least initially, and often throughout their lifetime, these individuals may not need insulin treatment to survive.

There are various causes of type 2 diabetes. Although the specific etiologies are not known, autoimmune destruction of  $\beta$ -cells does not occur, and patients do not have any of the other known causes of diabetes. Most,

**Table 2.5—Criteria defining prediabetes\***

FPG 100 mg/dL (5.6 mmol/L) to 125 mg/dL (6.9 mmol/L) (IFG)
OR
2-h PG during 75-g OGTT 140 mg/dL (7.8 mmol/L) to 199 mg/dL (11.0 mmol/L) (IGT)
OR
A1C 5.7–6.4% (39–47 mmol/mol)

FPG, fasting plasma glucose; IFG, impaired fasting glucose; IGT, impaired glucose tolerance; OGTT, oral glucose tolerance test; 2-h PG, 2-h plasma glucose. \*For all three tests, risk is continuous, extending below the lower limit of the range and becoming disproportionately greater at the higher end of the range.





# Are you at risk for type 2 diabetes?

## Diabetes Risk Test:

- How old are you?** .....  
 Less than 40 years (0 points)  
 40–49 years (1 point)  
 50–59 years (2 points)  
 60 years or older (3 points)
- Are you a man or a woman?** .....  
 Man (1 point)      Woman (0 points)
- If you are a woman, have you ever been diagnosed with gestational diabetes?** .....  
 Yes (1 point)      No (0 points)
- Do you have a mother, father, sister or brother with diabetes?** .....  
 Yes (1 point)      No (0 points)
- Have you ever been diagnosed with high blood pressure?** .....  
 Yes (1 point)      No (0 points)
- Are you physically active?** .....  
 Yes (0 points)      No (1 point)
- What is your weight category?** .....  
*See chart at right.*

WRITE YOUR SCORE IN THE BOX.








ADD UP YOUR SCORE.

Height	Weight (lbs.)		
4' 10"	119–142	143–190	191+
4' 11"	124–147	148–197	198+
5' 0"	128–152	153–203	204+
5' 1"	132–157	158–210	211+
5' 2"	136–163	164–217	218+
5' 3"	141–168	169–224	225+
5' 4"	145–173	174–231	232+
5' 5"	150–179	180–239	240+
5' 6"	155–185	186–246	247+
5' 7"	159–190	191–254	255+
5' 8"	164–196	197–261	262+
5' 9"	169–202	203–269	270+
5' 10"	174–208	209–277	278+
5' 11"	179–214	215–285	286+
6' 0"	184–220	221–293	294+
6' 1"	189–226	227–301	302+
6' 2"	194–232	233–310	311+
6' 3"	200–239	240–318	319+
6' 4"	205–245	246–327	328+
	1 point	2 points	3 points

If you weigh less than the amount in the left column: 0 points

Adapted from Bang et al., Ann Intern Med 151:775–783, 2009 • Original algorithm was validated without gestational diabetes as part of the model.

### If you scored 5 or higher:

You are at increased risk for having type 2 diabetes. However, only your doctor can tell for sure if you do have type 2 diabetes or prediabetes, a condition in which blood glucose levels are higher than normal but not yet high enough to be diagnosed as diabetes. Talk to your doctor to see if additional testing is needed.

Type 2 diabetes is more common in African Americans, Hispanics/Latinos, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders.

Higher body weight increases diabetes risk for everyone. Asian Americans are at increased diabetes risk at lower body weight than the rest of the general public (about 15 pounds lower).

### Lower Your Risk

The good news is you can manage your risk for type 2 diabetes. Small steps make a big difference in helping you live a longer, healthier life.

If you are at high risk, your first step is to visit your doctor to see if additional testing is needed.

Visit [diabetes.org](http://diabetes.org) or call 1-800-DIABETES (800-342-2383) for information, tips on getting started, and ideas for simple, small steps you can take to help lower your risk.

Learn more at [diabetes.org/risktest](http://diabetes.org/risktest) | 1-800-DIABETES (800-342-2383)

Diabetes Risk Test | American Diabetes Association®

Figure 2.1—ADA risk test ([diabetes.org/socrisktest](http://diabetes.org/socrisktest)).

but not all, patients with type 2 diabetes have overweight or obesity. Excess weight itself causes some degree of insulin resistance. Patients who do not have obesity or overweight by traditional weight criteria may have an increased percentage of body fat

distributed predominantly in the abdominal region.

DKA seldom occurs spontaneously in type 2 diabetes; when seen, it usually arises in association with the stress of another illness such as infection, myocardial infarction, or with the use of

certain drugs (e.g., corticosteroids, atypical antipsychotics, and sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors) (88,89). Type 2 diabetes frequently goes undiagnosed for many years because hyperglycemia develops gradually and, at earlier stages, is often not severe enough for

the patient to notice the classic diabetes symptoms caused by hyperglycemia, such as dehydration or unintentional weight loss. Nevertheless, even undiagnosed patients are at increased risk of developing macrovascular and microvascular complications.

Patients with type 2 diabetes may have insulin levels that appear normal or elevated, yet the failure to normalize blood glucose reflects a relative defect in glucose-stimulated insulin secretion. Thus, insulin secretion is defective in these patients and insufficient to compensate for insulin resistance. Insulin resistance may improve with weight reduction, exercise, and/or pharmacologic treatment of hyperglycemia but is seldom restored to normal. Recent interventions with intensive diet and exercise or surgical weight loss have led to diabetes remission (90–96) (see Section 8, “Obesity and Weight Management for the Prevention and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S008>).

The risk of developing type 2 diabetes increases with age, obesity, and lack of physical activity (97,98). It occurs more frequently in women with prior gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) or polycystic ovary syndrome. It is also more common in people with hypertension or dyslipidemia and in certain racial/ethnic subgroups (African American, Native American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian American). It is often associated with a strong genetic predisposition or family history in first-degree relatives (more so than type 1 diabetes). However, the genetics of type 2 diabetes are poorly understood and under intense investigation in this era of precision medicine (18). In adults without traditional risk factors for type 2 diabetes and/or of younger age, consider islet autoantibody testing (e.g., GAD65 autoantibodies) to exclude the diagnosis of type 1 diabetes (8).

### Screening and Testing for Prediabetes and Type 2 Diabetes in Asymptomatic Adults

Screening for prediabetes and type 2 diabetes risk through an informal assessment of risk factors (Table 2.3) or with an assessment tool, such as the ADA risk test (Fig. 2.1) (online at [diabetes.org/socrisktest](https://diabetes.org/socrisktest)), is recommended to guide providers on whether performing

a diagnostic test (Table 2.2) is appropriate. Prediabetes and type 2 diabetes meet criteria for conditions in which early detection via screening is appropriate. Both conditions are common and impose significant clinical and public health burdens. There is often a long presymptomatic phase before the diagnosis of type 2 diabetes. Simple tests to detect preclinical disease are readily available (99). The duration of glycemic burden is a strong predictor of adverse outcomes. There are effective interventions that prevent progression from prediabetes to diabetes. It is important to individualize risk/benefit of formal intervention for patients with prediabetes and consider patient-centered goals. Risk models have explored the benefit, in general finding higher benefit of intervention in those at highest risk (100) (see Section 3, “Prevention or Delay of Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Comorbidities,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S003>) and reduce the risk of diabetes complications (101) (see Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>, Section 11, “Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>, and Section 12, “Retinopathy, Neuropathy, and Foot Care,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S012>). In the most recent National Institutes of Health (NIH) Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study (DPPOS) report, prevention of progression from prediabetes to diabetes (102) resulted in lower rates of developing retinopathy and nephropathy (103). Similar impact on diabetes complications was reported with screening, diagnosis, and comprehensive risk factor management in the U.K. Clinical Practice Research Datalink database (101). In that report, progression from prediabetes to diabetes augmented risk of complications.

Approximately one-quarter of people with diabetes in the U.S. and nearly half of Asian and Hispanic Americans with diabetes are undiagnosed (82,83). Although screening of asymptomatic individuals to identify those with prediabetes or diabetes might seem reasonable, rigorous clinical trials to prove the effectiveness of such screening have not been conducted and are unlikely to occur. Clinical conditions, such as hypertension, hypertensive pregnancy, and obesity, enhance risk (104). Based on a population estimate, diabetes in women

of childbearing age is underdiagnosed (105). Employing a probabilistic model, Peterson et al. (106) demonstrated cost and health benefits of preconception screening.

A large European randomized controlled trial compared the impact of screening for diabetes and intensive multifactorial intervention with that of screening and routine care (107). General practice patients between the ages of 40 and 69 years were screened for diabetes and randomly assigned by practice to intensive treatment of multiple risk factors or routine diabetes care. After 5.3 years of follow-up, CVD risk factors were modestly but significantly improved with intensive treatment compared with routine care, but the incidence of first CVD events or mortality was not significantly different between the groups (25). The excellent care provided to patients in the routine care group and the lack of an unscreened control arm limited the authors’ ability to determine whether screening and early treatment improved outcomes compared with no screening and later treatment after clinical diagnoses. Computer simulation modeling studies suggest that major benefits are likely to accrue from the early diagnosis and treatment of hyperglycemia and cardiovascular risk factors in type 2 diabetes (108); moreover, screening, beginning at age 30 or 45 years and independent of risk factors, may be cost-effective (<\$11,000 per quality-adjusted life year gained—2010 modeling data) (109). Cost-effectiveness of screening has been reinforced in cohort studies (110,111).

Additional considerations regarding testing for type 2 diabetes and prediabetes in asymptomatic patients include the following.

#### Age

Age is a major risk factor for diabetes. Testing should begin at no later than age 35 years for all patients (111a). Screening should be considered in adults of any age with overweight or obesity and one or more risk factors for diabetes.

#### BMI and Ethnicity

In general, BMI  $\geq 25$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> is a risk factor for diabetes. However, data suggest that the BMI cut point should be lower

for the Asian American population (112,113). The BMI cut points fall consistently between 23 and 24 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (sensitivity of 80%) for nearly all Asian American subgroups (with levels slightly lower for Japanese Americans). This makes a rounded cut point of 23 kg/m<sup>2</sup> practical. An argument can be made to push the BMI cut point to lower than 23 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in favor of increased sensitivity; however, this would lead to an unacceptably low specificity (13.1%). Data from the World Health Organization also suggest that a BMI of  $\geq 23$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> should be used to define increased risk in Asian Americans (114). The finding that one-third to one-half of diabetes in Asian Americans is undiagnosed suggests that testing is not occurring at lower BMI thresholds (97,115).

Evidence also suggests that other populations may benefit from lower BMI cut points. For example, in a large multiethnic cohort study, for an equivalent incidence rate of diabetes, a BMI of 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in non-Hispanic Whites was equivalent to a BMI of 26 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in African Americans (116).

#### Medications

Certain medications, such as glucocorticoids, thiazide diuretics, some HIV medications (30), and atypical antipsychotics (90), are known to increase the risk of diabetes and should be considered when deciding whether to screen.

#### HIV

Individuals with HIV are at higher risk for developing prediabetes and diabetes on antiretroviral (ARV) therapies, so a screening protocol is recommended (117). The A1C test may underestimate glycemia in people with HIV; it is not recommended for diagnosis and may present challenges for monitoring (31). In those with prediabetes, weight loss through healthy nutrition and physical activity may reduce the progression toward diabetes. Among patients with HIV and diabetes, preventive health care using an approach used in patients without HIV is critical to reduce the risks of microvascular and macrovascular complications. Diabetes risk is increased with certain PIs and NRTIs. New-onset diabetes is estimated to occur in more than 5% of patients infected with HIV on PIs, whereas more than 15% may have prediabetes (118).

PIs are associated with insulin resistance and may also lead to apoptosis of pancreatic  $\beta$ -cells. NRTIs also affect fat distribution (both lipohypertrophy and lipoatrophy), which is associated with insulin resistance. For patients with HIV and ARV-associated hyperglycemia, it may be appropriate to consider discontinuing the problematic ARV agents if safe and effective alternatives are available (119). Before making ARV substitutions, carefully consider the possible effect on HIV virological control and the potential adverse effects of new ARV agents. In some cases, antihyperglycemic agents may still be necessary.

#### Testing Interval

The appropriate interval between screening tests is not known (120). The rationale for the 3-year interval is that with this interval, the number of false-positive tests that require confirmatory testing will be reduced and individuals with false-negative tests will be retested before substantial time elapses and complications develop (120). In especially high-risk individuals, particularly with weight gain, shorter intervals between screening may be useful.

#### Community Screening

Ideally, screening should be carried out within a health care setting because of the need for follow-up and treatment. Community screening outside a health care setting is generally not recommended because people with positive tests may not seek, or have access to, appropriate follow-up testing and care. However, in specific situations where an adequate referral system is established beforehand for positive tests, community screening may be considered. Community screening may also be poorly targeted; i.e., it may fail to reach the groups most at risk and inappropriately test those at very low risk or even those who have already been diagnosed (121).

#### Screening in Dental Practices

Because periodontal disease is associated with diabetes, the utility of screening in a dental setting and referral to primary care as a means to improve the diagnosis of prediabetes and diabetes has been explored (122–124), with one study estimating

that 30% of patients  $\geq 30$  years of age seen in general dental practices had dysglycemia (124,125). A similar study in 1,150 dental patients  $>40$  years old in India reported 20.69% and 14.60% meeting criteria for prediabetes and diabetes, respectively, using random blood glucose. Further research is needed to demonstrate the feasibility, effectiveness, and cost-effectiveness of screening in this setting.

#### Screening and Testing for Prediabetes and Type 2 Diabetes in Children and Adolescents

In the last decade, the incidence and prevalence of type 2 diabetes in children and adolescents has increased dramatically, especially in racial and ethnic minority populations (72). See **Table 2.4** for recommendations on risk-based screening for type 2 diabetes or prediabetes in asymptomatic children and adolescents in a clinical setting (32). See **Table 2.2** and **Table 2.5** for the criteria for the diagnosis of diabetes and prediabetes, respectively, that apply to children, adolescents, and adults. See Section 14, “Children and Adolescents” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>) for additional information on type 2 diabetes in children and adolescents.

Some studies question the validity of A1C in the pediatric population, especially among certain ethnicities, and suggest OGTT or FPG as more suitable diagnostic tests (126). However, many of these studies do not recognize that diabetes diagnostic criteria are based on long-term health outcomes, and validations are not currently available in the pediatric population (127). The ADA acknowledges the limited data supporting A1C for diagnosing type 2 diabetes in children and adolescents. Although A1C is not recommended for diagnosis of diabetes in children with cystic fibrosis or symptoms suggestive of acute onset of type 1 diabetes and only A1C assays without interference are appropriate for children with hemoglobinopathies, the ADA continues to recommend A1C and the criteria in **Table 2.2** for diagnosis of type 2 diabetes in this cohort to decrease barriers to screening (128,129).



## CYSTIC FIBROSIS–RELATED DIABETES

### Recommendations

- 2.16** Annual screening for cystic fibrosis–related diabetes with an oral glucose tolerance test should begin by age 10 years in all patients with cystic fibrosis not previously diagnosed with cystic fibrosis–related diabetes. **B**
- 2.17** A1C is not recommended as a screening test for cystic fibrosis–related diabetes. **B**
- 2.18** People with cystic fibrosis–related diabetes should be treated with insulin to attain individualized glycemic goals. **A**
- 2.19** Beginning 5 years after the diagnosis of cystic fibrosis–related diabetes, annual monitoring for complications of diabetes is recommended. **E**

Cystic fibrosis–related diabetes (CFRD) is the most common comorbidity in people with cystic fibrosis, occurring in about 20% of adolescents and 40–50% of adults (130). Diabetes in this population, compared with individuals with type 1 or type 2 diabetes, is associated with worse nutritional status, more severe inflammatory lung disease, and greater mortality. Insulin insufficiency is the primary defect in CFRD. Genetically determined  $\beta$ -cell function and insulin resistance associated with infection and inflammation may also contribute to the development of CFRD. Milder abnormalities of glucose tolerance are even more common and occur at earlier ages than CFRD. Whether individuals with IGT should be treated with insulin replacement has not currently been determined. Although screening for diabetes before the age of 10 years can identify risk for progression to CFRD in those with abnormal glucose tolerance, no benefit has been established with respect to weight, height, BMI, or lung function. OGTT is the recommended screening test; however, recent publications suggest that an A1C cut point threshold of 5.5% (5.8% in a second study) would detect more than 90% of cases and reduce patient screening burden (131,132). Ongoing studies are underway to validate this approach, and

A1C is not recommended for screening (133). Regardless of age, weight loss or failure of expected weight gain is a risk for CFRD and should prompt screening (131,132). The Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Patient Registry (134) evaluated 3,553 cystic fibrosis patients and diagnosed 445 (13%) with CFRD. Early diagnosis and treatment of CFRD was associated with preservation of lung function. The European Cystic Fibrosis Society Patient Registry reported an increase in CFRD with age (increased 10% per decade), genotype, decreased lung function, and female sex (135,136). Continuous glucose monitoring or HOMA of  $\beta$ -cell function (137) may be more sensitive than OGTT to detect risk for progression to CFRD; however, evidence linking these results to long-term outcomes is lacking, and these tests are not recommended for screening outside of the research setting (138).

CFRD mortality has significantly decreased over time, and the gap in mortality between cystic fibrosis patients with and without diabetes has considerably narrowed (139). There are limited clinical trial data on therapy for CFRD. The largest study compared three regimens: premeal insulin aspart, repaglinide, or oral placebo in cystic fibrosis patients with diabetes or abnormal glucose tolerance. Participants all had weight loss in the year preceding treatment; however, in the insulin-treated group, this pattern was reversed, and patients gained 0.39 ( $\pm$  0.21) BMI units ( $P = 0.02$ ). The repaglinide-treated group had initial weight gain, but it was not sustained by 6 months. The placebo group continued to lose weight (139). Insulin remains the most widely used therapy for CFRD (140). The primary rationale for the use of insulin in patients with CFRD is to induce an anabolic state while promoting macronutrient retention and weight gain.

Additional resources for the clinical management of CFRD can be found in the position statement “Clinical Care Guidelines for Cystic Fibrosis–Related Diabetes: A Position Statement of the American Diabetes Association and a Clinical Practice Guideline of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Endorsed by the Pediatric Endocrine Society” (141) and in the International Society for Pediatric and Adolescent Diabetes 2018 clinical practice consensus guidelines (130).

## POSTTRANSPLANTATION DIABETES MELLITUS

### Recommendations

- 2.20** After organ transplantation, screening for hyperglycemia should be done. A formal diagnosis of posttransplantation diabetes mellitus is best made once the individual is stable on an immunosuppressive regimen and in the absence of an acute infection. **B**
- 2.21** The oral glucose tolerance test is the preferred test to make a diagnosis of posttransplantation diabetes mellitus. **B**
- 2.22** Immunosuppressive regimens shown to provide the best outcomes for patient and graft survival should be used, irrespective of posttransplantation diabetes mellitus risk. **E**

Several terms are used in the literature to describe the presence of diabetes following organ transplantation (142). “New-onset diabetes after transplantation” (NODAT) is one such designation that describes individuals who develop new-onset diabetes following transplant. NODAT excludes patients with pretransplant diabetes that was undiagnosed as well as posttransplant hyperglycemia that resolves by the time of discharge (143). Another term, “posttransplantation diabetes mellitus” (PTDM) (143,144), describes the presence of diabetes in the posttransplant setting irrespective of the timing of diabetes onset.

Hyperglycemia is very common during the early posttransplant period, with ~90% of kidney allograft recipients exhibiting hyperglycemia in the first few weeks following transplant (143–146). In most cases, such stress- or steroid-induced hyperglycemia resolves by the time of discharge (146,147). Although the use of immunosuppressive therapies is a major contributor to the development of PTDM, the risks of transplant rejection outweigh the risks of PTDM and the role of the diabetes care provider is to treat hyperglycemia appropriately regardless of the type of immunosuppression (143). Risk factors for PTDM include both general diabetes

risks (such as age, family history of diabetes, etc.) as well as transplant-specific factors, such as use of immunosuppressant agents (148–150). Whereas post-transplantation hyperglycemia is an important risk factor for subsequent PTDM, a formal diagnosis of PTDM is optimally made once the patient is stable on maintenance immunosuppression and in the absence of acute infection (146–148,151). In a recent study of 152 heart transplant recipients, 38% had PTDM at 1 year. Risk factors for PTDM included elevated BMI, discharge from the hospital on insulin, and glucose values in the 24 h prior to hospital discharge (152). In an Iranian cohort, 19% had PTDM after heart and lung transplant (153). The OGTT is considered the gold-standard test for the diagnosis of PTDM (1 year posttransplant) (143,144, 154,155). Pretransplant elevation in hs-CRP was associated with PTDM in the setting of renal transplant (156,157). However, screening patients with fasting glucose and/or A1C can identify high-risk patients requiring further assessment and may reduce the number of overall OGTTs required.

Few randomized controlled studies have reported on the short- and long-term use of antihyperglycemic agents in the setting of PTDM (148,158,159). Most studies have reported that transplant patients with hyperglycemia and PTDM after transplantation have higher rates of rejection, infection, and rehospitalization (146,148,160). Insulin therapy is the agent of choice for the management of hyperglycemia, PTDM, and preexisting diabetes and diabetes in the hospital setting. After discharge, patients with preexisting diabetes could go back on their pretransplant regimen if they were in good control before transplantation. Those with previously poor control or with persistent hyperglycemia should continue insulin with frequent home self-monitoring of blood glucose to determine when insulin dose reductions may be needed and when it may be appropriate to switch to noninsulin agents.

No studies to date have established which noninsulin agents are safest or most efficacious in PTDM. The choice of agent is usually made based on the side effect profile of the medication and possible interactions with the patient's immunosuppression regimen (148).

Drug dose adjustments may be required because of decreases in the glomerular filtration rate, a relatively common complication in transplant patients. A small short-term pilot study reported that metformin was safe to use in renal transplant recipients (161), but its safety has not been determined in other types of organ transplant. Thiazolidinediones have been used successfully in patients with liver and kidney transplants, but side effects include fluid retention, heart failure, and osteopenia (162,163). Dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitors do not interact with immunosuppressant drugs and have demonstrated safety in small clinical trials (164,165). Well-designed intervention trials examining the efficacy and safety of these and other antihyperglycemic agents in patients with PTDM are needed.

## MONOGENIC DIABETES SYNDROMES

### Recommendations

- 2.23** Regardless of current age, all people diagnosed with diabetes in the first 6 months of life should have immediate genetic testing for neonatal diabetes. **A**
- 2.24** Children and young adults who do not have typical characteristics of type 1 or type 2 diabetes and who often have a family history of diabetes in successive generations (suggestive of an autosomal dominant pattern of inheritance) should have genetic testing for maturity-onset diabetes of the young. **A**
- 2.25** In both instances, consultation with a center specializing in diabetes genetics is recommended to understand the significance of genetic mutations and how best to approach further evaluation, treatment, and genetic counseling. **E**

Monogenic defects that cause  $\beta$ -cell dysfunction, such as neonatal diabetes and MODY, represent a small fraction of patients with diabetes (<5%). **Table 2.6** describes the most common causes of monogenic diabetes. For a

comprehensive list of causes, see *Genetic Diagnosis of Endocrine Disorders* (166).

### Neonatal Diabetes

Diabetes occurring under 6 months of age is termed “neonatal” or “congenital” diabetes, and about 80–85% of cases can be found to have an underlying monogenic cause (8,167–170). Neonatal diabetes occurs much less often after 6 months of age, whereas autoimmune type 1 diabetes rarely occurs before 6 months of age. Neonatal diabetes can either be transient or permanent. Transient diabetes is most often due to overexpression of genes on chromosome 6q24, is recurrent in about half of cases, and may be treatable with medications other than insulin. Permanent neonatal diabetes is most commonly due to autosomal dominant mutations in the genes encoding the Kir6.2 subunit (*KCNJ11*) and SUR1 subunit (*ABCC8*) of the  $\beta$ -cell  $K_{ATP}$  channel. A recent report details a de novo mutation in *EIF2B1* affecting eIF2 signaling associated with permanent neonatal diabetes and hepatic dysfunction, similar to Wolcott-Rallison syndrome but with few severe comorbidities (171). The recent ADA-European Association for the Study of Diabetes type 1 diabetes consensus report makes the recommendation that regardless of current age, individuals diagnosed under 6 months of age should have genetic testing (8). Correct diagnosis has critical implications because 30–50% of people with  $K_{ATP}$ -related neonatal diabetes will exhibit improved glycemic control when treated with high-dose oral sulfonylureas instead of insulin. Insulin gene (*INS*) mutations are the second most common cause of permanent neonatal diabetes, and, while intensive insulin management is currently the preferred treatment strategy, there are important genetic counseling considerations, as most of the mutations that cause diabetes are dominantly inherited.

### Maturity-Onset Diabetes of the Young

MODY is frequently characterized by onset of hyperglycemia at an early age (classically before age 25 years, although diagnosis may occur at older ages). MODY is characterized by impaired insulin secretion with minimal or no defects in insulin

**Table 2.6—Most common causes of monogenic diabetes (166)**

	Gene	Inheritance	Clinical features
<b>MODY</b>	<i>GCK</i>	AD	GCK-MODY: higher glucose threshold (set-point) for glucose-stimulated insulin secretion, causing stable, nonprogressive elevated fasting blood glucose; typically does not require treatment; microvascular complications are rare; small rise in 2-h PG level on OGTT (<54 mg/dL [3 mmol/L])
	<i>HNF1A</i>	AD	HNF1A-MODY: progressive insulin secretory defect with presentation in adolescence or early adulthood; lowered renal threshold for glucosuria; large rise in 2-h PG level on OGTT (>90 mg/dL [5 mmol/L]); sensitive to sulfonylureas
	<i>HNF4A</i>	AD	HNF4A-MODY: progressive insulin secretory defect with presentation in adolescence or early adulthood; may have large birth weight and transient neonatal hypoglycemia; sensitive to sulfonylureas
	<i>HNF1B</i>	AD	HNF1B-MODY: developmental renal disease (typically cystic); genitourinary abnormalities; atrophy of the pancreas; hyperuricemia; gout
<b>Neonatal diabetes</b>	<i>KCNJ11</i>	AD	Permanent or transient: IUGR; possible developmental delay and seizures; responsive to sulfonylureas
	<i>INS</i>	AD	Permanent: IUGR; insulin requiring
	<i>ABCC8</i>	AD	Permanent or transient: IUGR; rarely developmental delay; responsive to sulfonylureas
	6q24 ( <i>PLAGL1</i> , <i>HYMA1</i> )	AD for paternal duplications	Transient: IUGR; macroglossia; umbilical hernia; mechanisms include UPD6, paternal duplication, or maternal methylation defect; may be treatable with medications other than insulin
	<i>GATA6</i>	AD	Permanent: pancreatic hypoplasia; cardiac malformations; pancreatic exocrine insufficiency; insulin requiring
	<i>EIF2AK3</i>	AR	Permanent: Wolcott-Rallison syndrome: epiphyseal dysplasia; pancreatic exocrine insufficiency; insulin requiring
	<i>EIF2B1</i> <i>FOXP3</i>	AD X-linked	Permanent diabetes: can be associated with fluctuating liver function (171) Permanent: immunodysregulation, polyendocrinopathy, enteropathy X-linked (IPEX) syndrome: autoimmune diabetes, autoimmune thyroid disease, exfoliative dermatitis; insulin requiring

AD, autosomal dominant; AR, autosomal recessive; IUGR, intrauterine growth restriction; OGTT, oral glucose tolerance test; UPD6, uniparental disomy of chromosome 6; 2-h PG, 2-h plasma glucose.

action (in the absence of coexistent obesity). It is inherited in an autosomal dominant pattern with abnormalities in at least 13 genes on different chromosomes identified to date (172). The most commonly reported forms are GCK-MODY (MODY2), HNF1A-MODY (MODY3), and HNF4A-MODY (MODY1).

For individuals with MODY, the treatment implications are considerable and warrant genetic testing (173,174). Clinically, patients with GCK-MODY exhibit mild, stable fasting hyperglycemia and do not require antihyperglycemic therapy except commonly during pregnancy. Patients with HNF1A- or HNF4A-MODY usually respond well to low doses of sulfonylureas, which are considered first-line therapy; in some instances insulin will be required over time. Mutations or deletions in *HNF1B* are associated with renal cysts and uterine malformations (renal cysts and diabetes [RCAD] syndrome). Other extremely rare forms of MODY have been reported to involve other transcription factor genes including *PDX1* (*IPF1*) and *NEUROD1*.

### Diagnosis of Monogenic Diabetes

A diagnosis of one of the three most common forms of MODY, including GCK-MODY, HNF1A-MODY, and HNF4A-MODY, allows for more cost-effective therapy (no therapy for GCK-MODY; sulfonylureas as first-line therapy for HNF1A-MODY and HNF4A-MODY). Additionally, diagnosis can lead to identification of other affected family members. Genetic screening is increasingly available and cost-effective (171,174).

A diagnosis of MODY should be considered in individuals who have atypical diabetes and multiple family members with diabetes not characteristic of type 1 or type 2 diabetes, although admittedly “atypical diabetes” is becoming increasingly difficult to precisely define in the absence of a definitive set of tests for either type of diabetes (168–170,173–179). In most cases, the presence of autoantibodies for type 1 diabetes precludes further testing for monogenic diabetes, but the presence of autoantibodies in patients with monogenic diabetes has been reported

(180). Individuals in whom monogenic diabetes is suspected should be referred to a specialist for further evaluation if available, and consultation can be obtained from several centers. Readily available commercial genetic testing following the criteria listed below now enables a cost-effective (181), often cost-saving, genetic diagnosis that is increasingly supported by health insurance. A biomarker screening pathway such as the combination of urinary C-peptide/creatinine ratio and antibody screening may aid in determining who should get genetic testing for MODY (182). It is critical to correctly diagnose one of the monogenic forms of diabetes because these patients may be incorrectly diagnosed with type 1 or type 2 diabetes, leading to suboptimal, even potentially harmful, treatment regimens and delays in diagnosing other family members (183). The correct diagnosis is especially critical for those with GCK-MODY mutations, where multiple studies have shown that no complications ensue in the absence of glucose-



lowering therapy (184). The risks of microvascular and macrovascular complications with HNF1A- and HNF4A-MODY are similar to those observed in patients with type 1 and type 2 diabetes (185,186). Genetic counseling is recommended to ensure that affected individuals understand the patterns of inheritance and the importance of a correct diagnosis and addressing comprehensive cardiovascular risk.

The diagnosis of monogenic diabetes should be considered in children and adults diagnosed with diabetes in early adulthood with the following findings:

- Diabetes diagnosed within the first 6 months of life (with occasional cases presenting later, mostly *INS* and *ABCC8* mutations) (167,187)
- Diabetes without typical features of type 1 or type 2 diabetes (negative diabetes-associated autoantibodies, no obesity, lacking other metabolic features, especially with strong family history of diabetes)
- Stable, mild fasting hyperglycemia (100–150 mg/dL [5.5–8.5 mmol/L]), stable A1C between 5.6% and 7.6% (between 38 and 60 mmol/mol), especially if no obesity

### PANCREATIC DIABETES OR DIABETES IN THE CONTEXT OF DISEASE OF THE EXOCRINE PANCREAS

Pancreatic diabetes includes both structural and functional loss of glucose-normalizing insulin secretion in the context of exocrine pancreatic dysfunction and is commonly misdiagnosed as type 2 diabetes. Hyperglycemia due to general pancreatic dysfunction has been called “type 3c diabetes” and, more recently, diabetes in the context of disease of the exocrine pancreas has been termed pancreoprivic diabetes (1). The diverse set of etiologies includes pancreatitis (acute and chronic), trauma or pancreatectomy, neoplasia, cystic fibrosis (addressed elsewhere in this chapter), hemochromatosis, fibrocalculous pancreatopathy, rare genetic disorders (188), and idiopathic forms (1); as such, pancreatic diabetes is the preferred umbrella terminology.

Pancreatitis, even a single bout, can lead to postpancreatitis diabetes mellitus (PPDM). Both acute and chronic

pancreatitis can lead to PPDM, and the risk is highest with recurrent bouts. A distinguishing feature is concurrent pancreatic exocrine insufficiency (according to the monoclonal fecal elastase 1 test or direct function tests), pathological pancreatic imaging (endoscopic ultrasound, MRI, computed tomography), and absence of type 1 diabetes–associated autoimmunity (189–194). There is loss of both insulin and glucagon secretion and often higher-than-expected insulin requirements. Risk for microvascular complications appears to be similar to other forms of diabetes. In the context of pancreatectomy, islet autotransplantation can be done to retain insulin secretion (195,196). In some cases, autotransplant can lead to insulin independence. In others, it may decrease insulin requirements (197).

### GESTATIONAL DIABETES MELLITUS

#### Recommendations

- 2.26a** In women who are planning pregnancy, screen those with risk factors **B** and consider testing all women for undiagnosed diabetes. **E**
- 2.26b** Before 15 weeks of gestation, test women with risk factors **B** and consider testing all women **E** for undiagnosed diabetes at the first prenatal visit using standard diagnostic criteria, if not screened preconception.
- 2.26c** Women identified as having diabetes should be treated as such. **A**
- 2.26d** Before 15 weeks of gestation, screen for abnormal glucose metabolism to identify women who are at higher risk of adverse pregnancy and neonatal outcomes, are more likely to need insulin, and are at high risk of a later gestational diabetes mellitus diagnosis. **B** Treatment may provide some benefit. **E**
- 2.26e** Screen for early abnormal glucose metabolism using fasting glucose of 110–125 mg/dL (6.1 mmol/L) or A1C 5.9–6.4% (41–47 mmol/mol). **B**
- 2.27** Screen for gestational diabetes mellitus at 24–28 weeks

of gestation in pregnant women not previously found to have diabetes or high-risk abnormal glucose metabolism detected earlier in the current pregnancy. **A**

- 2.28** Screen women with gestational diabetes mellitus for prediabetes or diabetes at 4–12 weeks postpartum, using the 75-g oral glucose tolerance test and clinically appropriate nonpregnancy diagnostic criteria. **B**
- 2.29** Women with a history of gestational diabetes mellitus should have lifelong screening for the development of diabetes or prediabetes at least every 3 years. **B**
- 2.30** Women with a history of gestational diabetes mellitus found to have prediabetes should receive intensive lifestyle interventions and/or metformin to prevent diabetes. **A**

#### Definition

For many years, GDM was defined as any degree of glucose intolerance that was first recognized during pregnancy (84), regardless of the degree of hyperglycemia. This definition facilitated a uniform strategy for detection and classification of GDM, but this definition has serious limitations (198). First, the best available evidence reveals that many cases of GDM represent preexisting hyperglycemia that is detected by routine screening in pregnancy, as routine screening is not widely performed in nonpregnant women of reproductive age. It is the severity of hyperglycemia that is clinically important with regard to both short- and long-term maternal and fetal risks.

The ongoing epidemic of obesity and diabetes has led to more type 2 diabetes in women of reproductive age, with an increase in the number of pregnant women with undiagnosed type 2 diabetes in early pregnancy (199–201). Ideally, undiagnosed diabetes should be identified preconception in women with risk factors or in high-risk populations (202–207), as the preconception care of women with preexisting diabetes results in lower A1C and reduced risk of birth defects, preterm delivery,

perinatal mortality, small-for-gestational-age births, and neonatal intensive care unit admission (208). If women are not screened prior to pregnancy, universal early screening at <15 weeks of gestation for undiagnosed diabetes may be considered over selective screening (Table 2.3), particularly in populations with high prevalence of risk factors and undiagnosed diabetes in women of childbearing age. Strong racial and ethnic disparities exist in the prevalence of undiagnosed diabetes. Therefore, early screening provides an initial step to identify these health disparities so that they can begin to be addressed (204–207). Standard diagnostic criteria for identifying undiagnosed diabetes in early pregnancy are the same as those used in the nonpregnant population (see Table 2.2). Women found to have diabetes by the standard diagnostic criteria used outside of pregnancy should be classified as having diabetes complicating pregnancy (most often type 2 diabetes, rarely type 1 diabetes or monogenic diabetes) and managed accordingly.

Early abnormal glucose metabolism, defined as fasting glucose threshold of 110 mg/dL (6.1 mmol/L) or an A1C of 5.9% (39 mmol/mol) may identify women who are at higher risk of adverse pregnancy and neonatal outcomes (pre-eclampsia, macrosomia, shoulder dystocia, perinatal death), are more likely to need insulin treatment, and are at high risk of a later GDM diagnosis (209–215). An A1C threshold of 5.7% has not been shown to be associated with adverse perinatal outcomes (216,217).

If early screening is negative, women should be rescreened for GDM between 24 and 28 weeks of gestation (see Section 15, “Management of Diabetes in Pregnancy,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S015>). The International Association of the Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups (IADPSG) GDM diagnostic criteria for the 75-g OGTT as well as the GDM screening and diagnostic criteria used in the two-step approach were not derived from data in the first half of pregnancy and should not be used for early screening (218). To date, most randomized controlled trials of treatment of early abnormal glucose metabolism have been underpowered for outcomes. Therefore, the benefits of treatment for

early abnormal glucose metabolism remain uncertain. Nutrition counseling and periodic “block” testing of glucose levels weekly to identify women with high glucose levels are suggested. Testing frequency may proceed to daily, and treatment may be intensified, if the fasting glucose is predominantly >110 mg/dL, prior to 18 weeks of gestation.

Both the fasting glucose and A1C are low-cost tests. An advantage of the A1C is its convenience, as it can be added to the prenatal laboratories and does not require an early-morning fasting appointment. Disadvantages include inaccuracies in the presence of increased red blood cell turnover and hemoglobinopathies (usually reads lower), and higher values with anemia and reduced red blood cell turnover (219). A1C is not reliable to screen for GDM or for preexisting diabetes at 15 weeks of gestation or later. See Recommendation 2.3 above.

GDM is often indicative of underlying  $\beta$ -cell dysfunction (220), which confers marked increased risk for later development of diabetes, generally but not always type 2 diabetes, in the mother after delivery (221,222). As effective prevention interventions are available (223,224), women diagnosed with GDM should receive lifelong screening for prediabetes to allow interventions to

reduce diabetes risk and for type 2 diabetes to allow treatment at the earliest possible time (225).

### Diagnosis

GDM carries risks for the mother, fetus, and neonate. The Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome (HAPO) study (226), a large-scale multinational cohort study completed by more than 23,000 pregnant women, demonstrated that risk of adverse maternal, fetal, and neonatal outcomes continuously increased as a function of maternal glycemia at 24–28 weeks of gestation, even within ranges previously considered normal for pregnancy. For most complications, there was no threshold for risk. These results have led to careful reconsideration of the diagnostic criteria for GDM.

GDM diagnosis (Table 2.7) can be accomplished with either of two strategies:

1. The “one-step” 75-g OGTT derived from the IADPSG criteria, or
2. The older “two-step” approach with a 50-g (nonfasting) screen followed by a 100-g OGTT for those who screen positive, based on the work of Carpenter and Coustan’s interpretation of the older O’Sullivan (227) criteria.

**Table 2.7—Screening for and diagnosis of GDM**

#### One-step strategy

Perform a 75-g OGTT, with plasma glucose measurement when patient is fasting and at 1 and 2 h, at 24–28 weeks of gestation in women not previously diagnosed with diabetes. The OGTT should be performed in the morning after an overnight fast of at least 8 h. The diagnosis of GDM is made when any of the following plasma glucose values are met or exceeded:

- Fasting: 92 mg/dL (5.1 mmol/L)
- 1 h: 180 mg/dL (10.0 mmol/L)
- 2 h: 153 mg/dL (8.5 mmol/L)

#### Two-step strategy

**Step 1:** Perform a 50-g GLT (nonfasting), with plasma glucose measurement at 1 h, at 24–28 weeks of gestation in women not previously diagnosed with diabetes.

If the plasma glucose level measured 1 h after the load is  $\geq 130$ , 135, or 140 mg/dL (7.2, 7.5, or 7.8 mmol/L, respectively), proceed to a 100-g OGTT.

**Step 2:** The 100-g OGTT should be performed when the patient is fasting.

The diagnosis of GDM is made when at least two\* of the following four plasma glucose levels (measured fasting and at 1, 2, and 3 h during OGTT) are met or exceeded (Carpenter-Coustan criteria [244]):

- Fasting: 95 mg/dL (5.3 mmol/L)
- 1 h: 180 mg/dL (10.0 mmol/L)
- 2 h: 155 mg/dL (8.6 mmol/L)
- 3 h: 140 mg/dL (7.8 mmol/L)

GDM, gestational diabetes mellitus; GLT, glucose load test; OGTT, oral glucose tolerance test. \*American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists notes that one elevated value can be used for diagnosis (240).

Different diagnostic criteria will identify different degrees of maternal hyperglycemia and maternal/fetal risk, leading some experts to debate, and disagree on, optimal strategies for the diagnosis of GDM.

#### **One-Step Strategy**

The IADPSG defined diagnostic cut points for GDM as the average fasting, 1-h, and 2-h PG values during a 75-g OGTT in women at 24–28 weeks of gestation who participated in the HAPO study at which odds for adverse outcomes reached 1.75 times the estimated odds of these outcomes at the mean fasting, 1-h, and 2-h PG levels of the study population. This one-step strategy was anticipated to significantly increase the incidence of GDM (from 5–6% to 15–20%), primarily because only one abnormal value, not two, became sufficient to make the diagnosis (228). Many regional studies have investigated the impact of adopting the IADPSG criteria on prevalence and have seen a roughly one- to threefold increase (229). The anticipated increase in the incidence of GDM could have a substantial impact on costs and medical infrastructure needs and has the potential to “medicalize” pregnancies previously categorized as normal. A recent follow-up study of women participating in a blinded study of pregnancy OGTTs found that 11 years after their pregnancies, women who would have been diagnosed with GDM by the one-step approach, as compared with those without, were at 3.4-fold higher risk of developing prediabetes and type 2 diabetes and had children with a higher risk of obesity and increased body fat, suggesting that the larger group of women identified by the one-step approach would benefit from the increased screening for diabetes and prediabetes that would accompany a history of GDM (230,231). The ADA recommends the IADPSG diagnostic criteria with the intent of optimizing gestational outcomes because these criteria are the only ones based on pregnancy outcomes rather than end points such as prediction of subsequent maternal diabetes.

The expected benefits of using IADPSG criteria to the offspring are inferred from intervention trials that focused on women with lower levels of hyperglycemia than identified using older GDM diagnostic criteria. Those

trials found modest benefits including reduced rates of large-for-gestational-age births and preeclampsia (232,233). It is important to note that 80–90% of women being treated for mild GDM in these two randomized controlled trials could be managed with lifestyle therapy alone. The OGTT glucose cutoffs in these two trials overlapped with the thresholds recommended by the IADPSG, and in one trial (233), the 2-h PG threshold (140 mg/dL [7.8 mmol/L]) was lower than the cutoff recommended by the IADPSG (153 mg/dL [8.5 mmol/L]). No randomized controlled trials of treating versus not treating GDM diagnosed by the IADPSG criteria but not the Carpenter-Coustan criteria have been published to date. However, a recent randomized trial of testing for GDM at 24–28 weeks of gestation by the one-step method using IADPSG criteria versus the two-step method using a 1-h 50-g glucose loading test (GLT) and, if positive, a 3-h OGTT by Carpenter-Coustan criteria identified twice as many women with GDM using the one-step method compared with the two-step. Despite treating more women for GDM using the one-step method, there was no difference in pregnancy and perinatal complications (234).

The one-step method identifies the long-term risks of maternal prediabetes and diabetes and offspring abnormal glucose metabolism and adiposity. Post hoc GDM in women diagnosed by the one-step method in the HAPO cohort was associated with higher prevalence of IGT; higher 30-min, 1-h, and 2-h glucoses during the OGTT; and reduced insulin sensitivity and oral disposition index in their offspring at 10–14 years of age compared with offspring of mothers without GDM. Associations of mother's fasting, 1-h, and 2-h values on the 75-g OGTT were continuous with a comprehensive panel of offspring metabolic outcomes (231,235). In addition, HAPO Follow-up Study (HAPO FUS) data demonstrate that neonatal adiposity and fetal hyperinsulinemia (cord C-peptide), both higher across the continuum of maternal hyperglycemia, are mediators of childhood body fat (236).

Data are lacking on how the treatment of mother's hyperglycemia in pregnancy affects her offspring's risk for obesity, diabetes, and other metabolic disorders.

Additional well-designed clinical studies are needed to determine the optimal intensity of monitoring and treatment of women with GDM diagnosed by the one-step strategy (237,238).

#### **Two-Step Strategy**

In 2013, the NIH convened a consensus development conference to consider diagnostic criteria for diagnosing GDM (239). The 15-member panel had representatives from obstetrics and gynecology, maternal-fetal medicine, pediatrics, diabetes research, biostatistics, and other related fields. The panel recommended a two-step approach to screening that used a 1-h 50-g GLT followed by a 3-h 100-g OGTT for those who screened positive. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) recommends any of the commonly used thresholds of 130, 135, or 140 mg/dL for the 1-h 50-g GLT (240). A systematic review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force compared GLT cutoffs of 130 mg/dL (7.2 mmol/L) and 140 mg/dL (7.8 mmol/L) (241). The higher cutoff yielded sensitivity of 70–88% and specificity of 69–89%, while the lower cutoff was 88–99% sensitive and 66–77% specific. Data regarding a cutoff of 135 mg/dL are limited. As for other screening tests, choice of a cutoff is based upon the trade-off between sensitivity and specificity. The use of A1C at 24–28 weeks of gestation as a screening test for GDM does not function as well as the GLT (242).

Key factors cited by the NIH panel in their decision-making process were the lack of clinical trial data demonstrating the benefits of the one-step strategy and the potential negative consequences of identifying a large group of women with GDM, including medicalization of pregnancy with increased health care utilization and costs. Moreover, screening with a 50-g GLT does not require fasting and is therefore easier to accomplish for many women. Treatment of higher-threshold maternal hyperglycemia, as identified by the two-step approach, reduces rates of neonatal macrosomia, large-for-gestational-age births (243), and shoulder dystocia without increasing small-for-gestational-age births. ACOG currently supports the two-step approach but notes that one elevated value, as opposed to two, may



be used for the diagnosis of GDM (240). If this approach is implemented, the incidence of GDM by the two-step strategy will likely increase markedly. ACOG recommends either of two sets of diagnostic thresholds for the 3-h 100-g OGTT—Carpenter-Coustan or National Diabetes Data Group (244,245). Each is based on different mathematical conversions of the original recommended thresholds by O’Sullivan (227), which used whole blood and nonenzymatic methods for glucose determination. A secondary analysis of data from a randomized clinical trial of identification and treatment of mild GDM (246) demonstrated that treatment was similarly beneficial in patients meeting only the lower thresholds per Carpenter-Coustan (244) and in those meeting only the higher thresholds per National Diabetes Data Group (245). If the two-step approach is used, it would appear advantageous to use the Carpenter-Coustan lower diagnostic thresholds as shown in step 2 in **Table 2.7**.

#### Future Considerations

The conflicting recommendations from expert groups underscore the fact that there are data to support each strategy. A cost-benefit estimation comparing the two strategies concluded that the one-step approach is cost-effective only if patients with GDM receive postdelivery counseling and care to prevent type 2 diabetes (247). The decision of which strategy to implement must therefore be made based on the relative values placed on factors that have yet to be measured (e.g., willingness to change practice based on correlation studies rather than intervention trial results, available infrastructure, and importance of cost considerations).

As the IADPSG criteria (“one-step strategy”) have been adopted internationally, further evidence has emerged to support improved pregnancy outcomes with cost savings (248), and IADPSG may be the preferred approach. Data comparing populationwide outcomes with one-step versus two-step approaches have been inconsistent to date (234,249–251). In addition, pregnancies complicated by GDM per the IADPSG criteria, but not recognized as such, have outcomes comparable to pregnancies with diagnosed GDM by the more stringent two-step criteria (252,253). There remains strong consensus

that establishing a uniform approach to diagnosing GDM will benefit patients, caregivers, and policy makers. Longer-term outcome studies are currently underway.

#### References

1. American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37(Suppl. 1):S81–S90
2. Rewers A, Dong F, Slover RH, Klingensmith GJ, Rewers M. Incidence of diabetic ketoacidosis at diagnosis of type 1 diabetes in Colorado youth, 1998–2012. *JAMA* 2015;313:1570–1572
3. Alonso GT, Coakley A, Pyle L, Manseau K, Thomas S, Rewers A. Diabetic ketoacidosis at diagnosis of type 1 diabetes in Colorado children, 2010–2017. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:117–121
4. Jensen ET, Stafford JM, Saydah S, et al. Increase in prevalence of diabetic ketoacidosis at diagnosis among youth with type 1 diabetes: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:1573–1578
5. Humphreys A, Bravis V, Kaur A, et al. Individual and diabetes presentation characteristics associated with partial remission status in children and adults evaluated up to 12 months following diagnosis of type 1 diabetes: an ADDRESS-2 (After Diagnosis Diabetes Research Support System-2) study analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2019;155:107789
6. Thomas NJ, Lynam AL, Hill AV, et al. Type 1 diabetes defined by severe insulin deficiency occurs after 30 years of age and is commonly treated as type 2 diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2019;62:1167–1172
7. Hope SV, Wienand-Barnett S, Shepherd M, et al. Practical Classification Guidelines for Diabetes in patients treated with insulin: a cross-sectional study of the accuracy of diabetes diagnosis. *Br J Gen Pract* 2016;66:e315–e322
8. Holt RIG, DeVries JH, Hess-Fischl A, et al. The management of type 1 diabetes in adults. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care*. 11 October 2021 [Epub ahead of print]. DOI: 10.2337/dci21-0043
9. Zhong VW, Juhaeri J, Mayer-Davis EJ. Trends in hospital admission for diabetic ketoacidosis in adults with type 1 and type 2 diabetes in England, 1998–2013: a retrospective cohort study. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1870–1877
10. Lawrence JM, Slezak JM, Quesenberry C, et al. Incidence and predictors of type 1 diabetes among younger adults aged 20–45 years: the Diabetes in Young Adults (DiYA) study. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2021;171:108624
11. Newton CA, Raskin P. Diabetic ketoacidosis in type 1 and type 2 diabetes mellitus: clinical and biochemical differences. *Arch Intern Med* 2004;164:1925–1931
12. Skyler JS, Bakris GL, Bonifacio E, et al. Differentiation of diabetes by pathophysiology, natural history, and prognosis. *Diabetes* 2017;66:241–255
13. Lynam AL, Dennis JM, Owen KR, et al. Logistic regression has similar performance to optimised machine learning algorithms in a clinical setting: application to the discrimination between type 1 and type 2 diabetes in young adults. *Diagn Progn Res* 2020;4:6
14. Ziegler AG, Rewers M, Simell O, et al. Seroconversion to multiple islet autoantibodies and risk of progression to diabetes in children. *JAMA* 2013;309:2473–2479
15. Insel RA, Dunne JL, Atkinson MA, et al. Staging presymptomatic type 1 diabetes: a scientific statement of JDRF, the Endocrine Society, and the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1964–1974
16. Zhu Y, Qian L, Liu Q, et al. Glutamic acid decarboxylase autoantibody detection by electrochemiluminescence assay identifies latent autoimmune diabetes in adults with poor islet function. *Diabetes Metab J* 2020;44:260–266
17. Lynam A, McDonald T, Hill A, et al. Development and validation of multivariable clinical diagnostic models to identify type 1 diabetes requiring rapid insulin therapy in adults aged 18–50 years. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e031586
18. Chung WK, Erion K, Florez JC, et al. Precision medicine in diabetes: a consensus report from the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1617–1635
19. Gale EA. Declassifying diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2006;49:1989–1995
20. Schwartz SS, Epstein S, Corkey BE, Grant SFA, Gavin JR 3rd, Aguilar RB. The time is right for a new classification system for diabetes: rationale and implications of the  $\beta$ -cell-centric classification schema. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:179–186
21. International Expert Committee. International Expert Committee report on the role of the A1C assay in the diagnosis of diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1327–1334
22. Knowler WC, Barrett-Connor E, Fowler SE, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes with lifestyle intervention or metformin. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:393–403
23. Tuomilehto J, Lindström J, Eriksson JG, et al.; Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study Group. Prevention of type 2 diabetes mellitus by changes in lifestyle among subjects with impaired glucose tolerance. *N Engl J Med* 2001;344:1343–1350
24. Chadha C, Pittas AG, Lary CW, et al.; D2d Research Group. Reproducibility of a prediabetes classification in a contemporary population. *Metabol Open* 2020;6:100031
25. Expert Committee on the Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. Report of the Expert Committee on the Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 1997;20:1183–1197
26. Expert Committee on the Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. Report of the Expert Committee on the Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26(Suppl. 1):S5–S20
27. Meijnikman AS, De Block CEM, Dirinck E, et al. Not performing an OGTT results in significant underdiagnosis of (pre)diabetes in a high risk adult Caucasian population. *Int J Obes* 2017;41:1615–1620
28. Gonzalez A, Deng Y, Lane AN, et al. Impact of mismatches in HbA<sub>1c</sub> vs glucose values on the diagnostic classification of diabetes and prediabetes. *Diabet Med* 2020;37:689–696
29. Cowie CC, Rust KF, Byrd-Holt DD, et al. Prevalence of diabetes and high risk for diabetes



- using A1C criteria in the U.S. population in 1988–2006. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:562–568
30. Eckhardt BJ, Holzman RS, Kwan CK, Baghdadi J, Aberg JA. Glycated hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> as screening for diabetes mellitus in HIV-infected individuals. *AIDS Patient Care STDS* 2012;26:197–201
31. Kim PS, Woods C, Georgoff P, et al. A1C underestimates glycemia in HIV infection. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1591–1593
32. Arslanian S, Bacha F, Grey M, Marcus MD, White NH, Zeitler P. Evaluation and management of youth-onset type 2 diabetes: a position statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2648–2668
33. Lacy ME, Wellenius GA, Sumner AE, et al. Association of sickle cell trait with hemoglobin A1c in African Americans. *JAMA* 2017;317:507–515
34. Wheeler E, Leong A, Liu C-T, et al.; EPIC-CVD Consortium; EPIC-InterAct Consortium; Lifelines Cohort Study. Impact of common genetic determinants of hemoglobin A1c on type 2 diabetes risk and diagnosis in ancestrally diverse populations: a transethnic genome-wide meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* 2017;14:e1002383
35. Kweka B, Lyimo E, Jeremiah K, et al. Influence of hemoglobinopathies and glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency on diagnosis of diabetes by HbA1c among Tanzanian adults with and without HIV: a cross-sectional study. *PLoS One* 2020;15:e0244782
36. Ziemer DC, Kolm P, Weintraub WS, et al. Glucose-independent, black-white differences in hemoglobin A1c levels: a cross-sectional analysis of 2 studies. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152:770–777
37. Kumar PR, Bhansali A, Ravikiran M, et al. Utility of glycated hemoglobin in diagnosing type 2 diabetes mellitus: a community-based study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2010;95:2832–2835
38. Herman WH. Are there clinical implications of racial differences in HbA<sub>1c</sub>? Yes, to not consider can do great harm! *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1458–1461
39. Herman WH, Ma Y, Uwaifo G, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Differences in A1C by race and ethnicity among patients with impaired glucose tolerance in the Diabetes Prevention Program. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2453–2457
40. Selvin E, Steffes MW, Ballantyne CM, Hoogeveen RC, Coresh J, Brancati FL. Racial differences in glycemic markers: a cross-sectional analysis of community-based data. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;154:303–309
41. Herman WH, Dungan KM, Wolffenbuttel BHR, et al. Racial and ethnic differences in mean plasma glucose, hemoglobin A1c, and 1,5-anhydroglucitol in over 2000 patients with type 2 diabetes. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2009;94:1689–1694
42. Bergenstal RM, Gal RL, Connor CG, et al.; T1D Exchange Racial Differences Study Group. Racial differences in the relationship of glucose concentrations and hemoglobin A1c levels. *Ann Intern Med* 2017;167:95–102
43. Khosla L, Bhat S, Fullington LA, Horlyck-Romanovsky MF. HbA<sub>1c</sub> performance in African descent populations in the United States with normal glucose tolerance, prediabetes, or diabetes: a scoping review. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2021;18:E22
44. Selvin E, Rawlings AM, Bergenstal RM, Coresh J, Brancati FL. No racial differences in the association of glycated hemoglobin with kidney disease and cardiovascular outcomes. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2995–3001
45. Selvin E. Are there clinical implications of racial differences in HbA<sub>1c</sub>? A difference, to be a difference, must make a difference. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1462–1467
46. Huang S-H, Huang P-J, Li J-Y, Su Y-D, Lu C-C, Shih C-L. Hemoglobin A1c levels associated with age and gender in Taiwanese adults without prior diagnosis with diabetes. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;18:3390
47. Paterson AD. HbA1c for type 2 diabetes diagnosis in Africans and African Americans: personalized medicine NOW! *PLoS Med* 2017;14:e1002384
48. Cappellini MD, Fiorelli G. Glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency. *Lancet* 2008;371:64–74
49. Picón MJ, Murri M, Muñoz A, Fernández-García JC, Gomez-Huelgas R, Tinahones FJ. Hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> versus oral glucose tolerance test in postpartum diabetes screening. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:1648–1653
50. Göbl CS, Bozkurt L, Yarragudi R, Tura A, Pacini G, Kautzky-Willer A. Is early postpartum HbA1c an appropriate risk predictor after pregnancy with gestational diabetes mellitus? *Acta Diabetol* 2014;51:715–722
51. Megia A, Näf S, Herranz L, et al. The usefulness of HbA1c in postpartum reclassification of gestational diabetes. *BJOG* 2012;119:891–894
52. Welsh KJ, Kirkman MS, Sacks DB. Role of glycated proteins in the diagnosis and management of diabetes: research gaps and future directions. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1299–1306
53. Kim C, Bullard KM, Herman WH, Beckles GL. Association between iron deficiency and A1C levels among adults without diabetes in the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1999–2006. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:780–785
54. Selvin E, Wang D, Matsushita K, Grams ME, Coresh J. Prognostic implications of single-sample confirmatory testing for undiagnosed diabetes: a prospective cohort study. *Ann Intern Med* 2018;169:156–164
55. Klein KR, Walker CP, McFerren AL, Huffman H, Frohlich F, Buse JB. Carbohydrate intake prior to oral glucose tolerance testing. *J Endocr Soc* 2021;5:bvab049
56. Conn JW. Interpretation of the glucose tolerance test. The necessity of a stand and preparatory diet. *Am J Med Sci* 1940;199:555–564
57. Wilkerson HL, Butler FK, Francis JO. The effect of prior carbohydrate intake on the oral glucose tolerance test. *Diabetes* 1960;9:386–391
58. Ziegler A-G; BABYDIAB-BABYDIET Study Group. Age-related islet autoantibody incidence in offspring of patients with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2012;55:1937–1943
59. Parikka V, Näntö-Salonen K, Saarinen M, et al. Early seroconversion and rapidly increasing autoantibody concentrations predict prepubertal manifestation of type 1 diabetes in children at genetic risk. *Diabetologia* 2012;55:1926–1936
60. Steck AK, Vehik K, Bonifacio E, et al.; TEDDY Study Group. Predictors of progression from the appearance of islet autoantibodies to early childhood diabetes: The Environmental Determinants of Diabetes in the Young (TEDDY). *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:808–813
61. McKeigue PM, Spiliopoulou A, McGurnaghan S, et al. Persistent C-peptide secretion in type 1 diabetes and its relationship to the genetic architecture of diabetes. *BMC Med* 2019;17:165
62. Bogun MM, Bundy BN, Goland RS, Greenbaum CJ. C-Peptide levels in subjects followed longitudinally before and after type 1 diabetes diagnosis in TrialNet. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1836–1842
63. Greenbaum CJ, Beam CA, Boulware D, et al.; Type 1 Diabetes TrialNet Study Group. Fall in C-peptide during first 2 years from diagnosis: evidence of at least two distinct phases from composite Type 1 Diabetes TrialNet data. *Diabetes* 2012;61:2066–2073
64. Mishra R, Hodge KM, Cousminer DL, Leslie RD, Grant SFA. A global perspective of latent autoimmune diabetes in adults. *Trends Endocrinol Metab* 2018;29:638–650
65. Buzzetti R, Zampetti S, Maddaloni E. Adult-onset autoimmune diabetes: current knowledge and implications for management. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2017;13:674–686
66. Ben-Skowronek I. IPEX syndrome: genetics and treatment options. *Genes (Basel)* 2021;12:323
67. Frommer L, Kahaly GJ. Autoimmune polyendocrinopathy. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2019;104:4769–4782
68. Smith CJ, Almodallal Y, Jatou A. Rare adverse events with programmed death-1 and programmed death-1 ligand inhibitors: justification and rationale for a systematic review. *Curr Oncol Rep* 2021;23:86
69. Zhao Z, Wang X, Bao X-Q, Ning J, Shang M, Zhang D. Autoimmune polyendocrine syndrome induced by immune checkpoint inhibitors: a systematic review. *Cancer Immunol Immunother* 2021;70:1527–1540
70. Stamatouli AM, Quandt Z, Perdigoto AL, et al. Collateral damage: insulin-dependent diabetes induced with checkpoint inhibitors. *Diabetes* 2018;67:1471–1480
71. Balasubramanyam A, Nalini R, Hampe CS, Maldonado M. Syndromes of ketosis-prone diabetes mellitus. *Endocr Rev* 2008;29:292–302
72. Dabelea D, Mayer-Davis EJ, Saydah S, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. Prevalence of type 1 and type 2 diabetes among children and adolescents from 2001 to 2009. *JAMA* 2014;311:1778–1786
73. Ziegler A-G, Kick K, Bonifacio E, et al.; Fr1da Study Group. Yield of a public health screening of children for islet autoantibodies in Bavaria, Germany. *JAMA* 2020;323:339–351
74. McQueen RB, Geno Rasmussen C, Waugh K, et al. Cost and cost-effectiveness of large-scale screening for type 1 diabetes in Colorado. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1496–1503
75. Sosenko JM, Skyler JS, Palmer JP, et al.; Type 1 Diabetes TrialNet Study Group; Diabetes Prevention Trial-Type 1 Study Group. The prediction of type 1 diabetes by multiple autoantibody levels and their incorporation into an autoantibody risk score in relatives of type 1

- diabetic patients. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2615–2620
76. Orban T, Sosenko JM, Cuthbertson D, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Trial–Type 1 Study Group. Pancreatic islet autoantibodies as predictors of type 1 diabetes in the Diabetes Prevention Trial–Type 1. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:2269–2274
77. Jacobsen LM, Larsson HE, Tamura RN, et al.; TEDDY Study Group. Predicting progression to type 1 diabetes from ages 3 to 6 in islet autoantibody positive TEDDY children. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2019;20:263–270
78. Barker JM, Goehrig SH, Barriga K, et al.; DAISY study. Clinical characteristics of children diagnosed with type 1 diabetes through intensive screening and follow-up. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:1399–1404
79. Elding Larsson H, Vehik K, Gesualdo P, et al.; TEDDY Study Group. Children followed in the TEDDY study are diagnosed with type 1 diabetes at an early stage of disease. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2014;15:118–126
80. Herold KC, Bundy BN, Long SA, et al.; Type 1 Diabetes TrialNet Study Group. An anti-CD3 antibody, teplizumab, in relatives at risk for type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:603–613
81. Sims EK, Bundy BN, Stier K, et al.; Type 1 Diabetes TrialNet Study Group. Teplizumab improves and stabilizes beta cell function in antibody-positive high-risk individuals. *Sci Transl Med* 2021;13:eabc8980
82. American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34(Suppl. 1):S62–S69
83. Genuth S, Alberti KGMM, Bennett P, et al.; Expert Committee on the Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. Follow-up report on the diagnosis of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:3160–3167
84. Zhang X, Gregg EW, Williamson DF, et al. A1C level and future risk of diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1665–1673
85. Selvin E, Steffes MW, Zhu H, et al. Glycated hemoglobin, diabetes, and cardiovascular risk in nondiabetic adults. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:800–811
86. Ackermann RT, Cheng YJ, Williamson DF, Gregg EW. Identifying adults at high risk for diabetes and cardiovascular disease using hemoglobin A1c: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2005–2006. *Am J Prev Med* 2011;40:11–17
87. Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. HbA<sub>1c</sub> as a predictor of diabetes and as an outcome in the Diabetes Prevention Program: a randomized clinical trial. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:51–58
88. Empierrez G, Korytkowski M. Diabetic emergencies – ketoacidosis, hyperglycaemic hyperosmolar state and hypoglycaemia. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2016;12:222–232
89. Fadini GP, Bonora BM, Avogaro A. SGLT2 inhibitors and diabetic ketoacidosis: data from the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System. *Diabetologia* 2017;60:1385–1389
90. Lean ME, Leslie WS, Barnes AC, et al. Primary care-led weight management for remission of type 2 diabetes (DiRECT): an open-label, cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet* 2018;391:541–551
91. Taheri S, Zaghoul H, Chagoury O, et al. Effect of intensive lifestyle intervention on bodyweight and glycaemia in early type 2 diabetes (DIADEM-1): an open-label, parallel-group, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2020;8:477–489
92. Lean MEJ, Leslie WS, Barnes AC, et al. Durability of a primary care-led weight-management intervention for remission of type 2 diabetes: 2-year results of the DiRECT open-label, cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2019;7:344–355
93. Roth AE, Thornley CJ, Blackstone RP. Outcomes in bariatric and metabolic surgery: an updated 5-year review. *Curr Obes Rep* 2020;9:380–389
94. Conte C, Lapeyre-Mestre M, Hanaire H, Ritz P. Diabetes remission and relapse after bariatric surgery: a nationwide population-based study. *Obes Surg* 2020;30:4810–4820
95. Yoshino M, Kayser BD, Yoshino J, et al. Effects of diet versus gastric bypass on metabolic function in diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:721–732
96. Cresci B, Cosentino C, Monami M, Mannucci E. Metabolic surgery for the treatment of type 2 diabetes: a network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2020;22:1378–1387
97. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Diabetes Statistics Report, 2020: Estimates of Diabetes and Its Burden in the United States. National Diabetes Statistics Report, 2020: Estimates of Diabetes and Its Burden in the United States. Accessed 15 October 2020. Available from <https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/pdfs/data/statistics/national-diabetes-statistics-report.pdf>
98. International Diabetes Federation. IDF Diabetes Atlas, 9th edition. Brussels, Belgium, International Diabetes Federation, 2019. Accessed 15 October 2020. Available from <https://www.diabetesatlas.org/en/>
99. Bardenheier BH, Wu W-C, Zullo AR, Gravenstein S, Gregg EW. Progression to diabetes by baseline glycemic status among middle-aged and older adults in the United States, 2006–2014. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2021;174:108726
100. Sussman JB, Kent DM, Nelson JP, Hayward RA. Improving diabetes prevention with benefit based tailored treatment: risk based reanalysis of Diabetes Prevention Program. *BMJ* 2015;350:h454
101. Palladino R, Tabak AG, Khunti K, et al. Association between pre-diabetes and microvascular and macrovascular disease in newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2020;8:e001061
102. Perreault L, Pan Q, Aroda VR, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Exploring residual risk for diabetes and microvascular disease in the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study (DPPOS). *Diabet Med* 2017;34:1747–1755
103. Nathan DM, Bennett PH, Crandall JP, et al.; Research Group. Does diabetes prevention translate into reduced long-term vascular complications of diabetes? *Diabetologia* 2019;62:1319–1328
104. Lin C-H, Wei J-N, Fan K-C, et al. Different cutoffs of hypertension, risk of incident diabetes and progression of insulin resistance: a prospective cohort study. *J Formos Med Assoc.* 22 March 2021 [Epub ahead of print]. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfma.2021.02.022
105. Wei Y, Xu Q, Yang H, et al. Preconception diabetes mellitus and adverse pregnancy outcomes in over 6.4 million women: a population-based cohort study in China. *PLoS Med* 2019;16:e1002926
106. Peterson C, Grosse SD, Li R, et al. Preventable health and cost burden of adverse birth outcomes associated with pregestational diabetes in the United States. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2015;212:74.e1–74.e9
107. Griffin SJ, Borch-Johnsen K, Davies MJ, et al. Effect of early intensive multifactorial therapy on 5-year cardiovascular outcomes in individuals with type 2 diabetes detected by screening (ADDITION-Europe): a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet* 2011;378:156–167
108. Herman WH, Ye W, Griffin SJ, et al. Early detection and treatment of type 2 diabetes reduce cardiovascular morbidity and mortality: a simulation of the results of the Anglo-Danish-Dutch Study of Intensive Treatment in People With Screen-Detected Diabetes in Primary Care (ADDITION-Europe). *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1449–1455
109. Kahn R, Alperin P, Eddy D, et al. Age at initiation and frequency of screening to detect type 2 diabetes: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Lancet* 2010;375:1365–1374
110. Zhou X, Siegel KR, Ng BP, et al. Cost-effectiveness of diabetes prevention interventions targeting high-risk individuals and whole populations: a systematic review. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1593–1616
111. Chatterjee R, Narayan KMV, Lipscomb J, et al. Screening for diabetes and prediabetes should be cost-saving in patients at high risk. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1981–1987
- 111a. Chung S, Azar KM, Baek M, Lauderdale DS, Palaniappan LP. Reconsidering the age thresholds for type II diabetes screening in the U.S. *Am J Prev Med* 2014;47:375–381
112. Araneta MRG, Kanaya A, Hsu WC, et al. Optimum BMI cut points to screen Asian Americans for type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:814–820
113. Hsu WC, Araneta MRG, Kanaya AM, Chiang JL, Fujimoto W. BMI cut points to identify at-risk Asian Americans for type 2 diabetes screening. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:150–158
114. WHO Expert Consultation. Appropriate body-mass index for Asian populations and its implications for policy and intervention strategies. *Lancet* 2004;363:157–163
115. Menke A, Casagrande S, Geiss L, Cowie CC. Prevalence of and trends in diabetes among adults in the United States, 1988–2012. *JAMA* 2015;314:1021–1029
116. Chiu M, Austin PC, Manuel DG, Shah BR, Tu JV. Deriving ethnic-specific BMI cutoff points for assessing diabetes risk. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1741–1748
117. Schambelan M, Benson CA, Carr A, et al.; International AIDS Society-USA. Management of metabolic complications associated with antiretroviral therapy for HIV-1 infection: recommendations of an International AIDS Society-USA panel. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2002;31:257–275
118. Monroe AK, Glesby MJ, Brown TT. Diagnosing and managing diabetes in HIV-

- infected patients: current concepts. *Clin Infect Dis* 2015;60:453–462
119. Wohl DA, McComsey G, Tebas P, et al. Current concepts in the diagnosis and management of metabolic complications of HIV infection and its therapy. *Clin Infect Dis* 2006;43:645–653
  120. Johnson SL, Tabaei BP, Herman WH. The efficacy and cost of alternative strategies for systematic screening for type 2 diabetes in the U.S. population 45–74 years of age. *Diabetes Care* 2005;28:307–311
  121. Tabaei BP, Burke R, Constance A, et al. Community-based screening for diabetes in Michigan. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:668–670
  122. Lalla E, Kunzel C, Burkett S, Cheng B, Lamster IB. Identification of unrecognized diabetes and pre-diabetes in a dental setting. *J Dent Res* 2011;90:855–860
  123. Lalla E, Cheng B, Kunzel C, Burkett S, Lamster IB. Dental findings and identification of undiagnosed hyperglycemia. *J Dent Res* 2013;92:888–892
  124. Herman WH, Taylor GW, Jacobson JJ, Burke R, Brown MB. Screening for prediabetes and type 2 diabetes in dental offices. *J Public Health Dent* 2015;75:175–182
  125. Jadhav AN, Tarte PR, Puri SK. Dental clinic: potential source of high-risk screening for prediabetes and type 2 diabetes. *Indian J Dent Res* 2019;30:851–854
  126. Buse JB, Kaufman FR, Linder B, Hirst K, El Ghormli L; HEALTHY Study Group. Diabetes screening with hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> versus fasting plasma glucose in a multiethnic middle-school cohort. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:429–435
  127. Kapadia C; Drugs and Therapeutics Committee of the Pediatric Endocrine Society. Hemoglobin A1c measurement for the diagnosis of type 2 diabetes in children. *Int J Pediatr Endocrinol* 2012;2012:31
  128. Kester LM, Hey H, Hannon TS. Using hemoglobin A1c for prediabetes and diabetes diagnosis in adolescents: can adult recommendations be upheld for pediatric use? *J Adolesc Health* 2012;50:321–323
  129. Wu E-L, Kazzi NG, Lee JM. Cost-effectiveness of screening strategies for identifying pediatric diabetes mellitus and dysglycemia. *JAMA Pediatr* 2013;167:32–39
  130. Moran A, Pillay K, Becker D, Granados A, Hameed S, Acerini CL. ISPAD Clinical Practice Consensus Guidelines 2018: management of cystic fibrosis-related diabetes in children and adolescents. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2018;19(Suppl. 27):64–74
  131. Gilmour JA. Response to the letter to the editor from Dr. Boudreau et al., “Validation of a Stepwise Approach Using Glycated Hemoglobin Levels to Reduce the Number of Required Oral Glucose Tolerance Tests to Screen for Cystic Fibrosis-Related Diabetes in Adults”. *Can J Diabetes* 2019;43:163
  132. Gilmour JA, Sykes J, Etchells E, Tullis E. Cystic fibrosis-related diabetes screening in adults: a gap analysis and evaluation of accuracy of glycated hemoglobin levels. *Can J Diabetes* 2019;43:13–18
  133. Darukhanavala A, Van Dessel F, Ho J, Hansen M, Kremer T, Alfego D. Use of hemoglobin A1c to identify dysglycemia in cystic fibrosis. *PLoS One* 2021;16:e0250036
  134. Franck Thompson E, Watson D, Benoit CM, Landvik S, McNamara J. The association of pediatric cystic fibrosis-related diabetes screening on clinical outcomes by center: a CF patient registry study. *J Cyst Fibros* 2020;19:316–320
  135. Olesen HV, Drevinek P, Gulmans VA, et al.; ECFSPR Steering Group. Cystic fibrosis related diabetes in Europe: prevalence, risk factors and outcome. *J Cyst Fibros* 2020;19:321–327
  136. Prentice BJ, Chelliah A, Ooi CY, et al. Peak OGTT glucose is associated with lower lung function in young children with cystic fibrosis. *J Cyst Fibros* 2020;19:305–309
  137. Mainguy C, Bellon G, Delaup V, et al. Sensitivity and specificity of different methods for cystic fibrosis-related diabetes screening: is the oral glucose tolerance test still the standard? *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab* 2017;30:27–35
  138. Ode KL, Moran A. New insights into cystic fibrosis-related diabetes in children. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2013;1:52–58
  139. Moran A, Dunitz J, Nathan B, Saeed A, Holme B, Thomas W. Cystic fibrosis-related diabetes: current trends in prevalence, incidence, and mortality. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1626–1631
  140. Onady GM, Stolfi A. Insulin and oral agents for managing cystic fibrosis-related diabetes. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;4:CD004730
  141. Moran A, Brunzell C, Cohen RC, et al.; CFRD Guidelines Committee. Clinical care guidelines for cystic fibrosis-related diabetes: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association and a clinical practice guideline of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, endorsed by the Pediatric Endocrine Society. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:2697–2708
  142. Shivaswamy V, Boerner B, Larsen J. Post-transplant diabetes mellitus: causes, treatment, and impact on outcomes. *Endocr Rev* 2016;37:37–61
  143. Sharif A, Hecking M, de Vries APJ, et al. Proceedings from an international consensus meeting on posttransplantation diabetes mellitus: recommendations and future directions. *Am J Transplant* 2014;14:1992–2000
  144. Hecking M, Werzowa J, Haidinger M, et al.; European-New-Onset Diabetes After Transplantation Working Group. Novel views on new-onset diabetes after transplantation: development, prevention and treatment. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2013;28:550–566
  145. Ramirez SC, Maaske J, Kim Y, et al. The association between glycemic control and clinical outcomes after kidney transplantation. *Endocr Pract* 2014;20:894–900
  146. Thomas MC, Moran J, Mathew TH, Russ GR, Rao MM. Early peri-operative hyperglycaemia and renal allograft rejection in patients without diabetes. *BMC Nephrol* 2000;1:1
  147. Chakkerla HA, Weil EJ, Castro J, et al. Hyperglycemia during the immediate period after kidney transplantation. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2009;4:853–859
  148. Wallia A, Illuri V, Molitch ME. Diabetes care after transplant: definitions, risk factors, and clinical management. *Med Clin North Am* 2016;100:535–550
  149. Kim HD, Chang J-Y, Chung BH, et al. Effect of everolimus with low-dose tacrolimus on development of new-onset diabetes after transplantation and allograft function in kidney transplantation: a multicenter, open-label, randomized trial. *Ann Transplant* 2021;26:e927984
  150. Cheng C-Y, Chen C-H, Wu M-F, et al. Risk factors in and long-term survival of patients with post-transplantation diabetes mellitus: a retrospective cohort study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17:E4581
  151. Gulsoy Kirnap N, Bozkus Y, Haberal M. Analysis of risk factors for posttransplant diabetes mellitus after kidney transplantation: single-center experience. *Exp Clin Transplant* 2020;18(Suppl. 1):36–40
  152. Munshi VN, Saghafian S, Cook CB, Eric Steidley D, Hardaway B, Chakkerla HA. Incidence, risk factors, and trends for postheart transplantation diabetes mellitus. *Am J Cardiol* 2020;125:436–440
  153. Kgosidialwa O, Blake K, O’Connell O, Egan J, O’Neill J, Hatunic M. Post-transplant diabetes mellitus associated with heart and lung transplant. *Ir J Med Sci* 2020;189:185–189
  154. Sharif A, Moore RH, Baboolal K. The use of oral glucose tolerance tests to risk stratify for new-onset diabetes after transplantation: an underdiagnosed phenomenon. *Transplantation* 2006;82:1667–1672
  155. Hecking M, Kainz A, Werzowa J, et al. Glucose metabolism after renal transplantation. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2763–2771
  156. Pham Vu T, Nguyen Thi Thuy D, Truong Quy K, et al. Serum hs-CRP measured prior transplantation predicts of new-onset diabetes after transplantation in renal transplant recipients. *Transpl Immunol* 2021;66:101392
  157. Grundman JB, Wolfsdorf JL, Marks BE. Post-transplantation diabetes mellitus in pediatric patients. *Horm Res Paediatr* 2020;93:510–518
  158. Galindo RJ, Fried M, Breen T, Tamler R. Hyperglycemia management in patients with posttransplantation diabetes. *Endocr Pract* 2016;22:454–465
  159. Jenssen T, Hartmann A. Emerging treatments for post-transplantation diabetes mellitus. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 2015;11:465–477
  160. Thomas MC, Mathew TH, Russ GR, Rao MM, Moran J. Early peri-operative glycaemic control and allograft rejection in patients with diabetes mellitus: a pilot study. *Transplantation* 2001;72:1321–1324
  161. Kurian B, Joshi R, Helmuth A. Effectiveness and long-term safety of thiazolidinediones and metformin in renal transplant recipients. *Endocr Pract* 2008;14:979–984
  162. Budde K, Neumayer H-H, Fritsche L, Sulowicz W, Stompôt T, Eckland D. The pharmacokinetics of pioglitazone in patients with impaired renal function. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2003;55:368–374
  163. Luther P, Baldwin D Jr. Pioglitazone in the management of diabetes mellitus after transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2004;4:2135–2138
  164. Strøm Halden TA, Åsberg A, Vik K, Hartmann A, Jenssen T. Short-term efficacy and safety of sitagliptin treatment in long-term stable renal recipients with new-onset diabetes after transplantation. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2014;29:926–933
  165. Lane JT, Odegaard DE, Haire CE, Collier DS, Wrenshall LE, Stevens RB. Sitagliptin therapy in kidney transplant recipients with new-onset



- diabetes after transplantation. *Transplantation* 2011;92:e56–e57
166. Carmody D, Støy J, Greeley SAW, Bell GI, Philipson LH. Chapter 2 – A clinical guide to monogenic diabetes. In *Genetic Diagnosis of Endocrine Disorders*. 2nd ed. Weiss RE, Refetoff S, Eds. Academic Press, 2016, pp. 21–30
  167. De Franco E, Flanagan SE, Houghton JAL, et al. The effect of early, comprehensive genomic testing on clinical care in neonatal diabetes: an international cohort study. *Lancet* 2015;386:957–963
  168. Sanyoura M, Letourneau L, Knight Johnson AE, et al. GCK-MODY in the US Monogenic Diabetes Registry: description of 27 unpublished variants. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2019;151:231–236
  169. Carmody D, Naylor RN, Bell CD, et al. GCK-MODY in the US National Monogenic Diabetes Registry: frequently misdiagnosed and unnecessarily treated. *Acta Diabetol* 2016;53:703–708
  170. Timsit J, Saint-Martin C, Dubois-Laforgue D, Bellanné-Chantelot C. Searching for maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY): when and what for? *Can J Diabetes* 2016;40:455–461
  171. De Franco E, Caswell R, Johnson MB, et al. De novo mutations in *EIF2B1* affecting eIF2 signaling cause neonatal/early-onset diabetes and transient hepatic dysfunction. *Diabetes* 2020;69:477–483
  172. Valkovicova T, Skopkova M, Stanik J, Gasperikova D. Novel insights into genetics and clinics of the HNF1A-MODY. *Endocr Regul* 2019;53:110–134
  173. Shields BM, Hicks S, Shepherd MH, Colclough K, Hattersley AT, Ellard S. Maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY): how many cases are we missing? *Diabetologia* 2010;53:2504–2508
  174. Awa WL, Schober E, Wiegand S, et al. Reclassification of diabetes type in pediatric patients initially classified as type 2 diabetes mellitus: 15 years follow-up using routine data from the German/Austrian DPV database. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2011;94:463–467
  175. Shepherd M, Shields B, Hammersley S, et al.; UNITED Team. Systematic population screening, using biomarkers and genetic testing, identifies 2.5% of the U.K. pediatric diabetes population with monogenic diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1879–1888
  176. SEARCH Study Group. SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth: a multicenter study of the prevalence, incidence and classification of diabetes mellitus in youth. *Control Clin Trials* 2004;25:458–471
  177. Pihoker C, Gilliam LK, Ellard S, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Prevalence, characteristics and clinical diagnosis of maturity onset diabetes of the young due to mutations in HNF1A, HNF4A, and glucokinase: results from the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2013;98:4055–4062
  178. Draznin B (Ed.). *Atypical Diabetes: Pathophysiology, Clinical Presentations, and Treatment Options*. Arlington, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2018
  179. Exeter Diabetes. MODY Probability Calculator. Accessed 15 October 2021. Available from <https://www.diabetesgenes.org/exeter-diabetes-app/ModyCalculator>
  180. Urbanová J, Rypácková B, Procházková Z, et al. Positivity for islet cell autoantibodies in patients with monogenic diabetes is associated with later diabetes onset and higher HbA<sub>1c</sub> level. *Diabet Med* 2014;31:466–471
  181. Naylor RN, John PM, Winn AN, et al. Cost-effectiveness of MODY genetic testing: translating genomic advances into practical health applications. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:202–209
  182. Shields BM, Shepherd M, Hudson M, et al.; UNITED study team. Population-based assessment of a biomarker-based screening pathway to aid diagnosis of monogenic diabetes in young-onset patients. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1017–1025
  183. Hattersley A, Bruining J, Shield J, Njolstad P, Donaghue KC. The diagnosis and management of monogenic diabetes in children and adolescents. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2009;10(Suppl. 12):33–42
  184. Rubio-Cabezas O, Hattersley AT, Njolstad PR, et al.; International Society for Pediatric and Adolescent Diabetes. ISPAD Clinical Practice Consensus Guidelines 2014. The diagnosis and management of monogenic diabetes in children and adolescents. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2014;15(Suppl. 20):47–64
  185. Steele AM, Shields BM, Shepherd M, Ellard S, Hattersley AT, Pearson ER. Increased all-cause and cardiovascular mortality in monogenic diabetes as a result of mutations in the HNF1A gene. *Diabet Med* 2010;27:157–161
  186. Anök A, Çatlö G, Abacı A, Böber E. Maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY): an update. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab* 2015;28:251–263
  187. Greeley SAW, Naylor RN, Philipson LH, Bell GI. Neonatal diabetes: an expanding list of genes allows for improved diagnosis and treatment. *Curr Diab Rep* 2011;11:519–532
  188. Le Bodic L, Bignon JD, Raguénès O, et al. The hereditary pancreatitis gene maps to long arm of chromosome 7. *Hum Mol Genet* 1996;5:549–554
  189. Hardt PD, Brendel MD, Kloer HU, Bretzel RG. Is pancreatic diabetes (type 3c diabetes) underdiagnosed and misdiagnosed? *Diabetes Care* 2008;31(Suppl. 2):S165–S169
  190. Woodmansey C, McGovern AP, McCullough KA, et al. Incidence, demographics, and clinical characteristics of diabetes of the exocrine pancreas (type 3c): a retrospective cohort study. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1486–1493
  191. Duggan SN, Ewald N, Kelleher L, Griffin O, Gibney J, Conlon KC. The nutritional management of type 3c (pancreatogenic) diabetes in chronic pancreatitis. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 2017;71:3–8
  192. Makuc J. Management of pancreatogenic diabetes: challenges and solutions. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes* 2016;9:311–315
  193. Andersen DK, Korc M, Petersen GM, et al. Diabetes, pancreatogenic diabetes, and pancreatic cancer. *Diabetes* 2017;66:1103–1110
  194. Petrov MS, Basina M. Diagnosis of endocrine disease: diagnosing and classifying diabetes in diseases of the exocrine pancreas. *Eur J Endocrinol* 2021;184:R151–R163
  195. Bellin MD, Gelrud A, Arreaza-Rubin G, et al. Total pancreatectomy with islet autotransplantation: summary of an NIDDK workshop. *Ann Surg* 2015;261:21–29
  196. Anazawa T, Okajima H, Masui T, Uemoto S. Current state and future evolution of pancreatic islet transplantation. *Ann Gastroenterol Surg* 2018;3:34–42
  197. Quartuccio M, Hall E, Singh V, et al. Glycemic predictors of insulin independence after total pancreatectomy with islet autotransplantation. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2017;102:801–809
  198. Huvinen E, Koivusalo SB, Meinilä J, et al. Effects of a lifestyle intervention during pregnancy and first postpartum year: findings from the RADIEL Study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2018;103:1669–1677
  199. Feig DS, Hwee J, Shah BR, Booth GL, Bierman AS, Lipscombe LL. Trends in incidence of diabetes in pregnancy and serious perinatal outcomes: a large, population-based study in Ontario, Canada, 1996–2010. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:1590–1596
  200. Peng TY, Ehrlich SF, Crites Y, et al. Trends and racial and ethnic disparities in the prevalence of pregestational type 1 and type 2 diabetes in Northern California: 1996–2014. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2017;216:177.e1–177.e8
  201. Jovanović L, Liang Y, Weng W, Hamilton M, Chen L, Wintfeld N. Trends in the incidence of diabetes, its clinical sequelae, and associated costs in pregnancy. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2015;31:707–716
  202. Poltavskiy E, Kim DJ, Bang H. Comparison of screening scores for diabetes and prediabetes. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2016;118:146–153
  203. Mission JF, Catov J, Deihl TE, Feghali M, Scifres C. Early pregnancy diabetes screening and diagnosis: prevalence, rates of abnormal test results, and associated factors. *Obstet Gynecol* 2017;130:1136–1142
  204. Cho NH, Shaw JE, Karuranga S, et al. IDF Diabetes Atlas: global estimates of diabetes prevalence for 2017 and projections for 2045. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2018;138:271–281
  205. Britton LE, Hussey JM, Crandell JL, Berry DC, Brooks JL, Bryant AG. Racial/ethnic disparities in diabetes diagnosis and glycemic control among women of reproductive age. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)* 2018;27:1271–1277
  206. Robbins C, Boulet SL, Morgan I, et al. Disparities in preconception health indicators - Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2013–2015, and Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System, 2013–2014. *MMWR Surveill Summ* 2018;67:1–16
  207. Yuen L, Wong VW, Simmons D. Ethnic disparities in gestational diabetes. *Curr Diab Rep* 2018;18:68
  208. Wahabi HA, Fayed A, Esmaeil S, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of pre-pregnancy care for women with diabetes for improving maternal and perinatal outcomes. *PLoS One* 2020;15:e0237571
  209. Zhu W-W, Yang H-X, Wei Y-M, et al. Evaluation of the value of fasting plasma glucose in the first prenatal visit to diagnose gestational diabetes mellitus in China. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:586–590
  210. Hughes RCE, Moore MP, Gullam JE, Mohamed K, Rowan J. An early pregnancy HbA<sub>1c</sub>  $\geq 5.9\%$  (41 mmol/mol) is optimal for detecting diabetes and identifies women at increased risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2953–2959



211. Mañé L, Flores-Le Roux JA, Gómez N, et al. Association of first-trimester HbA1c levels with adverse pregnancy outcomes in different ethnic groups. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2019;150:202–210
212. Boe B, Barbour LA, Allshouse AA, Heyborne KD. Universal early pregnancy glycosylated hemoglobin A1c as an adjunct to Carpenter-Coustan screening: an observational cohort study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM* 2019;1:24–32
213. Immanuel J, Simmons D. Screening and treatment for early-onset gestational diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Curr Diab Rep* 2017;17:115
214. Yefet E, Jeda E, Tzur A, Nachum Z. Markers for undiagnosed type 2 diabetes mellitus during pregnancy—a population-based retrospective cohort study. *J Diabetes* 2020;12:205–214
215. Kattini R, Hummelen R, Kelly L. Early gestational diabetes mellitus screening with glycated hemoglobin: a systematic review. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* 2020;42:1379–1384
216. Chen L, Pocobelli G, Yu O, et al. Early pregnancy hemoglobin A1C and pregnancy outcomes: a population-based study. *Am J Perinatol* 2019;36:1045–1053
217. Osmundson SS, Zhao BS, Kunz L, et al. First trimester hemoglobin A1c prediction of gestational diabetes. *Am J Perinatol* 2016;33:977–982
218. McIntyre HD, Sacks DA, Barbour LA, et al. Issues with the diagnosis and classification of hyperglycemia in early pregnancy. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:53–54
219. Cavagnoli G, Pimentel AL, Freitas PAC, Gross JL, Camargo JL. Factors affecting A1C in non-diabetic individuals: review and meta-analysis. *Clin Chim Acta* 2015;445:107–114
220. Buchanan TA, Xiang A, Kjos SL, Watanabe R. What is gestational diabetes? *Diabetes Care* 2007;30(Suppl. 2):S105–S111
221. Noctor E, Crowe C, Carmody LA, et al.; ATLANTIC-DIP investigators. Abnormal glucose tolerance post-gestational diabetes mellitus as defined by the International Association of Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups criteria. *Eur J Endocrinol* 2016;175:287–297
222. Kim C, Newton KM, Knopp RH. Gestational diabetes and the incidence of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Care* 2002;25:1862–1868
223. Ratner RE, Christophi CA, Metzger BE, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Prevention of diabetes in women with a history of gestational diabetes: effects of metformin and lifestyle interventions. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2008;93:4774–4779
224. Aroda VR, Christophi CA, Edelstein SL, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. The effect of lifestyle intervention and metformin on preventing or delaying diabetes among women with and without gestational diabetes: the Diabetes Prevention Program outcomes study 10-year follow-up. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2015;100:1646–1653
225. Wang C, Wei Y, Zhang X, et al. A randomized clinical trial of exercise during pregnancy to prevent gestational diabetes mellitus and improve pregnancy outcome in overweight and obese pregnant women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2017;216:340–351
226. Metzger BE, Lowe LP, Dyer AR, et al.; HAPO Study Cooperative Research Group. Hyperglycemia and adverse pregnancy outcomes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:1991–2002
227. O'Sullivan JB, Mahan CM. Criteria for the oral glucose tolerance test in pregnancy. *Diabetes* 1964;13:278–285
228. Sacks DA, Hadden DR, Maresh M, et al.; HAPO Study Cooperative Research Group. Frequency of gestational diabetes mellitus at collaborating centers based on IADPSG consensus panel-recommended criteria: the Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome (HAPO) Study. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:526–528
229. Brown FM, Wyckoff J. Application of one-step IADPSG versus two-step diagnostic criteria for gestational diabetes in the real world: impact on health services, clinical care, and outcomes. *Curr Diab Rep* 2017;17:85
230. Lowe WL Jr, Scholtens DM, Lowe LP, et al.; HAPO Follow-up Study Cooperative Research Group. Association of gestational diabetes with maternal disorders of glucose metabolism and childhood adiposity. *JAMA* 2018;320:1005–1016
231. Lowe WL Jr, Scholtens DM, Kuang A, et al.; HAPO Follow-up Study Cooperative Research Group. Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome Follow-up Study (HAPO FUS): maternal gestational diabetes mellitus and childhood glucose metabolism. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:372–380
232. Landon MB, Spong CY, Thom E, et al.; Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units Network. A multicenter, randomized trial of treatment for mild gestational diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2009;361:1339–1348
233. Crowther CA, Hiller JE, Moss JR, McPhee AJ, Jeffries WS; Australian Carbohydrate Intolerance Study in Pregnant Women (ACHOIS) Trial Group. Effect of treatment of gestational diabetes mellitus on pregnancy outcomes. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:2477–2486
234. Hillier TA, Pedula KL, Ogasawara KK, et al. A pragmatic, randomized clinical trial of gestational diabetes screening. *N Engl J Med* 2021;384:895–904
235. Scholtens DM, Kuang A, Lowe LP, et al.; HAPO Follow-up Study Cooperative Research Group; HAPO Follow-Up Study Cooperative Research Group. Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome Follow-up Study (HAPO FUS): maternal glycemia and childhood glucose metabolism. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:381–392
236. Josefson JL, Scholtens DM, Kuang A, et al.; HAPO Follow-up Study Cooperative Research Group. Newborn adiposity and cord blood C-peptide as mediators of the maternal metabolic environment and childhood adiposity. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:1194–1202
237. Tam WH, Ma RCW, Ozaki R, et al. In utero exposure to maternal hyperglycemia increases childhood cardiometabolic risk in offspring. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:679–686
238. Landon MB, Rice MM, Varner MW, et al.; Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units (MFMU) Network. Mild gestational diabetes mellitus and long-term child health. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:445–452
239. Vandersten JP, Dodson WC, Espeland MA, et al. NIH consensus development conference: diagnosing gestational diabetes mellitus. *NIH Consens State Sci Statements* 2013;29:1–31
240. Committee on Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics. ACOG practice bulletin no. 190: gestational diabetes mellitus. *Obstet Gynecol* 2018;131:e49–e64
241. Donovan L, Hartling L, Muise M, Guthrie A, Vandermeer B, Dryden DM. Screening tests for gestational diabetes: a systematic review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;159:115–122
242. Khalafallah A, Phuah E, Al-Barazan AM, et al. Glycosylated haemoglobin for screening and diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus. *BMJ Open* 2016;6:e011059
243. Horvath K, Koch K, Jaitler K, et al. Effects of treatment in women with gestational diabetes mellitus: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2010;340:c1395
244. Carpenter MW, Coustan DR. Criteria for screening tests for gestational diabetes. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1982;144:768–773
245. National Diabetes Data Group. Classification and diagnosis of diabetes mellitus and other categories of glucose intolerance. *Diabetes* 1979;28:1039–1057
246. Harper LM, Mele L, Landon MB, et al.; Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Maternal-Fetal Medicine Units (MFMU) Network. Carpenter-Coustan compared with National Diabetes Data Group criteria for diagnosing gestational diabetes. *Obstet Gynecol* 2016;127:893–898
247. Werner EF, Pettker CM, Zuckerwise L, et al. Screening for gestational diabetes mellitus: are the criteria proposed by the International Association of the Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups cost-effective? *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:529–535
248. Duran A, Sáenz S, Torrejón MJ, et al. Introduction of IADPSG criteria for the screening and diagnosis of gestational diabetes mellitus results in improved pregnancy outcomes at a lower cost in a large cohort of pregnant women: the St. Carlos Gestational Diabetes Study. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2442–2450
249. Wei Y, Yang H, Zhu W, et al. International Association of Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Group criteria is suitable for gestational diabetes mellitus diagnosis: further evidence from China. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2014;127:3553–3556
250. Feldman RK, Tieu RS, Yasumura L. Gestational diabetes screening: the International Association of the Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups compared with Carpenter-Coustan screening. *Obstet Gynecol* 2016;127:10–17
251. Saccone G, Khalifeh A, Al-Kouatly HB, Sendek K, Berghella V. Screening for gestational diabetes mellitus: one step versus two step approach. A meta-analysis of randomized trials. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2020;33:1616–1624
252. Ethridge JK Jr, Catalano PM, Waters TP. Perinatal outcomes associated with the diagnosis of gestational diabetes made by the International Association of the Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups criteria. *Obstet Gynecol* 2014;124:571–578
253. Mayo K, Melamed N, Vandenbergh H, Berger H. The impact of adoption of the International Association of Diabetes in Pregnancy Study Group criteria for the screening and diagnosis of gestational diabetes. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2015;212:224.e1–224.e9
254. Hutchins J, Barajas RA, Hale D, Escaname E, Lynch J. Type 2 diabetes in a 5-year-old and single center experience of type 2 diabetes in youth under 10. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2017;18:674–677



### 3. Prevention or Delay of Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Comorbidities: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S39–S45 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S003>

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).

For guidelines related to screening for increased risk for type 2 diabetes (prediabetes), please refer to Section 2, “Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>). For guidelines related to screening, diagnosis, and management of type 2 diabetes in youth, please refer to Section 14, “Children and Adolescents” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>).

#### Recommendation

**3.1** Monitor for the development of type 2 diabetes in those with prediabetes at least annually, modified based on individual risk/benefit assessment. **E**

Screening for prediabetes and type 2 diabetes risk through an informal assessment of risk factors (**Table 2.3**) or with an assessment tool, such as the American Diabetes Association risk test (**Fig. 2.1**), is recommended to guide providers on whether performing a diagnostic test for prediabetes (**Table 2.5**) and previously undiagnosed type 2 diabetes (**Table 2.2**) is appropriate (see Section 2, “Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>). Testing high-risk patients for prediabetes is warranted because the laboratory assessment is safe and reasonable in cost, substantial time exists before the development of type 2 diabetes and its complications during which one can intervene, and there is an effective means of preventing type 2 diabetes in those determined to have prediabetes with an A1C 5.7–6.4% (39–47 mmol/mol), impaired glucose tolerance, or impaired fasting glucose. The utility of A1C screening for prediabetes and diabetes may be limited in the presence of hemoglobinopathies and conditions that affect red blood cell turnover. See

\*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. 3. Prevention or delay of type 2 diabetes and associated comorbidities: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45 (Suppl. 1):S39–S45

© 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>.

Section 2, “Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>), and Section 6, “Glycemic Targets” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>), for additional details on the appropriate use and limitations of A1C testing.

## LIFESTYLE BEHAVIOR CHANGE FOR DIABETES PREVENTION

### Recommendations

- 3.2** Refer adults with overweight/obesity at high risk of type 2 diabetes, as typified by the Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP), to an intensive lifestyle behavior change program consistent with the DPP to achieve and maintain 7% loss of initial body weight, and increase moderate-intensity physical activity (such as brisk walking) to at least 150 min/week. **A**
- 3.3** A variety of eating patterns can be considered to prevent diabetes in individuals with prediabetes. **B**
- 3.4** Given the cost-effectiveness of lifestyle behavior modification programs for diabetes prevention, such diabetes prevention programs should be offered to patients. **A** Diabetes prevention programs should be covered by third-party payers and inconsistencies in access should be addressed.
- 3.5** Based on patient preference, certified technology-assisted diabetes prevention programs may be effective in preventing type 2 diabetes and should be considered. **B**

### The Diabetes Prevention Program

Several major randomized controlled trials, including the Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP) (1), the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study (DPS) (2), and the Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Study (Da Qing study) (3), demonstrate that lifestyle/behavioral therapy with individualized reduced-calorie meal plan is highly effective in preventing or delaying type 2 diabetes and improving other cardiometabolic markers (such as blood pressure, lipids, and inflammation) (4). The strongest evidence for diabetes pre-

vention in the U.S. comes from the DPP trial (1). The DPP demonstrated that intensive lifestyle intervention could reduce the risk of incident type 2 diabetes by 58% over 3 years. Follow-up of three large studies of lifestyle intervention for diabetes prevention has shown sustained reduction in the risk of progression to type 2 diabetes: 39% reduction at 30 years in the Da Qing study (5), 43% reduction at 7 years in the Finnish DPS (2), and 34% reduction at 10 years (6) and 27% reduction at 15 years (7) in the U.S. Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study (DPPOS).

The two major goals of the DPP intensive lifestyle intervention were to achieve and maintain a minimum of 7% weight loss and 150 min of physical activity per week similar in intensity to brisk walking. The DPP lifestyle intervention was a goal-based intervention: all participants were given the same weight loss and physical activity goals, but individualization was permitted in the specific methods used to achieve the goals (8). Although weight loss was the most important factor to reduce the risk of incident diabetes, it was also found that achieving the target behavioral goal of at least 150 min of physical activity per week, even without achieving the weight loss goal, reduced the incidence of type 2 diabetes by 44% (9).

The 7% weight loss goal was selected because it was feasible to achieve and maintain and likely to lessen the risk of developing diabetes. Participants were encouraged to achieve the 7% weight loss during the first 6 months of the intervention. Further analysis suggests maximal prevention of diabetes with at least 7–10% weight loss (9). The recommended pace of weight loss was 1–2 lb/week. Calorie goals were calculated by estimating the daily calories needed to maintain the participant’s initial weight and subtracting 500–1,000 calories/day (depending on initial body weight). The initial focus was on reducing total dietary fat. After several weeks, the concept of calorie balance and the need to restrict calories as well as fat was introduced (8).

The goal for physical activity was selected to approximate at least 700 kcal/week expenditure from physical activity. For ease of translation, this goal was described as at least 150 min of moderate-intensity physical activity per

week similar in intensity to brisk walking. Participants were encouraged to distribute their activity throughout the week with a minimum frequency of three times per week and at least 10 min per session. A maximum of 75 min of strength training could be applied toward the total 150 min/week physical activity goal (8).

To implement the weight loss and physical activity goals, the DPP used an individual model of treatment rather than a group-based approach. This choice was based on a desire to intervene before participants had the possibility of developing diabetes or losing interest in the program. The individual approach also allowed for tailoring of interventions to reflect the diversity of the population (8).

The DPP intervention was administered as a structured core curriculum followed by a flexible maintenance program of individual counseling, group sessions, motivational campaigns, and restart opportunities. The 16-session core curriculum was completed within the first 24 weeks of the program and included sessions on lowering calories, increasing physical activity, self-monitoring, maintaining healthy lifestyle behaviors, and guidance on managing psychological, social, and motivational challenges. Further details are available regarding the core curriculum sessions (8).

### Nutrition

Dietary counseling for weight loss in the DPP lifestyle intervention arm included a reduction of total dietary fat and calories (1,8,9). However, evidence suggests that there is not an ideal percentage of calories from carbohydrate, protein, and fat for all people to prevent diabetes; therefore, macronutrient distribution should be based on an individualized assessment of current eating patterns, preferences, and metabolic goals (10). Based on other intervention trials, a variety of eating patterns characterized by the totality of food and beverages habitually consumed (10,11) may also be appropriate for patients with prediabetes (10), including Mediterranean-style and low-carbohydrate eating plans (12–15). Observational studies have also shown that vegetarian, plant-based (may include some animal products), and

Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) eating patterns are associated with a lower risk of developing type 2 diabetes (16–19). Evidence suggests that the overall quality of food consumed (as measured by the Healthy Eating Index, Alternative Healthy Eating Index, and DASH score), with an emphasis on whole grains, legumes, nuts, fruits, and vegetables and minimal refined and processed foods, is also associated with a lower risk of type 2 diabetes (18,20–22). As is the case for those with diabetes, individualized medical nutrition therapy (see Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>, for more detailed information) is effective in lowering A1C in individuals diagnosed with prediabetes (23).

### Physical Activity

Just as 150 min/week of moderate-intensity physical activity, such as brisk walking, showed beneficial effects in those with prediabetes (1), moderate-intensity physical activity has been shown to improve insulin sensitivity and reduce abdominal fat in children and young adults (24,25). On the basis of these findings, providers are encouraged to promote a DPP-style program, including a focus on physical activity, to all individuals who have been identified to be at an increased risk of type 2 diabetes. In addition to aerobic activity, an exercise regimen designed to prevent diabetes may include resistance training (8,26,27). Breaking up prolonged sedentary time may also be encouraged, as it is associated with moderately lower postprandial glucose levels (28,29). The preventive effects of exercise appear to extend to the prevention of gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) (30).

### Delivery and Dissemination of Lifestyle Behavior Change for Diabetes Prevention

Because the intensive lifestyle intervention in the DPP was effective in preventing type 2 diabetes among those at high risk for the disease and lifestyle behavior change programs for diabetes prevention were shown to be cost-effective, broader efforts to disseminate scalable lifestyle behavior change programs for diabetes prevention with coverage by third-party payers ensued (31–35). Group delivery of DPP content in community or primary

care settings has demonstrated the potential to reduce overall program costs while still producing weight loss and diabetes risk reduction (36–40).

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) developed the National Diabetes Prevention Program (National DPP), a resource designed to bring such evidence-based lifestyle change programs for preventing type 2 diabetes to communities ([www.cdc.gov/diabetes/prevention/index.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/prevention/index.htm)). This online resource includes locations of CDC-recognized diabetes prevention lifestyle change programs (available at [www.cdc.gov/diabetes/prevention/find-a-program.html](http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/prevention/find-a-program.html)). To be eligible for this program, patients must have a BMI in the overweight range and be at risk for diabetes based on laboratory testing, a previous diagnosis of GDM, or a positive risk test (available at [www.cdc.gov/prediabetes/takethetest/](http://www.cdc.gov/prediabetes/takethetest/)). Results from the CDC’s National DPP during the first 4 years of implementation are promising and demonstrate cost-efficacy (41). The CDC has also developed the Diabetes Prevention Impact Tool Kit (available at [nccd.cdc.gov/toolkit/diabetesimpact](http://nccd.cdc.gov/toolkit/diabetesimpact)) to help organizations assess the economics of providing or covering the National DPP lifestyle change program (42). In an effort to expand preventive services using a cost-effective model that began in April 2018, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services expanded Medicare reimbursement coverage for the National DPP lifestyle intervention to organizations recognized by the CDC that become Medicare suppliers for this service (at [innovation.cms.gov/innovation-models/medicare-diabetes-prevention-program](http://innovation.cms.gov/innovation-models/medicare-diabetes-prevention-program)). The locations of Medicare DPPs are available online at [innovation.cms.gov/innovation-models/medicare-diabetes-prevention-program/mdpp-map](http://innovation.cms.gov/innovation-models/medicare-diabetes-prevention-program/mdpp-map). To qualify for Medicare coverage, patients must have BMI >25 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (or BMI >23 kg/m<sup>2</sup> if self-identified as Asian) and laboratory testing consistent with prediabetes in the last year. Medicaid coverage of the DPP lifestyle intervention is also expanding on a state-by-state basis.

While CDC-recognized behavioral counseling programs, including Medicare DPP services, have met minimum quality standards and are reimbursed by many payers, there have been lower retention rates reported for younger adults and racial/ethnic minority populations (43). Therefore, other programs

and modalities of behavioral counseling for diabetes prevention may also be appropriate and efficacious based on patient preferences and availability. The use of community health workers to support DPP efforts has been shown to be effective and cost-effective (44,45) (see Section 1, “Improving Care and Promoting Health in Populations,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S001>, for more information). The use of community health workers may facilitate adoption of behavior changes for diabetes prevention while bridging barriers related to social determinants of health, though coverage by third-party payers remains problematic. Counseling by registered dietitians/registered dietitian nutritionists (RDNs) has been shown to help individuals with prediabetes improve eating habits, increase physical activity, and achieve 7–10% weight loss (10,46–48). Individualized medical nutrition therapy (see Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>, for more detailed information) is also effective in improving glycemia in individuals diagnosed with prediabetes (23,46). Furthermore, trials involving medical nutrition therapy for patients with prediabetes found significant reductions in weight, waist circumference, and glycemia. Individuals with prediabetes can benefit from referral to an RDN for individualized medical nutrition therapy upon diagnosis and at regular intervals throughout their treatment regimen (48,49). Other allied health professionals, such as pharmacists and diabetes care and education specialists, may be considered for diabetes prevention efforts (50,51).

Technology-assisted programs may effectively deliver the DPP program (52–57). Such technology-assisted programs may deliver content through smartphone, web-based applications, and telehealth and may be an acceptable and efficacious option to bridge barriers, particularly for low-income and rural patients; however, not all programs are effective in helping people reach targets for diabetes prevention (52,58–60). The CDC Diabetes Prevention Recognition Program (DPRP) ([www.cdc.gov/diabetes/prevention/requirements-recognition.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/prevention/requirements-recognition.htm)) certifies technology-assisted modalities as effective vehicles for DPP-based programs; such programs must use an approved curriculum,



include interaction with a coach, and attain the DPP outcomes of participation, physical activity reporting, and weight loss. Therefore, providers should consider referring patients with prediabetes to certified technology-assisted DPP programs based on patient preference.

## PHARMACOLOGIC INTERVENTIONS

### Recommendations

**3.6** Metformin therapy for prevention of type 2 diabetes should be considered in adults with prediabetes, as typified by the Diabetes Prevention Program, especially those aged 25–59 years with BMI  $\geq 35$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>, higher fasting plasma glucose (e.g.,  $\geq 110$  mg/dL), and higher A1C (e.g.,  $\geq 6.0\%$ ), and in women with prior gestational diabetes mellitus. **A**

**3.7** Long-term use of metformin may be associated with biochemical vitamin B12 deficiency; consider periodic measurement of vitamin B12 levels in metformin-treated patients, especially in those with anemia or peripheral neuropathy. **B**

Because weight loss through behavior changes in diet and exercise alone can be difficult to maintain long term (6), people being treated with weight loss therapy may benefit from support and additional pharmacotherapeutic options, if needed. Various pharmacologic agents used to treat diabetes have been evaluated for diabetes prevention. Metformin,  $\alpha$ -glucosidase inhibitors, liraglutide, thiazolidinediones, testosterone (61), and insulin have been shown to lower the incidence of diabetes in specific populations (62–67), whereas diabetes prevention was not seen with nateglinide (68). In addition, several weight loss medications like orlistat and phentermine topiramate have also been shown in research studies to decrease the incidence of diabetes to various degrees in those with prediabetes (69,70). Studies of other pharmacologic agents have shown some efficacy in diabetes prevention with valsartan but no efficacy in preventing diabetes with ramipril or anti-inflammatory drugs (71–74). Although

the Vitamin D and Type 2 Diabetes (D2d) prospective randomized controlled trial showed no significant benefit of vitamin D versus placebo on the progression to type 2 diabetes in individuals at high risk (75), post hoc analyses and meta-analyses suggest a potential benefit in specific populations (75–78). Further research is needed to define patient characteristics and clinical indicators where vitamin D supplementation may be of benefit (61).

No pharmacologic agent has been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration specifically for diabetes prevention. The risk versus benefit of each medication must be weighed. Metformin has the strongest evidence base (1) and demonstrated long-term safety as pharmacologic therapy for diabetes prevention (79). For other drugs, cost, side effects, treatment goals, and durable efficacy require consideration.

Metformin was overall less effective than lifestyle modification in the DPP, though group differences declined over time in the DPPOS (7), and metformin may be cost-saving over a 10-year period (33). During initial follow-up in the DPP, metformin was as effective as lifestyle modification in participants with BMI  $\geq 35$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> and in younger participants aged 25–44 years (1). In the DPP, for women with a history of GDM, metformin and intensive lifestyle modification led to an equivalent 50% reduction in diabetes risk (80), and both interventions remained highly effective during a 10-year follow-up period (81). By the time of the 15-year follow-up (DPPOS), exploratory analyses demonstrated that participants with a higher baseline fasting glucose ( $\geq 110$  mg/dL vs. 95–109 mg/dL), those with a higher A1C (6.0–6.4% vs.  $< 6.0\%$ ), and women with a history of GDM (vs. women without a history of GDM) experienced higher risk reductions with metformin, identifying subgroups of participants that benefitted the most from metformin (82). In the Indian Diabetes Prevention Program (IDPP-1), metformin and the lifestyle intervention reduced diabetes risk similarly at 30 months; of note, the lifestyle intervention in IDPP-1 was less intensive than that in the DPP (83). Based on findings from the DPP, metformin should be recommended as an option for high-risk individuals (e.g., those with a history of GDM or those with BMI  $\geq 35$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>). Consider

periodic monitoring of vitamin B12 levels in those taking metformin chronically to check for possible deficiency (84,85) (see Section 9, “Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>, for more details).

## PREVENTION OF VASCULAR DISEASE AND MORTALITY

### Recommendation

**3.8** Prediabetes is associated with heightened cardiovascular risk; therefore, screening for and treatment of modifiable risk factors for cardiovascular disease are suggested. **B**

People with prediabetes often have other cardiovascular risk factors, including hypertension and dyslipidemia (86), and are at increased risk for cardiovascular disease (87,88). Evaluation for tobacco use and referral for tobacco cessation, if indicated, should be part of routine care for those at risk for diabetes. Of note, the years immediately following smoking cessation may represent a time of increased risk for diabetes (89–91), a time when patients should be monitored for diabetes development and receive the concurrent evidence-based lifestyle behavior change for diabetes prevention described in this section. See Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>), for more detailed information. The lifestyle interventions for weight loss in study populations at risk for type 2 diabetes have shown a reduction in cardiovascular risk factors and the need for medications used to treat these cardiovascular risk factors (92,93). In longer-term follow-up, lifestyle interventions for diabetes prevention also prevented the development of microvascular complications among women enrolled in the DPPOS and in the study population enrolled in the China Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Outcome Study (7,94). The lifestyle intervention in the latter study was also efficacious in preventing cardiovascular disease and mortality at 23 and 30 years of follow-up (3,5). Treatment goals and therapies for hypertension and dyslipidemia in the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease for people with prediabetes should

be based on their level of cardiovascular risk, and increased vigilance is warranted to identify and treat these and other cardiovascular risk factors (95).

## PATIENT-CENTERED CARE GOALS

### Recommendation

**3.9** In adults with overweight/obesity at high risk of type 2 diabetes, care goals should include weight loss or prevention of weight gain, minimizing progression of hyperglycemia, and attention to cardiovascular risk and associated comorbidities. **B**

Individualized risk/benefit should be considered in screening, intervention, and monitoring for the prevention or delay of type 2 diabetes and associated comorbidities. Multiple factors, including age, BMI, and other comorbidities, may influence risk of progression to diabetes and lifetime risk of complications (96,97). In the DPP, which enrolled high-risk individuals with impaired glucose tolerance, elevated fasting glucose, and elevated BMI, the crude incidence of diabetes within the placebo arm was 11.0 cases per 100 person-years, with a cumulative 3-year incidence of diabetes of 28.9% (1). In the community-based Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) study, observational follow-up of older adults (mean age 75 years) with laboratory evidence of prediabetes (based on A1C 5.7–6.4% and/or fasting glucose 100–125 mg/dL) but not meeting specific BMI criteria found much lower progression to diabetes over 6 years: 9% of those with A1C-defined prediabetes, 8% with impaired fasting glucose (97).

Thus, it is important to individualize the risk/benefit of intervention and consider person-centered goals. Risk models have explored risk-based benefit, in general finding higher benefit of intervention in those at highest risk (9). Diabetes prevention and observational studies highlight several key principles, which may guide patient-centered goals. In the DPP, which enrolled a high-risk population meeting criteria for overweight/obesity, weight loss was an important mediator of diabetes prevention or delay, with greater metabolic benefit generally seen with greater

weight loss (9,98). In the DPP/DPPOS, progression to diabetes, duration of diabetes, and mean level of glycemia were important determinants of development of microvascular complications (7). Furthermore, ability to achieve normal glucose regulation, even once, during the DPP was associated with a lower risk of diabetes and lower risk of microvascular complications (99). Observational follow up of the Da Qing study also showed that regression from impaired glucose tolerance to normal glucose tolerance or remaining with impaired glucose tolerance rather than progressing to type 2 diabetes at the end of the 6-year intervention trial resulted in significantly lower risk of cardiovascular disease and microvascular disease over 30 years (100). Prediabetes is associated with increased cardiovascular disease and mortality (88), emphasizing the importance of attending to cardiovascular risk in this population.

## References

- Knowler WC, Barrett-Connor E, Fowler SE, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes with lifestyle intervention or metformin. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:393–403
- Lindström J, Ilanne-Parikka P, Peltonen M, et al.; Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study Group. Sustained reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes by lifestyle intervention: follow-up of the Finnish Diabetes Prevention Study. *Lancet* 2006;368:1673–1679
- Li G, Zhang P, Wang J, et al. Cardiovascular mortality, all-cause mortality, and diabetes incidence after lifestyle intervention for people with impaired glucose tolerance in the Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Study: a 23-year follow-up study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2:474–480
- Nathan DM, Bennett PH, Crandall JP, et al.; DPP Research Group. Does diabetes prevention translate into reduced long-term vascular complications of diabetes? *Diabetologia* 2019;62:1319–1328
- Gong Q, Zhang P, Wang J, et al.; Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Study Group. Morbidity and mortality after lifestyle intervention for people with impaired glucose tolerance: 30-year results of the Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Outcome Study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2019;7:452–461
- Knowler WC, Fowler SE, Hamman RF, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. 10-year follow-up of diabetes incidence and weight loss in the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study. *Lancet* 2009;374:1677–1686
- Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group; Nathan DM, Barrett-Connor E, Crandall JP, et al. Long-term effects of lifestyle intervention or metformin on diabetes development and microvascular complications: the DPP Outcomes Study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2015;3:866–875
- Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP) Research Group. The Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP): description of lifestyle intervention. *Diabetes Care* 2002;25:2165–2171
- Hamman RF, Wing RR, Edelstein SL, et al. Effect of weight loss with lifestyle intervention on risk of diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:2102–2107
- Evert AB, Dennison M, Gardner CD, et al. Nutrition therapy for adults with diabetes or prediabetes: a consensus report. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:731–754
- U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2020–2025. 9th Edition. December 2020. Accessed 30 October 2021. Available from <https://www.dietaryguidelines.gov/resources/2020-2025-dietary-guidelines-online-materials>
- Salas-Salvadó J, Guasch-Ferré M, Lee C-H, Estruch R, Clish CB, Ros E. Protective effects of the Mediterranean diet on type 2 diabetes and metabolic syndrome. *J Nutr* 2016;146:920S–927S
- Bloomfield HE, Koeller E, Greer N, MacDonald R, Kane R, Wilt TJ. Effects on health outcomes of a Mediterranean diet with no restriction on fat intake: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2016;165:491–500
- Estruch R, Ros E, Salas-Salvadó J, et al.; PREDIMED Study Investigators. Primary prevention of cardiovascular disease with a Mediterranean diet supplemented with extra-virgin olive oil or nuts. *N Engl J Med* 2018;378:e34
- Stentz FB, Brewer A, Wan J, et al. Remission of pre-diabetes to normal glucose tolerance in obese adults with high protein versus high carbohydrate diet: randomized control trial. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2016;4:e000258
- Chiu THT, Pan W-H, Lin M-N, Lin C-L. Vegetarian diet, change in dietary patterns, and diabetes risk: a prospective study. *Nutr Diabetes* 2018;8:12
- Lee Y, Park K. Adherence to a vegetarian diet and diabetes risk: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Nutrients* 2017;9:E603
- Qian F, Liu G, Hu FB, Bhupathiraju SN, Sun Q. Association between plant-based dietary patterns and risk of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern Med* 2019;179:1335–1344
- Esposito K, Chiodini P, Maiorino MI, Bellastella G, Panagiotakos D, Giugliano D. Which diet for prevention of type 2 diabetes? A meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Endocrine* 2014;47:107–116
- Ley SH, Hamdy O, Mohan V, Hu FB. Prevention and management of type 2 diabetes: dietary components and nutritional strategies. *Lancet* 2014;383:1999–2007
- Jacobs S, Harmon BE, Boushey CJ, et al. A priori-defined diet quality indexes and risk of type 2 diabetes: the Multiethnic Cohort. *Diabetologia* 2015;58:98–112
- Chiuve SE, Fung TT, Rimm EB, et al. Alternative dietary indices both strongly predict risk of chronic disease. *J Nutr* 2012;142:1009–1018
- Parker AR, Byham-Gray L, Denmark R, Winkle PJ. The effect of medical nutrition therapy by a registered dietitian nutritionist in patients with prediabetes participating in a randomized

- controlled clinical research trial. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2014;114:1739–1748
24. Fedewa MV, Gist NH, Evans EM, Dishman RK. Exercise and insulin resistance in youth: a meta-analysis. *Pediatrics* 2014;133:e163–e174
25. Davis CL, Pollock NK, Waller JL, et al. Exercise dose and diabetes risk in overweight and obese children: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2012;308:1103–1112
26. Sigal RJ, Alberga AS, Goldfield GS, et al. Effects of aerobic training, resistance training, or both on percentage body fat and cardiometabolic risk markers in obese adolescents: the Healthy Eating Aerobic and Resistance Training in Youth randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Pediatr* 2014;168:1006–1014
27. Dai X, Zhai L, Chen Q, et al. Two-year-supervised resistance training prevented diabetes incidence in people with prediabetes: a randomised control trial. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2019;35:e3143
28. Thorp AA, Kingwell BA, Sethi P, Hammond L, Owen N, Dunstan DW. Alternating bouts of sitting and standing attenuate postprandial glucose responses. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2014;46:2053–2061
29. Healy GN, Dunstan DW, Salmon J, et al. Breaks in sedentary time: beneficial associations with metabolic risk. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:661–666
30. Russo LM, Nobles C, Ertel KA, Chasan-Taber L, Whitcomb BW. Physical activity interventions in pregnancy and risk of gestational diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obstet Gynecol* 2015;125:576–582
31. Herman WH, Hoerger TJ, Brandle M, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. The cost-effectiveness of lifestyle modification or metformin in preventing type 2 diabetes in adults with impaired glucose tolerance. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;142:323–332
32. Chen F, Su W, Becker SH, et al. Clinical and economic impact of a digital, remotely-delivered intensive behavioral counseling program on Medicare beneficiaries at risk for diabetes and cardiovascular disease. *PLoS One* 2016;11:e0163627
33. Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. The 10-year cost-effectiveness of lifestyle intervention or metformin for diabetes prevention: an intent-to-treat analysis of the DPP/DPPOS. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:723–730
34. Alva ML, Hoerger TJ, Jeyaraman R, Amico P, Rojas-Smith L. Impact of the YMCA of the USA Diabetes Prevention Program on Medicare spending and utilization. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2017;36:417–424
35. Zhou X, Siegel KR, Ng BP, et al. Cost-effectiveness of diabetes prevention interventions targeting high-risk individuals and whole populations: a systematic review. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1593–1616
36. Ackermann RT, Finch EA, Brizendine E, Zhou H, Marrero DG. Translating the Diabetes Prevention Program into the community. The DEPLOY Pilot Study. *Am J Prev Med* 2008;35:357–363
37. Balk EM, Earley A, Raman G, Avendano EA, Pittas AG, Remington PL. Combined diet and physical activity promotion programs to prevent type 2 diabetes among persons at increased risk: a systematic review for the Community Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;163:437–451
38. Li R, Qu S, Zhang P, et al. Economic evaluation of combined diet and physical activity promotion programs to prevent type 2 diabetes among persons at increased risk: a systematic review for the Community Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;163:452–460
39. Gilmer T, O'Connor PJ, Schiff JS, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a community-based Diabetes Prevention Program with participation incentives for Medicaid beneficiaries. *Health Serv Res* 2018;53:4704–4724
40. Ackermann RT, Kang R, Cooper AJ, et al. Effect on health care expenditures during nationwide implementation of the Diabetes Prevention Program as a health insurance benefit. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:1776–1783
41. Ely EK, Gruss SM, Luman ET, et al. A national effort to prevent type 2 diabetes: participant-level evaluation of CDC's National Diabetes Prevention Program. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1331–1341
42. Lanza A, Soler R, Smith B, Hoerger T, Neuwahl S, Zhang P. The Diabetes Prevention Impact Tool Kit: an online tool kit to assess the cost-effectiveness of preventing type 2 diabetes. *J Public Health Manag Pract* 2019;25:E1–E5
43. Cannon MJ, Masalovich S, Ng BP, et al. Retention among participants in the National Diabetes Prevention Program lifestyle change program, 2012–2017. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2042–2049
44. The Community Guide. Diabetes Prevention: Interventions Engaging Community Health Workers, 2016. Accessed 15 October 2021. Available from <https://www.thecommunityguide.org/findings/diabetes-prevention-interventions-engaging-community-health-workers>
45. Jacob V, Chattopadhyay SK, Hopkins DP, et al. Economics of community health workers for chronic disease: findings from Community Guide systematic reviews. *Am J Prev Med* 2019;56:e95–e106
46. Raynor HA, Davidson PG, Burns H, et al. Medical nutrition therapy and weight loss questions for the Evidence Synthesis Library prevention of type 2 diabetes project: systematic reviews. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2017;117:1578–1611
47. Sun Y, You W, Almeida F, Estabrooks P, Davy B. The effectiveness and cost of lifestyle interventions including nutrition education for diabetes prevention: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2017;117:404–421.e36
48. Briggs Early K, Stanley K. Position of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics: the role of medical nutrition therapy and registered dietitian nutritionists in the prevention and treatment of prediabetes and type 2 diabetes. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2018;118:343–353
49. Powers MA, Bardsley JK, Cypress M, et al. Diabetes self-management education and support in adults with type 2 diabetes: a consensus report of the American Diabetes Association, the Association of Diabetes Care & Education Specialists, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of PAs, the American Association of Nurse Practitioners, and the American Pharmacists Association. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1636–1649
50. Hudspeth BD. Power of prevention: the pharmacist's role in prediabetes management. *Diabetes Spectr* 2018;31:320–323
51. Butcher MK, Vanderwood KK, Hall TO, Gohdes D, Helgerson SD, Harwell TS. Capacity of diabetes education programs to provide both diabetes self-management education and to implement diabetes prevention services. *J Public Health Manag Pract* 2011;17:242–247
52. Grock S, Ku J-H, Kim J, Moin T. A Review of technology-assisted interventions for diabetes prevention. *Curr Diab Rep* 2017;17:107
53. 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
54. Bian RR, Piatt GA, Sen A, et al. The effect of technology-mediated diabetes prevention interventions on weight: a meta-analysis. *J Med Internet Res* 2017;19:e76
55. Sepah SC, Jiang L, Peters AL. Long-term outcomes of a web-based diabetes prevention program: 2-year results of a single-arm longitudinal study. *J Med Internet Res* 2015;17:e92
56. Moin T, Damschroder LJ, AuYoung M, et al. Results from a trial of an online Diabetes Prevention Program intervention. *Am J Prev Med* 2018;55:583–591
57. Michaelides A, Major J, Pienkosz E Jr, Wood M, Kim Y, Toro-Ramos T. Usefulness of a novel mobile Diabetes Prevention Program delivery platform with human coaching: 65-week observational follow-up. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth* 2018;6:e93
58. Kim SE, Castro Sweet CM, Cho E, Tsai J, Cousineau MR. Evaluation of a digital diabetes prevention program adapted for low-income patients, 2016–2018. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2019;16:E155
59. Vadheim LM, Patch K, Brokaw SM, et al. Telehealth delivery of the Diabetes Prevention Program to rural communities. *Transl Behav Med* 2017;7:286–291
60. Fischer HH, Durfee MJ, Raghunath SG, Ritchie ND. Short message service text message support for weight loss in patients with prediabetes: pragmatic trial. *JMIR Diabetes* 2019;4:e12985
61. Wittert G, Bracken K, Robledo KP, et al. Testosterone treatment to prevent or revert type 2 diabetes in men enrolled in a lifestyle programme (T4DM): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, 2-year, phase 3b trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2021;9:32–45
62. Chiasson J-L, Josse RG, Gomis R, Hanefeld M, Karasik A; STOP-NIDDM Trial Research Group. Acarbose for prevention of type 2 diabetes mellitus: the STOP-NIDDM randomised trial. *Lancet* 2002;359:2072–2077
63. le Roux CW, Astrup A, Fujioka K, et al.; SCALE Obesity Prediabetes NN8022-1839 Study Group. 3 years of liraglutide versus placebo for type 2 diabetes risk reduction and weight management in individuals with prediabetes: a randomised, double-blind trial. *Lancet* 2017;389:1399–1409
64. Gerstein HC, Yusuf S, Bosch J, et al.; DREAM (Diabetes REduction Assessment with ramipril and rosiglitazone Medication) Trial Investigators. Effect of rosiglitazone on the frequency of diabetes in patients with impaired glucose tolerance or impaired fasting glucose: a



- randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2006;368:1096–1105
65. DeFronzo RA, Tripathy D, Schwenke DC, et al.; ACT NOW Study. Pioglitazone for diabetes prevention in impaired glucose tolerance. *N Engl J Med* 2011;364:1104–1115
66. Kawamori R, Tajima N, Iwamoto Y, Kashiwagi A, Shimamoto K; Voglibose Ph-3 Study Group. Voglibose for prevention of type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomised, double-blind trial in Japanese individuals with impaired glucose tolerance. *Lancet* 2009;373:1607–1614
67. Gerstein HC, Bosch J, Dagenais GR, et al.; ORIGIN Trial Investigators. Basal insulin and cardiovascular and other outcomes in dysglycemia. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367:319–328
68. Holman RR, Haffner SM, McMurray JJ, et al.; NAVIGATOR Study Group. Effect of nateglinide on the incidence of diabetes and cardiovascular events. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1463–1476
69. Torgerson JS, Hauptman J, Boldrin MN, Sjöström L. XENical in the prevention of diabetes in obese subjects (XENDOS) study: a randomized study of orlistat as an adjunct to lifestyle changes for the prevention of type 2 diabetes in obese patients. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:155–161
70. Garvey WT, Ryan DH, Henry R, et al. Prevention of type 2 diabetes in subjects with prediabetes and metabolic syndrome treated with phentermine and topiramate extended release. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:912–921
71. McMurray JJ, Holman RR, Haffner SM, et al.; NAVIGATOR Study Group. Effect of valsartan on the incidence of diabetes and cardiovascular events. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1477–1490
72. Bosch J, Yusuf S, Gerstein HC, et al.; DREAM Trial Investigators. Effect of ramipril on the incidence of diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355:1551–1562
73. Everett BM, Donath MY, Pradhan AD, et al. Anti-inflammatory therapy with canakinumab for the prevention and management of diabetes. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;71:2392–2401
74. Ray KK, Colhoun HM, Szarek M, et al.; ODYSSEY OUTCOMES Committees and Investigators. Effects of alirocumab on cardiovascular and metabolic outcomes after acute coronary syndrome in patients with or without diabetes: a prespecified analysis of the ODYSSEY OUTCOMES randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2019;7:618–628
75. Pittas AG, Dawson-Hughes B, Sheehan P, et al.; D2d Research Group. Vitamin D supplementation and prevention of type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:520–530
76. Dawson-Hughes B, Staten MA, Knowler WC, et al.; D2d Research Group. Intratrial exposure to vitamin D and new-onset diabetes among adults with prediabetes: a secondary analysis from the Vitamin D and Type 2 Diabetes (D2d) study. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2916–2922
77. Zhang Y, Tan H, Tang J, et al. Effects of vitamin D supplementation on prevention of type 2 diabetes in patients with prediabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1650–1658
78. Barbarawi M, Zayed Y, Barbarawi O, et al. Effect of vitamin D supplementation on the incidence of diabetes mellitus. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2020;105:dga335
79. Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Long-term safety, tolerability, and weight loss associated with metformin in the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:731–737
80. Ratner RE, Christophi CA, Metzger BE, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Prevention of diabetes in women with a history of gestational diabetes: effects of metformin and lifestyle interventions. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2008;93:4774–4779
81. Aroda VR, Christophi CA, Edelstein SL, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. The effect of lifestyle intervention and metformin on preventing or delaying diabetes among women with and without gestational diabetes: the Diabetes Prevention Program outcomes study 10-year follow-up. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2015;100:1646–1653
82. Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Long-term effects of metformin on diabetes prevention: identification of subgroups that benefited most in the Diabetes Prevention Program and Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:601–608
83. Ramachandran A, Snehalatha C, Mary S, Mukesh B, Bhaskar AD; Indian Diabetes Prevention Programme (IDPP). The Indian Diabetes Prevention Programme shows that lifestyle modification and metformin prevent type 2 diabetes in Asian Indian subjects with impaired glucose tolerance (IDPP-1). *Diabetologia* 2006;49:289–297
84. Griffin SJ, Bethel MA, Holman RR, et al. Metformin in non-diabetic hyperglycaemia: the GLINT feasibility RCT. *Health Technol Assess* 2018;22:1–64
85. Aroda VR, Edelstein SL, Goldberg RB, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Long-term metformin use and vitamin B12 deficiency in the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2016;101:1754–1761
86. Ali MK, Bullard KM, Saydah S, Imperatore G, Gregg EW. Cardiovascular and renal burdens of prediabetes in the USA: analysis of data from serial cross-sectional surveys, 1988–2014. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2018;6:392–403
87. Pan Y, Chen W, Wang Y. Prediabetes and outcome of ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis* 2019;28:683–692
88. Huang Y, Cai X, Mai W, Li M, Hu Y. Association between prediabetes and risk of cardiovascular disease and all cause mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2016;355:i5953
89. Yeh H-C, Duncan BB, Schmidt MI, Wang N-Y, Brancati FL. Smoking, smoking cessation, and risk for type 2 diabetes mellitus: a cohort study. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;152:10–17
90. Oba S, Noda M, Waki K, et al.; Japan Public Health Center-Based Prospective Study Group. Smoking cessation increases short-term risk of type 2 diabetes irrespective of weight gain: the Japan Public Health Center-Based Prospective Study [published correction appears in *PLoS One* 2013;8:10.1371/annotation/23aa7c42-9a4d-42a7-8f50-9d0ac4b85396] *PLoS One* 2012;7:e17061
91. Hu Y, Zong G, Liu G, et al. Smoking cessation, weight change, type 2 diabetes, and mortality. *N Engl J Med* 2018;379:623–632
92. Orchard TJ, Temprowsa M, Barrett-Connor E, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study Research Group. Long-term effects of the Diabetes Prevention Program interventions on cardiovascular risk factors: a report from the DPP Outcomes Study. *Diabet Med* 2013;30:46–55
93. Salas-Salvadó J, Díaz-López A, Ruiz-Canela M, et al.; PREDIMED-Plus investigators. Effect of a lifestyle intervention program with energy-restricted Mediterranean diet and exercise on weight loss and cardiovascular risk factors: one-year results of the PREDIMED-Plus trial. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:777–788
94. Gong Q, Gregg EW, Wang J, et al. Long-term effects of a randomised trial of a 6-year lifestyle intervention in impaired glucose tolerance on diabetes-related microvascular complications: the China Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Outcome Study. *Diabetologia* 2011;54:300–307
95. Arnett DK, Blumenthal RS, Albert MA, et al. 2019 ACC/AHA Guideline on the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation* 2019;140:e596–e646
96. Nadeau KJ, Anderson BJ, Berg EG, et al. Youth-onset type 2 diabetes consensus report: current status, challenges, and priorities. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1635–1642
97. Rooney MR, Rawlings AM, Pankow JS, et al. Risk of progression to diabetes among older adults with prediabetes. *JAMA Intern Med* 2021;181:511–519
98. Lachin JM, Christophi CA, Edelstein SL, et al.; DDK Research Group. Factors associated with diabetes onset during metformin versus placebo therapy in the diabetes prevention program. *Diabetes* 2007;56:1153–1159
99. Perreault L, Pan Q, Schroeder EB, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Regression From prediabetes to normal glucose regulation and prevalence of microvascular disease in the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study (DPPOS). *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:1809–1815
100. Chen Y, Zhang P, Wang J, et al. Associations of progression to diabetes and regression to normal glucose tolerance with development of cardiovascular and microvascular disease among people with impaired glucose tolerance: a secondary analysis of the 30 year Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Outcome Study. *Diabetologia* 2021;64:1279–1287





## 4. Comprehensive Medical Evaluation and Assessment of Comorbidities: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S46–S59 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S004>

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).

### PATIENT-CENTERED COLLABORATIVE CARE

#### Recommendations

- 4.1 A patient-centered communication style that uses person-centered and strength-based language and active listening; elicits patient preferences and beliefs; and assesses literacy, numeracy, and potential barriers to care should be used to optimize patient health outcomes and health-related quality of life. **B**
- 4.2 People with diabetes can benefit from a coordinated multidisciplinary team that may include and is not limited to diabetes care and education specialists, primary care and subspecialty clinicians, nurses, dietitians, exercise specialists, pharmacists, dentists, podiatrists, and mental health professionals. **E**

A successful medical evaluation depends on beneficial interactions between the patient and the care team. The Chronic Care Model (1–3) (see Section 1, “Improving Care and Promoting Health in Populations,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S001>) is a patient-centered approach to care that requires a close working relationship between the patient and clinicians involved in treatment planning. People with diabetes should receive health care from a coordinated interdisciplinary team that may include but is not limited to diabetes care and education specialists, primary care and subspecialty clinicians, nurses, dietitians, exercise specialists, pharmacists, dentists, podiatrists, and mental health professionals. Individuals with diabetes must assume an active role in their care. Based on patient

\*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. 4. Comprehensive medical evaluation and assessment of comorbidities: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45 (Suppl. 1):S46–S59

© 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>.

preferences, the patient, family or support people, and health care team together formulate the management plan, which includes lifestyle management (see Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>).

The goals of treatment for diabetes are to prevent or delay complications and optimize quality of life (Fig. 4.1). Treatment goals and plans should be created with patients based on their individual preferences, values, and goals. This individualized management plan should take into account the patient’s age, cognitive abilities, school/work schedule and conditions, health beliefs, support systems, eating patterns, physical activity, social situation, financial concerns, cultural factors, literacy and numeracy (mathematical literacy), diabetes history (duration, complications, current use of medications), comorbidities, disabilities, health priorities, other medical conditions, preferences for care, and life expectancy. Various strategies and

techniques should be used to support patients’ self-management efforts, including providing education on problem-solving skills for all aspects of diabetes management.

Provider communication with patients and families should acknowledge that multiple factors impact glycemic management but also emphasize that collaboratively developed treatment plans and a healthy lifestyle can significantly improve disease outcomes and well-being (4–7). Thus, the goal of provider-patient communication is to establish a collaborative relationship and to assess and address self-management barriers without blaming patients for “noncompliance” or “nonadherence” when the outcomes of self-management are not optimal (8). The familiar terms “noncompliance” and “nonadherence” denote a passive, obedient role for a person with diabetes in “following doctor’s orders” that is at odds with the active role people with diabetes take in directing the day-to-day decision-making, planning, monitoring, evaluation, and problem-solving involved

in diabetes self-management. Using a nonjudgmental approach that normalizes periodic lapses in self-management may help minimize patients’ resistance to reporting problems with self-management. Empathizing and using active listening techniques, such as open-ended questions, reflective statements, and summarizing what the patient said, can help facilitate communication. Patients’ perceptions about their own ability, or self-efficacy, to self-manage diabetes constitute one important psychosocial factor related to improved diabetes self-management and treatment outcomes in diabetes (9–11) and should be a target of ongoing assessment, patient education, and treatment planning.

Language has a strong impact on perceptions and behavior. The use of empowering language in diabetes care and education can help to inform and motivate people, yet language that shames and judges may undermine this effort. The American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the Association of Diabetes Care & Education Specialists (formerly

### DECISION CYCLE FOR PATIENT-CENTERED GLYCEMIC MANAGEMENT IN TYPE 2 DIABETES




Figure 4.1—Decision cycle for patient-centered glycemic management in type 2 diabetes. Adapted from Davies et al. (104).

called American Association of Diabetes Educators) joint consensus report, “The Use of Language in Diabetes Care and Education,” provides the authors’ expert opinion regarding the use of language by health care professionals when speaking or writing about diabetes for people with diabetes or for professional audiences (12). Although further research is needed to address the impact of language on diabetes outcomes, the report includes five key consensus recommendations for language use:

- Use language that is neutral, non-judgmental, and based on facts, actions, or physiology/biology.
- Use language free from stigma.
- Use language that is strength based, respectful, and inclusive and that imparts hope.
- Use language that fosters collaboration between patients and providers.
- Use language that is person centered (e.g., “person with diabetes” is preferred over “diabetic”).

## COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL EVALUATION

### Recommendations

**4.3** A complete medical evaluation should be performed at the initial visit to:

- Confirm the diagnosis and classify diabetes. **A**
- Evaluate for diabetes complications and potential comorbid conditions. **A**
- Review previous treatment and risk factor control in patients with established diabetes. **A**
- Begin patient engagement in the formulation of a care management plan. **A**
- Develop a plan for continuing care. **A**

**4.4** A follow-up visit should include most components of the initial comprehensive medical evaluation (see **Table 4.1**). **A**

**4.5** Ongoing management should be guided by the assessment of overall health status, diabetes complications, cardiovascular risk, hypoglycemia risk, and shared decision-making to set therapeutic goals. **B**

The comprehensive medical evaluation includes the initial and follow-up evaluations, assessment of complications, psychosocial assessment, management of comorbid conditions, and engagement of the patient throughout the process. While a comprehensive list is provided in **Table 4.1**, in clinical practice the provider may need to prioritize the components of the medical evaluation given the available resources and time. The goal is to provide the health care team information so it can optimally support a patient. In addition to the medical history, physical examination, and laboratory tests, providers should assess diabetes self-management behaviors, nutrition, social determinants of health, and psychosocial health (see Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>) and give guidance on routine immunizations. The assessment of sleep pattern and duration should be considered; a meta-analysis found that poor sleep quality, short sleep, and long sleep were associated with higher A1C in people with type 2 diabetes (13). Interval follow-up visits should occur at least every 3–6 months individualized to the patient, and then at least annually.

Lifestyle management and psychosocial care are the cornerstones of diabetes management. Patients should be referred for diabetes self-management education and support, medical nutrition therapy, and assessment of psychosocial/emotional health concerns if indicated. Patients should receive recommended preventive care services (e.g., immunizations, cancer screening, etc.); smoking cessation counseling; and ophthalmological, dental, and podiatric referrals, as needed.

The assessment of risk of acute and chronic diabetes complications and treatment planning are key components of initial and follow-up visits (**Table 4.2**). The risk of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease and heart failure (see Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>), chronic kidney disease staging (see Section 11, “Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>), presence of retinopathy (see Section 12, “Retinopathy, Neuropathy, and Foot Care,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S012>), and risk of treatment-associated hypoglycemia (**Table 4.3**) should be used to individualize targets for glycemia (see Section 6, “Glycemic Targets,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>), blood pressure, and lipids and to select specific glucose-lowering medication (see Section 9, “Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>), antihypertension medication, and statin treatment intensity.

Additional referrals should be arranged as necessary (**Table 4.4**). Clinicians should ensure that individuals with diabetes are appropriately screened for complications and comorbidities. Discussing and implementing an approach to glycemic control with the patient is a part, not the sole goal, of the patient encounter.

Additional referrals should be arranged as necessary (**Table 4.4**). Clinicians should ensure that individuals with diabetes are appropriately screened for complications and comorbidities. Discussing and implementing an approach to glycemic control with the patient is a part, not the sole goal, of the patient encounter.

## IMMUNIZATIONS

### Recommendation

**4.6** Provide routinely recommended vaccinations for children and adults with diabetes as indicated by age (see **Table 4.5** for highly recommended vaccinations for adults with diabetes). **A**

The importance of routine vaccinations for people living with diabetes has been elevated by the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. Preventing avoidable infections not only directly prevents morbidity but also reduces hospitalizations, which may additionally reduce risk of acquiring infections such as COVID-19. Children and adults with diabetes should receive vaccinations according to age-appropriate recommendations (14,15). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provides vaccination schedules specifically for children, adolescents, and adults with diabetes (see [www.cdc.gov/vaccines/](http://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/)). The CDC Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) makes recommendations based on its own review and rating of the evidence, provided in **Table 4.5** for selected vaccinations. The ACIP evidence review has evolved over time with the adoption of Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) in 2010 and then the Evidence to Decision or Evidence to Recommendation frameworks



**Table 4.1 - Components of the comprehensive diabetes medical evaluation at initial, follow-up, and annual visits**

		INITIAL VISIT	EVERY FOLLOW-UP VISIT	ANNUAL VISIT
<b>PAST MEDICAL AND FAMILY HISTORY</b>	<b>Diabetes history</b>			
	▪ Characteristics at onset (e.g., age, symptoms)	✓		
	▪ Review of previous treatment regimens and response	✓		
	▪ Assess frequency/cause/severity of past hospitalizations	✓		
	<b>Family history</b>			
	▪ Family history of diabetes in a first-degree relative	✓		
	▪ Family history of autoimmune disorder	✓		
	<b>Personal history of complications and common comorbidities</b>			
	▪ Common comorbidities (e.g., obesity, OSA, NAFLD)	✓		✓
	▪ High blood pressure or abnormal lipids	✓		✓
	▪ Macrovascular and microvascular complications	✓		✓
	▪ Hypoglycemia: awareness/frequency/causes/timing of episodes	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Presence of hemoglobinopathies or anemias	✓		✓
▪ Last dental visit	✓		✓	
▪ Last dilated eye exam	✓		✓	
▪ Visits to specialists	✓	✓	✓	
<b>Interval history</b>				
▪ Changes in medical/family history since last visit		✓	✓	
<b>BEHAVIORAL FACTORS</b>	▪ Eating patterns and weight history	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Assess familiarity with carbohydrate counting (e.g., type 1 diabetes, type 2 diabetes treated with MDI)	✓		✓
	▪ Physical activity and sleep behaviors	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Tobacco, alcohol, and substance use	✓		✓
<b>MEDICATIONS AND VACCINATIONS</b>	▪ Current medication regimen	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Medication-taking behavior	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Medication intolerance or side effects	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Complementary and alternative medicine use	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Vaccination history and needs	✓		✓
<b>TECHNOLOGY USE</b>	▪ Assess use of health apps, online education, patient portals, etc.	✓		✓
	▪ Glucose monitoring (meter/CGM): results and data use	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Review insulin pump settings and use, connected pen and glucose data	✓	✓	✓
<b>SOCIAL LIFE ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>Social network</b>			
	▪ Identify existing social supports	✓		✓
	▪ Identify surrogate decision maker, advanced care plan	✓		✓
	▪ Identify social determinants of health (e.g., food security, housing stability & homelessness, transportation access, financial security, community safety)	✓		✓

Continued on p. S50

**Table 4.1 (cont.)- Components of the comprehensive diabetes medical evaluation at initial, follow-up, and annual visits**

		INITIAL VISIT	EVERY FOLLOW-UP VISIT	ANNUAL VISIT
<b>PHYSICAL EXAMINATION</b>	▪ Height, weight, and BMI; growth/pubertal development in children and adolescents	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Blood pressure determination	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Orthostatic blood pressure measures (when indicated)	✓		
	▪ Fundoscopic examination (refer to eye specialist)	✓		✓
	▪ Thyroid palpation	✓		✓
	▪ Skin examination (e.g., acanthosis nigricans, insulin injection or insertion sites, lipodystrophy)	✓	✓	✓
	▪ Comprehensive foot examination			
	• Visual inspection (e.g., skin integrity, callous formation, foot deformity or ulcer, toenails)**	✓		✓
	• Screen for PAD (pedal pulses—refer for ABI if diminished)	✓		✓
	• Determination of temperature, vibration or pinprick sensation, and 10-g monofilament exam	✓		✓
	▪ Screen for depression, anxiety, and disordered eating	✓		✓
	▪ Consider assessment for functional performance*	✓		✓
	▪ Consider assessment for functional performance*	✓		✓
<b>LABORATORY EVALUATION</b>	▪ A1C, if the results are not available within the past 3 months	✓	✓	✓
	▪ If not performed/available within the past year	✓		✓
	• Lipid profile, including total, LDL, and HDL cholesterol and triglycerides#	✓		✓^
	• Liver function tests#	✓		✓
	• Spot urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio	✓		✓
	• Serum creatinine and estimated glomerular filtration rate+	✓		✓
	• Thyroid-stimulating hormone in patients with type 1 diabetes#	✓		✓
	• Vitamin B12 if on metformin	✓		✓
• Serum potassium levels in patients on ACE inhibitors, ARBs, or diuretics+	✓		✓	

ABI, ankle-brachial pressure index; ARBs, angiotensin receptor blockers; CGM, continuous glucose monitors; MDI, multiple daily injections; NAFLD, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease; OSA obstructive sleep apnea; PAD, peripheral arterial disease

\*At 65 years of age or older

+May be needed more frequently in patients with known chronic kidney disease or with changes in medications that affect kidney function and serum potassium (see Table 11.1)

#May also need to be checked after initiation or dose changes of medications that affect these laboratory values (i.e., diabetes medications, blood pressure medications, cholesterol medications, or thyroid medications)

^In people without dyslipidemia and not on cholesterol-lowering therapy, testing may be less frequent

\*\*Should be performed at every visit in patients with sensory loss, previous foot ulcers, or amputations

in 2018 (16). Here we discuss the particular importance of specific vaccines.

**Influenza**

Influenza is a common, preventable infectious disease associated with high mortality and morbidity in vulnerable populations, including youth, older adults, and people with chronic diseases. Influenza vaccination in people

with diabetes has been found to significantly reduce influenza and diabetes-related hospital admissions (17). In patients with diabetes and cardiovascular disease, influenza vaccine has been associated with lower risk of all-cause mortality, cardiovascular mortality, and cardiovascular events (18). Given the benefits of the annual influenza vaccination, it is recommended for all individuals ≥6 months of age who do

not have a contraindication. Influenza vaccination is critically important in the next year as the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and influenza viruses will both be active in the U.S. during the 2021–2022 season (19). The live attenuated influenza vaccine, which is delivered by nasal spray, is an option for patients who are age 2 years through age 49 years and who are

**Table 4.2—Assessment and treatment plan\***

## Assessing risk of diabetes complications

- ASCVD and heart failure history
- ASCVD risk factors and 10-year ASCVD risk assessment
- Staging of chronic kidney disease (see **Table 11.1**)
- Hypoglycemia risk (see **Table 4.3**)
- Assessment for retinopathy
- Assessment for neuropathy

## Goal setting

- Set A1C/blood glucose/time in range target
- If hypertension is present, establish blood pressure target
- Diabetes self-management goals

## Therapeutic treatment plans

- Lifestyle management
- Pharmacologic therapy: glucose lowering
- Pharmacologic therapy: cardiovascular and renal disease risk factors
- Use of glucose monitoring and insulin delivery devices
- Referral to diabetes education and medical specialists (as needed)

ASCVD, atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease. \*Assessment and treatment planning are essential components of initial and all follow-up visits.

not pregnant, but patients with chronic conditions such as diabetes are cautioned against taking the live attenuated influenza vaccine and are instead recommended to receive the inactive or recombinant influenza vaccination. For individuals  $\geq 65$  years of age, there may be additional benefit from the high-dose quadrivalent inactivated influenza vaccine (19).

**Pneumococcal Pneumonia**

Like influenza, pneumococcal pneumonia is a common, preventable disease. People with diabetes are at increased risk for the bacteremic form of pneumococcal infection and have been reported to have a high risk of nosocomial bacteremia, with a mortality rate as high as 50% (20). There are two vaccination types, the 23-valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine (PPSV23)

and the 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine (PCV13), with distinct schedules for children and adults.

All children are recommended to receive a four-dose series of PCV13 by 15 months of age. For children with diabetes who have incomplete series by ages 2–5 years, the CDC recommends a catch-up schedule to ensure that these children have four doses. Children with diabetes between 6–18 years of age are also advised to receive one dose of PPSV23, preferably after receipt of PCV13.

For adults with diabetes, one dose of PPSV23 is recommended between the ages of 19 and 64 years and another dose at  $\geq 65$  years of age. The PCV13 is no longer routinely recommended for patients over 65 years of age because of the declining rates of pneumonia attributable to these strains (21). Older patients should have a shared decision-making discussion with their provider to determine individualized risks and benefits. PCV13 is recommended for patients with immunocompromising conditions such as asplenia, advanced kidney disease, cochlear implants, or cerebrospinal fluid leaks (22). Some older patients residing in assisted living facilities may also consider PCV13. If the PCV13 is to be administered, it should be given prior to the next dose of PPSV23.

**Table 4.3—Assessment of hypoglycemia risk**

## Factors that increase risk of treatment-associated hypoglycemia

- Use of insulin or insulin secretagogues (i.e., sulfonylureas, meglitinides)
- Impaired kidney or hepatic function
- Longer duration of diabetes
- Frailty and older age
- Cognitive impairment
- Impaired counterregulatory response, hypoglycemia unawareness
- Physical or intellectual disability that may impair behavioral response to hypoglycemia
- Alcohol use
- Polypharmacy (especially ACE inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, nonselective  $\beta$ -blockers)
- History of severe hypoglycemic event

In addition to individual risk factors, consider use of comprehensive risk prediction models (105).

See references 106–110.

**Table 4.4—Referrals for initial care management**

- Eye care professional for annual dilated eye exam
- Family planning for women of reproductive age
- Registered dietitian nutritionist for medical nutrition therapy
- Diabetes self-management education and support
- Dentist for comprehensive dental and periodontal examination
- Mental health professional, if indicated
- Audiology, if indicated
- Social worker/community resources, if indicated

**Hepatitis B**

Compared with the general population, people with type 1 or type 2 diabetes have higher rates of hepatitis B. This may be due to contact with infected blood or through improper equipment use (glucose monitoring devices or infected needles). Because of the higher likelihood of transmission, hepatitis B vaccine is recommended for adults with diabetes aged  $< 60$  years. For adults aged  $\geq 60$  years, hepatitis B vaccine may be administered at the discretion of the treating clinician based on the patient's likelihood of acquiring hepatitis B infection.

**COVID-19**

As of August 2021, the COVID-19 vaccines are recommended for all adults and some children, including people with diabetes, under full approval of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The three options in the U.S. are the mRNA vaccines from Pfizer-BioNTech and



**Table 4.5—Highly recommended immunizations for adult patients with diabetes (Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)**

Vaccination	Age-group recommendations	Frequency	GRADE evidence type*	Reference
Hepatitis B	<60 years of age; ≥60 years of age discuss with health care provider	Two- or three-dose series	2	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Use of Hepatitis B Vaccination for Adults With Diabetes Mellitus: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) (111)
Human papilloma virus (HPV)	≤26 years of age; 27–45 years of age may also be vaccinated against HPV after a discussion with health care provider	Three doses over 6 months	2 for females, 3 for males	Meites et al., Human Papillomavirus Vaccination for Adults: Updated Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (112)
Influenza	All patients; advised not to receive live attenuated influenza vaccine	Annual	–	Demicheli et al., Vaccines for Preventing Influenza in the Elderly (113)
Pneumonia (PPSV23 [Pneumovax])	19–64 years of age, vaccinate with Pneumovax	One dose	2	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Updated Recommendations for Prevention of Invasive Pneumococcal Disease Among Adults Using the 23-Valent Pneumococcal Polysaccharide Vaccine (PPSV23) (114)
	≥65 years of age, obtain second dose of Pneumovax, at least 5 years from prior Pneumovax vaccine	One dose; if PCV13 has been given, then give PPSV23 ≥1 year after PCV13 and ≥5 years after any PPSV23 at age <65 years	2	Falkenhorst et al., Effectiveness of the 23-Valent Pneumococcal Polysaccharide Vaccine (PPV23) Against Pneumococcal Disease in the Elderly: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (115)
Pneumonia (PCV13 [Prenar])	Adults ≥19 of age, with an immunocompromising condition (e.g., chronic renal failure), cochlear implant, or cerebrospinal fluid leak	One dose	3	Matanock et al., Use of 13-Valent Pneumococcal Conjugate Vaccine and 23-Valent Pneumococcal Polysaccharide Vaccine Among Adults Aged ≥65 Years: Updated Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (21)
	19–64 years of age, immunocompetent, no recommendation	None		
	≥65 years of age, immunocompetent, have shared decision-making discussion with health care provider	One dose		
Tetanus, diphtheria, pertussis (TDAP)	All adults; pregnant women should have an extra dose	Booster every 10 years	2 for effectiveness, 3 for safety	Havers et al., Use of Tetanus Toxoid, Reduced Diphtheria Toxoid, and Acellular Pertussis Vaccines: Updated Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices—United States, 2019 (116)

Continued on p. S53

Table 4.5—Continued

Vaccination	Age-group recommendations	Frequency	GRADE evidence type*	Reference
Zoster	≥50 years of age	Two-dose Shingrix, even if previously vaccinated	1	Dooling et al., Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices for Use of Herpes Zoster Vaccines (117)

GRADE, Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation; PCV13, 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine; PPSV23, 23-valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine. \*Evidence type: 1 = randomized controlled trials (RCTs), or overwhelming evidence from observational studies; 2 = RCTs with important limitations, or exceptionally strong evidence from observational studies; 3 = observational studies, or RCTs with notable limitations; and 4 = clinical experience and observations, observational studies with important limitations, or RCTs with several major limitations. For a comprehensive list, refer to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention at [www.cdc.gov/vaccines/](http://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/).

Moderna and the recombinant, replication-incompetent adenovirus serotype 26 (Ad26) vector vaccine from Janssen. Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine is recommended for people aged 12 years and older, with a grade 1 evidence rating for the prevention of symptomatic COVID-19 (23,24). It is given as a two-shot series 21 days apart. Moderna vaccine is recommended for people aged 18 years and older, with a grade 1 evidence rating for prevention of symptomatic COVID-19 (23). It is given as a two-shot series 28 days apart. Janssen vaccine is also recommended for people aged 18 years and older, with a grade 2 evidence rating (25). Unlike the mRNA vaccines, only one shot is required. Evidence regarding the efficacy of mixing vaccines is still emerging. Booster vaccine recommendations are also evolving, with the CDC just recently recommending the Pfizer-BioNTech booster for older adults and those with underlying conditions such as diabetes. The COVID-19 vaccine will likely become a routine part of the annual preventive schedule for people with diabetes.

## ASSESSMENT OF COMORBIDITIES

Besides assessing diabetes-related complications, clinicians and their patients need to be aware of common comorbidities that affect people with diabetes and that may complicate management (26–30). Diabetes comorbidities are conditions that affect people with diabetes more often than age-matched people without diabetes. This section discusses many of the common comorbidities observed in patients with diabetes but is not necessarily inclusive of all the conditions that have been reported.

## Autoimmune Diseases

### Recommendations

- 4.7** Patients with type 1 diabetes should be screened for autoimmune thyroid disease soon after diagnosis and periodically thereafter. **B**
- 4.8** Adult patients with type 1 diabetes should be screened for celiac disease in the presence of gastrointestinal symptoms, signs, or laboratory manifestations suggestive of celiac disease. **B**

People with type 1 diabetes are at increased risk for other autoimmune diseases, with thyroid disease, celiac disease, and pernicious anemia (vitamin B12 deficiency) being among the most common (31). Other associated conditions include autoimmune hepatitis, primary adrenal insufficiency (Addison disease), collagen vascular diseases, and myasthenia gravis (32–35). Type 1 diabetes may also occur with other autoimmune diseases in the context of specific genetic disorders or polyglandular autoimmune syndromes (36). Given the high prevalence, nonspecific symptoms, and insidious onset of primary hypothyroidism, routine screening for thyroid dysfunction is recommended for all patients with type 1 diabetes. Screening for celiac disease should be considered in adult patients with suggestive symptoms (e.g., diarrhea, malabsorption, abdominal pain) or signs (e.g., osteoporosis, vitamin deficiencies, iron deficiency anemia) (37,38). Measurement of vitamin B12 levels should be considered for patients with type 1 diabetes and peripheral neuropathy or unexplained anemia.

## Cancer

Diabetes is associated with increased risk of cancers of the liver, pancreas, endometrium, colon/rectum, breast, and bladder (39). The association may result from shared risk factors between type 2 diabetes and cancer (older age, obesity, and physical inactivity) but may also be due to diabetes-related factors (40), such as underlying disease physiology or diabetes treatments, although evidence for these links is scarce. Patients with diabetes should be encouraged to undergo recommended age- and sex-appropriate cancer screenings and to reduce their modifiable cancer risk factors (obesity, physical inactivity, and smoking). New onset of atypical diabetes (lean body habitus, negative family history) in a middle-aged or older patient may precede the diagnosis of pancreatic adenocarcinoma (41). However, in the absence of other symptoms (e.g., weight loss, abdominal pain), routine screening of all such patients is not currently recommended.

## Cognitive Impairment/Dementia

### Recommendation

- 4.9** In the presence of cognitive impairment, diabetes treatment regimens should be simplified as much as possible and tailored to minimize the risk of hypoglycemia. **B**

Diabetes is associated with a significantly increased risk and rate of cognitive decline and an increased risk of dementia (42,43). A recent meta-analysis of prospective observational studies in people with diabetes showed 73% increased risk of all types of dementia, 56% increased

risk of Alzheimer dementia, and 127% increased risk of vascular dementia compared with individuals without diabetes (44). The reverse is also true: people with Alzheimer dementia are more likely to develop diabetes than people without Alzheimer dementia. In a 15-year prospective study of community-dwelling people >60 years of age, the presence of diabetes at baseline significantly increased the age- and sex-adjusted incidence of all-cause dementia, Alzheimer dementia, and vascular dementia compared with rates in those with normal glucose tolerance (45). See Section 13, "Older Adults" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>), for a more detailed discussion regarding screening for cognitive impairment.

#### Hyperglycemia

In those with type 2 diabetes, the degree and duration of hyperglycemia are related to dementia. More rapid cognitive decline is associated with both increased A1C and longer duration of diabetes (44). The Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) study found that each 1% higher A1C level was associated with lower cognitive function in individuals with type 2 diabetes (46). However, the ACCORD study found no difference in cognitive outcomes in participants randomly assigned to intensive and standard glycemic control, supporting the recommendation that intensive glucose control should not be advised for the improvement of cognitive function in individuals with type 2 diabetes (47).

#### Hypoglycemia

In type 2 diabetes, severe hypoglycemia is associated with reduced cognitive function, and those with poor cognitive function have more severe hypoglycemia. In a long-term study of older patients with type 2 diabetes, individuals with one or more recorded episodes of severe hypoglycemia had a stepwise increase in risk of dementia (48). Likewise, the ACCORD trial found that as cognitive function decreased, the risk of severe hypoglycemia increased (49). Tailoring glycemic therapy may help to prevent hypoglycemia in individuals with cognitive dysfunction. See Section 13, "Older Adults" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>), for more detailed discussion of hypoglycemia

in older patients with type 1 and type 2 diabetes.

#### Nutrition

In one study, adherence to the Mediterranean diet correlated with improved cognitive function (50). However, a recent Cochrane review found insufficient evidence to recommend any specific dietary change for the prevention or treatment of cognitive dysfunction (51).

#### Statins

A systematic review has reported that data do not support an adverse effect of statins on cognition (52). The U.S. Food and Drug Administration postmarketing surveillance databases have also revealed a low reporting rate for cognitive-related adverse events, including cognitive dysfunction or dementia, with statin therapy, similar to rates seen with other commonly prescribed cardiovascular medications (52). Therefore, fear of cognitive decline should not be a barrier to statin use in individuals with diabetes and a high risk for cardiovascular disease.

#### Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease

##### Recommendation

**4.10** Patients with type 2 diabetes or prediabetes and elevated liver enzymes (ALT) or fatty liver on ultrasound should be evaluated for presence of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis and liver fibrosis. **C**

Diabetes is associated with the development of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), including its more severe manifestations of nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), liver fibrosis, cirrhosis, and hepatocellular carcinoma (53). Elevations of hepatic transaminase concentrations are associated with higher BMI, waist circumference, and triglyceride levels and lower HDL cholesterol levels. Noninvasive tests, such as elastography or fibrosis biomarkers, may be used to assess risk of fibrosis, but referral to a liver specialist and liver biopsy may be required for definitive diagnosis (54). Interventions that improve metabolic abnormalities in patients with diabetes (weight loss, glycemic control, and treatment with specific drugs for hyperglycemia or dyslipidemia)

are also beneficial for fatty liver disease (55,56). Pioglitazone, vitamin E treatment, liraglutide, and semaglutide treatment of biopsy-proven NASH have each been shown to improve liver histology, but effects on longer-term clinical outcomes are not known (57–59). Treatment with other glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists and with sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors has shown promise in preliminary studies, although benefits may be mediated, at least in part, by weight loss (59–61).

The American Gastroenterological Association convened an international conference, including representatives of the ADA, to review and discuss published literature on burden, screening, risk stratification, diagnosis, and management of individuals with NAFLD, including NASH (62). Please see the special report "Preparing for the NASH Epidemic: A Call to Action" for full details (62). Significant gaps were identified, including gaps in knowledge in who to screen and how to diagnose and treat patients at high risk for NASH. In patients with suspected NAFLD, diagnosis consists of evaluating patients for alternative or coexisting causes of liver disease through history and laboratory testing. In patients with NAFLD/NASH, risk stratification with non-invasive fibrosis scores was suggested. **Table 4.6**, reproduced from the special report, summarizes the management recommendations for patients with NAFLD and NASH, and **Table 4.7** presents the summary of published NAFLD guidelines included in the report (62). Further research and interdisciplinary consensus are required to fully define screening, referral, and diagnostic pathways.

#### Hepatitis C Infection

Infection with hepatitis C virus (HCV) is associated with a higher prevalence of type 2 diabetes, which is present in up to one-third of individuals with chronic HCV infection. HCV may impair glucose metabolism by several mechanisms, including directly via viral proteins and indirectly by altering proinflammatory cytokine levels (63). The use of newer direct-acting antiviral drugs produces a sustained virological response (cure) in nearly all cases and has been reported to improve glucose metabolism in individuals with diabetes (64). A meta-analysis of mostly observational studies



found a mean reduction in A1C levels of 0.45% (95% CI −0.60 to −0.30) and reduced requirement for glucose-lowering medication use following successful eradication of HCV infection (65).

**Pancreatitis**

Diabetes is linked to diseases of the exocrine pancreas such as pancreatitis, which may disrupt the global architecture or physiology of the pancreas, often resulting in both exocrine and endocrine dysfunction. Up to half of patients with diabetes may have some degree of impaired exocrine pancreas function (66). People with diabetes are at an approximately twofold higher risk of developing acute pancreatitis (67).

Conversely, prediabetes and/or diabetes has been found to develop in approximately one-third of patients after an episode of acute pancreatitis (68); thus, the relationship is likely bidirectional. Postpancreatitis diabetes may include either new-onset disease or previously unrecognized diabetes (69). Studies of patients treated with incretin-based therapies for diabetes have also reported that pancreatitis may occur more frequently with these medications, but results have been mixed and causality has not been established (70–72).

Islet autotransplantation should be considered for patients requiring total pancreatectomy for medically refractory chronic pancreatitis to prevent postsurgical diabetes. Approximately one-third of patients undergoing total pancreatectomy with islet autotransplantation are insulin free 1 year postoperatively, and observational studies from different centers have demonstrated islet graft function up to a

decade after the surgery in some patients (73–77). Both patient and disease factors should be carefully considered when deciding the indications and timing of this surgery. Surgeries should be performed in skilled facilities that have demonstrated expertise in islet autotransplantation.

**Fractures**

Age-specific hip fracture risk is significantly increased in both people with type 1 diabetes (relative risk 6.3) and those with type 2 diabetes (relative risk 1.7) in both sexes (78). Type 1 diabetes is associated with osteoporosis, but in type 2 diabetes, an increased risk of hip fracture is seen despite higher bone mineral density (BMD) (79). In three large observational studies of older adults, femoral neck BMD T-score and the World Health Organization Fracture Risk Assessment Tool (FRAX) score were associated with hip and nonspine fractures. Fracture risk was higher in participants with diabetes compared with those without diabetes for a given T-score and age or for a given FRAX score (80). Providers should assess fracture history and risk factors in older patients with diabetes and recommend measurement of BMD if appropriate for the patient’s age and sex. Fracture prevention strategies for people with diabetes are the same as for the general population and may include vitamin D supplementation. For patients with type 2 diabetes with fracture risk factors, thiazolidinediones (81) and sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors (82) should be used with caution.

**Sensory Impairment**

Hearing impairment, both in high-frequency and low- to midfrequency ranges, is more common in people with diabetes than in those without, with stronger associations found in studies of younger people (83). Proposed pathophysiologic mechanisms include the combined contributions of hyperglycemia and oxidative stress to cochlear microangiopathy and auditory neuropathy (84). In a National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) analysis, hearing impairment was about twice as prevalent in people with diabetes compared with those without, after adjusting for age and other risk factors for hearing impairment (85). Low HDL cholesterol, coronary heart disease, peripheral neuropathy, and general poor health have been reported as risk factors for hearing impairment for people with diabetes, but an association of hearing loss with blood glucose levels has not been consistently observed (86). In the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) cohort, time-weighted mean A1C was associated with increased risk of hearing impairment when tested after long-term (>20 years) follow-up (87). Impairment in smell, but not taste, has also been reported in individuals with diabetes (88).

**Low Testosterone in Men**

**Recommendation**

**4.11** In men with diabetes who have symptoms or signs of hypogonadism, such as decreased sexual desire (libido) or activity, or

**Table 4.6—Management of patients with nonalcoholic fatty liver disease and nonalcoholic steatohepatitis**

Variable	Lifestyle intervention <sup>a</sup>	Liver-directed pharmacotherapy	Diabetes care (in individuals with diabetes)	Cardiovascular risk reduction
NAFLD	Yes	No	Standard of care	Yes
NASH with fibrosis stage 0 or 1 (F0, F1)	Yes	No	Standard of care	Yes
NASH with fibrosis stage 2 or 3 (F2, F3)	Yes	Yes	Pioglitazone, GLP-1 receptor agonists <sup>b</sup>	Yes
NASH cirrhosis (F4)	Yes	Yes	Individualize <sup>c</sup>	Yes

NAFLD, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease; NASH, nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. <sup>a</sup>All patients require regular physical activity and healthy diet and to avoid excess alcohol intake; weight loss recommended. <sup>b</sup>Among glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists, semaglutide has the best evidence of benefit in patients with NASH and fibrosis. <sup>c</sup>Evidence for efficacy of pharmacotherapy in patients with NASH cirrhosis is very limited and should be individualized and used with caution. Adapted from “Preparing for the NASH Epidemic: A Call to Action” (62).

**Table 4.7—Summary of published nonalcoholic fatty liver disease guidelines**

Organization	Year	First-line diagnosis test	When to refer to hepatologist	Noninvasive tests
American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases (AASLD)	2018	Not clear in the guideline Routine screening for NAFLD in high-risk groups is not recommended	Not clear in the guideline	Diagnosis for NASH: liver biopsy Assessment for fibrosis: NFS or FIB-4
American Gastroenterological Association (AGA)	2012	Routine screening for NAFLD is not recommended	Not clear in the guideline	Metabolic syndrome can be used to target patients for liver biopsy
European Association for the Study of the Liver (EASL)	2016	Ultrasound + liver enzymes for patients with risk factors	Refer patients with abnormal liver enzymes or medium-/high-risk fibrosis markers to specialist	Diagnosis for NASH: liver biopsy Assessment for fibrosis: NFS or FIB-4
World Gastroenterology Organization (WGO)	2012	Ultrasound + liver enzymes for patients with risk factors	Not clear in the guideline	Diagnosis for NASH: liver biopsy
National Institute for Health Care and Excellence (NICE)	2016	Ultrasound + liver enzymes for patients with risk factors But routine liver function blood tests are not sensitive, and ultrasound is not cost-effective	Refer adults with advanced liver fibrosis to a hepatologist Refer children with suspected NAFLD to a pediatric specialist in hepatology	Assessment for advanced fibrosis: enhanced liver fibrosis (every 2–3 years)

FIB-4, Fibrosis-4 Index; NAFLD, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease; NASH, nonalcoholic steatohepatitis; NFS, NAFLD fibrosis score. Adapted from "Preparing for the NASH Epidemic: A Call to Action" (62).

erectile dysfunction, consider screening with a morning serum testosterone level. **B**

Mean levels of testosterone are lower in men with diabetes compared with age-matched men without diabetes, but obesity is a major confounder (89,90). Testosterone replacement in men with symptomatic hypogonadism may have benefits including improved sexual function, well-being, muscle mass and strength, and bone density (91). In men with diabetes who have symptoms or signs of low testosterone (hypogonadism), a morning total testosterone level should be measured using an accurate and reliable assay (92). In men who have total testosterone levels close to the lower limit, it is reasonable to determine free testosterone concentrations either directly from equilibrium dialysis assays or by calculations that use total testosterone, sex hormone binding globulin, and albumin concentrations (92). Please see the Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline for detailed recommendations (92). Further tests (such as luteinizing hormone and follicle-stimulating hormone levels) may be needed to further evaluate the patient. Testosterone replacement in older men with hypogonadism has been associated with increased coronary artery

plaque volume, with no conclusive evidence that testosterone supplementation is associated with increased cardiovascular risk in hypogonadal men (92).

#### Obstructive Sleep Apnea

Age-adjusted rates of obstructive sleep apnea, a risk factor for cardiovascular disease, are significantly higher (4- to 10-fold) with obesity, especially with central obesity (93). The prevalence of obstructive sleep apnea in the population with type 2 diabetes may be as high as 23%, and the prevalence of any sleep-disordered breathing may be as high as 58% (94,95). In participants with obesity enrolled in the Action for Health in Diabetes (Look AHEAD) trial, it exceeded 80% (96). Patients with symptoms suggestive of obstructive sleep apnea (e.g., excessive daytime sleepiness, snoring, witnessed apnea) should be considered for screening (97). Sleep apnea treatment (lifestyle modification, continuous positive airway pressure, oral appliances, and surgery) significantly improves quality of life and blood pressure control. The evidence for a treatment effect on glycemic control is mixed (98).

#### Periodontal Disease

Periodontal disease is more severe, and may be more prevalent, in patients with diabetes than in those without and has

been associated with higher A1C levels (99–101). Longitudinal studies suggest that people with periodontal disease have higher rates of incident diabetes. Current evidence suggests that periodontal disease adversely affects diabetes outcomes, although evidence for treatment benefits remains controversial (30,102). In a randomized clinical trial, intensive periodontal treatment was associated with better glycemic control (A1C 8.3% vs. 7.8% in control subjects and the intensive-treatment group, respectively) and reduction in inflammatory markers after 12 months of follow-up (103).

#### References

1. Stelfox M, Dipnarine K, Stopka C. The chronic care model and diabetes management in US primary care settings: a systematic review. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2013;10:E26
2. Coleman K, Austin BT, Brach C, Wagner EH. Evidence on the Chronic Care Model in the new millennium. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2009;28:75–85
3. Gabbay RA, Bailit MH, Mauger DT, Wagner EH, Siminerio L. Multipayer patient-centered medical home implementation guided by the chronic care model. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2011;37:265–273
4. UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). *Lancet* 1998;352:837–853
5. 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
6. Lachin JM, Genuth S, Nathan DM, Zinman B; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Effect of glycemic exposure on the risk of microvascular complications in the diabetes control and complications trial—revisited. *Diabetes* 2008;57:995–1001
7. White NH, Cleary PA, Dahms W, Goldstein D, Malone J; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT)/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) Research Group. Beneficial effects of intensive therapy of diabetes during adolescence: outcomes after the conclusion of the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT). *J Pediatr* 2001;139:804–812
8. Anderson RM, Funnell MM. Compliance and adherence are dysfunctional concepts in diabetes care. *Diabetes Educ* 2000;26:597–604
9. Sarkar U, Fisher L, Schillinger D. Is self-efficacy associated with diabetes self-management across race/ethnicity and health literacy? *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:823–829
10. King DK, Glasgow RE, Toobert DJ, et al. Self-efficacy, problem solving, and social-environmental support are associated with diabetes self-management behaviors. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:751–753
11. Nouwen A, Urquhart Law G, Hussain S, McGovern S, Napier H. Comparison of the role of self-efficacy and illness representations in relation to dietary self-care and diabetes distress in adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *Psychol Health* 2009;24:1071–1084
12. Dickinson JK, Guzman SJ, Maryniuk MD, et al. The use of language in diabetes care and education. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1790–1799
13. Lee SWH, Ng KY, Chin WK. The impact of sleep amount and sleep quality on glycemic control in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep Med Rev* 2017;31:91–101
14. Robinson CL, Bernstein H, Poehling K, Romero JR, Szilagyi P. Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices recommended immunization schedule for children and adolescents aged 18 years or younger – United States, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:130–132
15. Freedman MS, Hunter P, Ault K, Kroger A. Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices recommended immunization schedule for adults aged 19 years or older – United States, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:133–135
16. Lee G, Carr W; ACIP Evidence-Based Recommendations Work Group. Updated framework for development of evidence-based recommendations by the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2018;67:1271–1272
17. Goeijenbier M, van Sloten TT, Slobbe L, et al. Benefits of flu vaccination for persons with diabetes mellitus: a review. *Vaccine* 2017;35:5095–5101
18. Yedlapati SH, Khan SU, Talluri S, et al. Effects of influenza vaccine on mortality and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2021;10:e019636
19. Grohskopf LA, Alyanak E, Broder KR, et al. Prevention and control of seasonal influenza with vaccines: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices – United States, 2020–21 influenza season. *MMWR Recomm Rep* 2020;69:1–24
20. Smith SA, Poland GA. Use of influenza and pneumococcal vaccines in people with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2000;23:95–108
21. Matanock A, Lee G, Gierke R, Kobayashi M, Leidner A, Piiishvili T. Use of 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine and 23-valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine among adults aged  $\geq 65$  years: updated recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2019;68:1069–1075
22. Ahmed SS, Pondo GA, Xing W, et al. Early impact of 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine use on invasive pneumococcal disease among adults with and without underlying medical conditions—United States. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020;70:2484–2492
23. Oliver SE, Gargano JW, Marin M, et al. The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices’ interim recommendation for use of Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine – United States, December 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:1922–1924
24. Wallace M, Woodworth KR, Gargano JW, et al. The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices’ interim recommendation for use of Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine in adolescents aged 12–15 years – United States, May 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021;70:749–752
25. Oliver SE, Gargano JW, Scobie H, et al. The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices’ interim recommendation for use of Janssen COVID-19 vaccine – United States, February 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021;70:329–332
26. Selvin E, Coresh J, Brancati FL. The burden and treatment of diabetes in elderly individuals in the U.S. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:2415–2419
27. Grant RW, Ashburner JM, Hong CS, Chang Y, Barry MJ, Atlas SJ. Defining patient complexity from the primary care physician’s perspective: a cohort study [published correction appears in *Ann Intern Med* 2012;157:152]. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;155:797–804
28. Tinetti ME, Fried TR, Boyd CM. Designing health care for the most common chronic condition—multimorbidity. *JAMA* 2012;307:2493–2494
29. Sudore RL, Karter AJ, Huang ES, et al. Symptom burden of adults with type 2 diabetes across the disease course: Diabetes & Aging Study. *J Gen Intern Med* 2012;27:1674–1681
30. Borgnakke WS, Ylöstalo PV, Taylor GW, Genco RJ. Effect of periodontal disease on diabetes: systematic review of epidemiologic observational evidence. *J Periodontol* 2013;84 (Suppl.):S135–S152
31. Nederstigt C, Uitbeijerse BS, Janssen LGM, Corssmit EPM, de Koning EJP, Dekkers OM. Associated auto-immune disease in type 1 diabetes patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Endocrinol* 2019;180:135–144
32. De Block CE, De Leeuw IH, Van Gaal LF. High prevalence of manifestations of gastric autoimmunity in parietal cell antibody-positive type 1 (insulin-dependent) diabetic patients. The Belgian Diabetes Registry. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 1999;84:4062–4067
33. Triolo TM, Armstrong TK, McFann K, et al. Additional autoimmune disease found in 33% of patients at type 1 diabetes onset. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1211–1213
34. Hughes JW, Riddlesworth TD; T1D Exchange Clinic Network. Autoimmune diseases in children and adults with type 1 diabetes from the T1D Exchange Clinic Registry. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2016;101:4931–4937
35. Kahaly GJ, Hansen MP. Type 1 diabetes associated autoimmunity. *Autoimmun Rev* 2016;15:644–648
36. Eisenbarth GS, Gottlieb PA. Autoimmune polyendocrine syndromes. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:2068–2079
37. Rubio-Tapia A, Hill ID, Kelly CP, Calderwood AH; American College of Gastroenterology. ACG clinical guidelines: diagnosis and management of celiac disease. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:656–676; quiz 677
38. Husby S, Murray JA, Katzka DA. AGA clinical practice update on diagnosis and monitoring of celiac disease—changing utility of serology and histologic measures: expert review. *Gastroenterology* 2019;156:885–889
39. Suh S, Kim K-W. Diabetes and cancer: is diabetes causally related to cancer? *Diabetes Metab J* 2011;35:193–198
40. Giovannucci E, Harlan DM, Archer MC, et al. Diabetes and cancer: a consensus report. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2010;60:207–221
41. Aggarwal G, Kamada P, Chari ST. Prevalence of diabetes mellitus in pancreatic cancer compared to common cancers. *Pancreas* 2013;42:198–201
42. Cukierman T, Gerstein HC, Williamson JD. Cognitive decline and dementia in diabetes—systematic overview of prospective observational studies. *Diabetologia* 2005;48:2460–2469
43. Biessels GJ, Staekenborg S, Brunner E, Brayne C, Scheltens P. Risk of dementia in diabetes mellitus: a systematic review. *Lancet Neurol* 2006;5:64–74
44. Gudala K, Bansal D, Schifano F, Bhansali A. Diabetes mellitus and risk of dementia: a meta-analysis of prospective observational studies. *J Diabetes Invest* 2013;4:640–650
45. Ohara T, Doi Y, Ninomiya T, et al. Glucose tolerance status and risk of dementia in the community: the Hisayama study. *Neurology* 2011;77:1126–1134
46. Cukierman-Yaffe T, Gerstein HC, Williamson JD, et al.; Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes-Memory in Diabetes (ACCORD-MIND) Investigators. Relationship between baseline glycemic control and cognitive function in individuals with type 2 diabetes and other cardiovascular risk factors: the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes-Memory in Diabetes (ACCORD-MIND) trial. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:221–226
47. Launer LJ, Miller ME, Williamson JD, et al.; ACCORD MIND investigators. Effects of intensive glucose lowering on brain structure and function in people with type 2 diabetes (ACCORD MIND):



- a randomised open-label substudy. *Lancet Neurol* 2011;10:969–977
48. Whitmer RA, Karter AJ, Yaffe K, Quesenberry CP Jr, Selby JV. Hypoglycemic episodes and risk of dementia in older patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *JAMA* 2009;301:1565–1572
49. Punthakee Z, Miller ME, Launer LJ, et al.; ACCORD Group of Investigators; ACCORD-MIND Investigators. Poor cognitive function and risk of severe hypoglycemia in type 2 diabetes: post hoc epidemiologic analysis of the ACCORD trial. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:787–793
50. Scarmeas N, Stern Y, Mayeux R, Manly JJ, Schupf N, Luchsinger JA. Mediterranean diet and mild cognitive impairment. *Arch Neurol* 2009;66:216–225
51. Ooi CP, Loke SC, Yassin Z, Hamid T-A. Carbohydrates for improving the cognitive performance of independent-living older adults with normal cognition or mild cognitive impairment. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011;4:CD007220
52. Richardson K, Schoen M, French B, et al. Statins and cognitive function: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;159:688–697
53. El-Serag HB, Tran T, Everhart JE. Diabetes increases the risk of chronic liver disease and hepatocellular carcinoma. *Gastroenterology* 2004;126:460–468
54. Chalasani N, Younossi Z, Lavine JE, et al. The diagnosis and management of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease: practice guidance from the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. *Hepatology* 2018;67:328–357
55. American Gastroenterological Association. American Gastroenterological Association medical position statement: nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Gastroenterology* 2002;123:1702–1704
56. Cusi K, Orsak B, Bril F, et al. Long-term pioglitazone treatment for patients with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis and prediabetes or type 2 diabetes mellitus: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2016;165:305–315
57. Belfort R, Harrison SA, Brown K, et al. A placebo-controlled trial of pioglitazone in subjects with nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355:2297–2307
58. Sanyal AJ, Chalasani N, Kowdley KV, et al.; NASH CRN. Pioglitazone, vitamin E, or placebo for nonalcoholic steatohepatitis. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1675–1685
59. Armstrong MJ, Gaunt P, Aithal GP, et al.; LEAN trial team. Liraglutide safety and efficacy in patients with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (LEAN): a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 2 study. *Lancet* 2016;387:679–690
60. Shimizu M, Suzuki K, Kato K, et al. Evaluation of the effects of dapagliflozin, a sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitor, on hepatic steatosis and fibrosis using transient elastography in patients with type 2 diabetes and non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2019;21:285–292
61. Kuchay MS, Krishan S, Mishra SK, et al. Effect of dulaglutide on liver fat in patients with type 2 diabetes and NAFLD: randomised controlled trial (D-LIFT trial). *Diabetologia* 2020;63:2434–2445
62. Kanwal F, Shubrook JH, Younossi Z, et al. Preparing for the NASH epidemic: a call to action. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:2162–2172
63. Lecube A, Hernández C, Genescà J, Simó R. Proinflammatory cytokines, insulin resistance, and insulin secretion in chronic hepatitis C patients: a case-control study. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:1096–1101
64. Hum J, Jou JH, Green PK, et al. Improvement in glycemic control of type 2 diabetes after successful treatment of hepatitis C virus. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1173–1180
65. Carnovale C, Pozzi M, Dassano A, et al. The impact of a successful treatment of hepatitis C virus on glyco-metabolic control in diabetic patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Diabetol* 2019;56:341–354
66. Piciocchi M, Capurso G, Archibugi L, Delle Fave MM, Capasso M, Delle Fave G. Exocrine pancreatic insufficiency in diabetic patients: prevalence, mechanisms, and treatment. *Int J Endocrinol* 2015;2015:595649
67. Lee Y-K, Huang M-Y, Hsu C-Y, Su Y-C. Bidirectional relationship between diabetes and acute pancreatitis: a population-based cohort study in Taiwan. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2016;95:e2448
68. Das SLM, Singh PP, Phillips ARJ, Murphy R, Windsor JA, Petrov MS. Newly diagnosed diabetes mellitus after acute pancreatitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gut* 2014;63:818–831
69. Petrov MS. Diabetes of the exocrine pancreas: American Diabetes Association-compliant lexicon. *Pancreatol* 2017;17:523–526
70. Thomsen RW, Pedersen L, Møller N, Kahlert J, Beck-Nielsen H, Sørensen HT. Incretin-based therapy and risk of acute pancreatitis: a nationwide population-based case-control study. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1089–1098
71. Tkáč I, Raz I. Combined analysis of three large interventional trials with gliptins indicates increased incidence of acute pancreatitis in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:284–286
72. Egan AG, Blind E, Dunder K, et al. Pancreatic safety of incretin-based drugs—FDA and EMA assessment. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370:794–797
73. Bellin MD, Gelrud A, Arreaza-Rubin G, et al. Total pancreatectomy with islet autotransplantation: summary of an NIDDK workshop. *Ann Surg* 2015;261:21–29
74. Sutherland DER, Radosevich DM, Bellin MD, et al. Total pancreatectomy and islet autotransplantation for chronic pancreatitis. *J Am Coll Surg* 2012;214:409–424; discussion 424–426
75. Quartuccio M, Hall E, Singh V, et al. Glycemic predictors of insulin independence after total pancreatectomy with islet autotransplantation. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2017;102:801–809
76. Webb MA, Illouz SC, Pollard CA, et al. Islet auto transplantation following total pancreatectomy: a long-term assessment of graft function. *Pancreas* 2008;37:282–287
77. Wu Q, Zhang M, Qin Y, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of islet autotransplantation after total pancreatectomy in chronic pancreatitis patients. *Endocr J* 2015;62:227–234
78. Janghorbani M, Van Dam RM, Willett WC, Hu FB. Systematic review of type 1 and type 2 diabetes mellitus and risk of fracture. *Am J Epidemiol* 2007;166:495–505
79. Vestergaard P. Discrepancies in bone mineral density and fracture risk in patients with type 1 and type 2 diabetes—a meta-analysis. *Osteoporos Int* 2007;18:427–444
80. Schwartz AV, Vittinghoff E, Bauer DC, et al.; Study of Osteoporotic Fractures (SOF) Research Group; Osteoporotic Fractures in Men (MrOS) Research Group; Health, Aging, and Body Composition (Health ABC) Research Group. Association of BMD and FRAX score with risk of fracture in older adults with type 2 diabetes. *JAMA* 2011;305:2184–2192
81. Kahn SE, Zinman B, Lachin JM, et al.; Diabetes Outcome Progression Trial (ADOPT) Study Group. Rosiglitazone-associated fractures in type 2 diabetes: an analysis from A Diabetes Outcome Progression Trial (ADOPT). *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:845–851
82. Taylor SI, Blau JE, Rother KI. Possible adverse effects of SGLT2 inhibitors on bone. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2015;3:8–10
83. Baiduc RR, Helzner EP. Epidemiology of diabetes and hearing loss. *Semin Hear* 2019;40:281–291
84. Helzner EP, Contrera KJ. Type 2 diabetes and hearing impairment. *Curr Diab Rep* 2016;16:3
85. Bainbridge KE, Hoffman HJ, Cowie CC. Diabetes and hearing impairment in the United States: audiometric evidence from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 1999 to 2004. *Ann Intern Med* 2008;149:1–10
86. Bainbridge KE, Hoffman HJ, Cowie CC. Risk factors for hearing impairment among U.S. adults with diabetes: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 1999–2004. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1540–1545
87. Schade DS, Lorenzi GM, Braffett BH, et al.; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Hearing impairment and type 1 diabetes in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) cohort. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2495–2501
88. Rasmussen VF, Vestergaard ET, Hejlesen O, Andersson CUN, Cichosz SL. Prevalence of taste and smell impairment in adults with diabetes: a cross-sectional analysis of data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). *Prim Care Diabetes* 2018;12:453–459
89. Dhindsa S, Miller MG, McWhirter CL, et al. Testosterone concentrations in diabetic and nondiabetic obese men. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1186–1192
90. Grossmann M. Low testosterone in men with type 2 diabetes: significance and treatment. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2011;96:2341–2353
91. Bhasin S, Cunningham GR, Hayes FJ, et al.; Task Force, Endocrine Society. Testosterone therapy in men with androgen deficiency syndromes: an Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2010;95:2536–2559
92. Bhasin S, Brito JP, Cunningham GR, et al. Testosterone therapy in men with hypogonadism: an Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2018;103:1715–1744
93. Li C, Ford ES, Zhao G, Croft JB, Balluz LS, Mokdad AH. Prevalence of self-reported clinically diagnosed sleep apnea according to obesity status in men and women: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2005–2006. *Prev Med* 2010;51:18–23
94. West SD, Nicoll DJ, Stradling JR. Prevalence of obstructive sleep apnoea in men with type 2 diabetes. *Thorax* 2006;61:945–950



95. Resnick HE, Redline S, Shahar E, et al.; Sleep Heart Health Study. Diabetes and sleep disturbances: findings from the Sleep Heart Health Study. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:702–709
96. Foster GD, Sanders MH, Millman R, et al.; Sleep AHEAD Research Group. Obstructive sleep apnea among obese patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1017–1019
97. Bibbins-Domingo K, Grossman DC, Curry SJ, et al.; US Preventive Services Task Force. Screening for obstructive sleep apnea in adults: US Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *JAMA* 2017;317:407–414
98. Shaw JE, Punjabi NM, Wilding JP, Alberti KGMM; International Diabetes Federation Taskforce on Epidemiology and Prevention. Sleep-disordered breathing and type 2 diabetes: a report from the International Diabetes Federation Taskforce on Epidemiology and Prevention. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2008;81:2–12
99. Khader YS, Dauod AS, El-Qaderi SS, Alkafajei A, Batayha WQ. Periodontal status of diabetics compared with nondiabetics: a meta-analysis. *J Diabetes Complications* 2006;20:59–68
100. Casanova L, Hughes FJ, Preshaw PM. Diabetes and periodontal disease: a two-way relationship. *Br Dent J* 2014;217:433–437
101. Eke PI, Thornton-Evans GO, Wei L, Borgnakke WS, Dye BA, Genco RJ. Periodontitis in US adults: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2009–2014. *J Am Dent Assoc* 2018;149:576–588.e6
102. Simpson TC, Weldon JC, Worthington HV, et al. Treatment of periodontal disease for glycaemic control in people with diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;11:CD004714
103. D’Aiuto F, Gkraniias N, Bhowruth D, et al.; TASTE Group. Systemic effects of periodontitis treatment in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 12 month, single-centre, investigator-masked, randomised trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2018;6:954–965
104. Davies MJ, D’Alessio DA, Fradkin J, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2018. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2669–2701
105. Karter AJ, Warton EM, Lipska KJ, et al. Development and validation of a tool to identify patients with type 2 diabetes at high risk of hypoglycemia-related emergency department or hospital use. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017;177:1461–1470
106. Lipska KJ, Ross JS, Wang Y, et al. National trends in US hospital admissions for hyperglycemia and hypoglycemia among Medicare beneficiaries, 1999 to 2011. *JAMA Intern Med* 2014;174:1116–1124
107. Shorr RI, Ray WA, Daugherty JR, Griffin MR. Incidence and risk factors for serious hypoglycemia in older persons using insulin or sulfonylureas. *Arch Intern Med* 1997;157:1681–1686
108. Abdelhafiz AH, Rodríguez-Mañas L, Morley JE, Sinclair AJ. Hypoglycemia in older people – a less well recognized risk factor for frailty. *Aging Dis* 2015;6:156–167
109. Yun J-S, Ko S-H, Ko S-H, et al. Presence of macroalbuminuria predicts severe hypoglycemia in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 10-year follow-up study. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1283–1289
110. Chelliah A, Burge MR. Hypoglycaemia in elderly patients with diabetes mellitus: causes and strategies for prevention. *Drugs Aging* 2004;21:511–530
111. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Use of hepatitis B vaccination for adults with diabetes mellitus: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). *MMWR* 2011;60:1709–1711
112. Meites E, Szilagyi PG, Chesson HW, Unger ER, Romero JR, Markowitz LE. Human papillomavirus vaccination for adults: updated recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices. *MMWR* 2019;68:698–702
113. Demicheli V, Jefferson T, Di Pietrantonj C, Ferroni E, Thorning S, Thomas RE, Rivetti A. Vaccines for preventing influenza in the elderly. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2018;2:CD004876
114. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Updated recommendations for prevention of invasive pneumococcal disease among adults using the 23-valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine (PPSV23). *MMWR* 2010;59:1102–1106
115. Falkenhorst G, Remschmidt C, Harder T, Hummers-Pradier E, Wichmann O, Bogdan C. Effectiveness of the 23-valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine (PPV23) against pneumococcal disease in the elderly: systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE* 2017;12:e0169368
116. Havers FP, Moro PL, Hunter P, Hariri S, Bernstein H. Use of tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and acellular pertussis vaccines: updated recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices–United States, 2019. *MMWR* 2020;69:77–83
117. Dooling KL, Guo A, Patel M, et al. Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices for use of herpes zoster vaccines. *MMWR* 2018;67:103–108



## 5. Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S60–S82 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>

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).

Building positive health behaviors and maintaining psychological well-being are foundational for achieving diabetes treatment goals and maximizing quality of life (1,2). Essential to achieving these goals are diabetes self-management education and support (DSMES), medical nutrition therapy (MNT), routine physical activity, smoking cessation counseling when needed, and psychosocial care. Following an initial comprehensive medical evaluation (see Section 4, “Comprehensive Medical Evaluation and Assessment of Comorbidities,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S004>), patients and providers are encouraged to engage in person-centered collaborative care (3–6), which is guided by shared decision-making in treatment regimen selection; facilitation of obtaining medical, psychosocial, and technology resources as needed; and shared monitoring of agreed-upon regimens and behavioral goals (7,8). Reevaluation during routine care should include assessment of medical, behavioral, and mental health outcomes, especially during times of deterioration in health and well-being.

### DIABETES SELF-MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND SUPPORT

#### Recommendations

**5.1** In accordance with the national standards for diabetes self-management education and support, all people with diabetes should participate in diabetes self-management education and receive the support needed to facilitate the knowledge, decision-making, and skills mastery for diabetes self-care. **A**

\*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. 5. Facilitating behavior change and well-being to improve health outcomes: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45 (Suppl. 1):S60–S82

© 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>.

- 5.2** There are four critical times to evaluate the need for diabetes self-management education to promote skills acquisition in support of regimen implementation, medical nutrition therapy, and well-being: at diagnosis, annually and/or when not meeting treatment targets, when complicating factors develop (medical, physical, psychosocial), and when transitions in life and care occur. **E**
- 5.3** Clinical outcomes, health status, and well-being are key goals of diabetes self-management education and support that should be measured as part of routine care. **C**
- 5.4** Diabetes self-management education and support should be patient-centered, may be offered in group or individual settings, and should be communicated with the entire diabetes care team. **A**
- 5.5** Digital coaching and digital self-management interventions can be effective methods to deliver diabetes self-management education and support. **B**
- 5.6** Because diabetes self-management education and support can improve outcomes and reduce costs **B**, reimbursement by third-party payers is recommended. **C**
- 5.7** Barriers to diabetes self-management education and support exist at the health system, payer, provider, and patient levels. **A** Efforts to identify and address barriers to diabetes self-management education and support should be prioritized. **E**
- 5.8** Some barriers to diabetes self-management education and support access may be mitigated through telemedicine approaches. **B**

DSMES services facilitate the knowledge, decision-making, and skills mastery necessary for optimal diabetes self-care and incorporate the needs, goals, and life experiences of the person with diabetes. The overall objectives of DSMES are to support informed decision-making, self-care behaviors, problem-solving, and

active collaboration with the health care team to improve clinical outcomes, health status, and well-being in a cost-effective manner (2). Providers are encouraged to consider the burden of treatment (9) and the patient's level of confidence and self-efficacy for management behaviors as well as the level of social and family support when providing DSMES. Patient engagement in self-management behaviors and their effects on clinical outcomes, health status, and quality of life, as well as the psychosocial factors impacting the person's ability to self-manage, should be monitored as part of routine clinical care. A randomized controlled trial (RCT) testing a decision-making education and skill-building program (10) showed that addressing these targets improved health outcomes in a population in need of health care resources. Furthermore, following a DSMES curriculum improves quality of care (11).

Additionally, in response to the growing literature that associates potentially judgmental words with increased feelings of shame and guilt, health care professionals are encouraged to consider the impact that language has on building therapeutic relationships and to choose positive, strength-based words and phrases that put people first (4,12). Please see Section 4, "Comprehensive Medical Evaluation and Assessment of Comorbidities" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S004>), for more on use of language.

Guidelines for DSMES are based on evidence of benefit (2,13). Specifically, DSMES helps people with diabetes to identify and implement effective self-management strategies and cope with diabetes at four critical time points (see below) (2). Ongoing DSMES helps people with diabetes to maintain effective self-management throughout the life course as they encounter new challenges and as advances in treatment become available (14).

There are four critical time points when the need for DSMES should be evaluated by the medical care provider and/or multidisciplinary team, with referrals made as needed (2):

1. At diagnosis
2. Annually and/or when not meeting treatment targets

3. When complicating factors (health conditions, physical limitations, emotional factors, or basic living needs) develop that influence self-management
4. When transitions in life and care occur

DSMES focuses on supporting patient empowerment by providing people with diabetes the tools to make informed self-management decisions (15). Diabetes care requires an approach that places the person with diabetes and their family and/or support system at the center of the care model, working in collaboration with health care professionals. Patient-centered care is respectful of and responsive to individual preferences, needs, and values. It ensures that patient values guide all decision-making (16).

#### Evidence for the Benefits

Studies have found that DSMES is associated with improved diabetes knowledge and self-care behaviors (16,17), lower A1C (16,18–21), lower self-reported weight (22), improved quality of life (19,23), reduced all-cause mortality risk (24), positive coping behaviors (5,25), and reduced health care costs (26–28). Better outcomes were reported for DSMES interventions that were more than 10 h over the course of 6–12 months (20), included ongoing support (14,29), were culturally (30,31) and age appropriate (32,33), were tailored to individual needs and preferences, and addressed psychosocial issues and incorporated behavioral strategies (15,25,34,35). Individual and group approaches are effective (36,37), with a slight benefit realized by those who engage in both (20).

Emerging evidence demonstrates the benefit of telemedicine or internet-based DSMES services for diabetes prevention and the management of type 2 diabetes (38–45).

Technologies such as mobile apps, simulation tools, digital coaching, and digital self-management interventions can be used to deliver DSMES (46,47). These methods provide comparable or even improved outcomes compared with traditional in-person care (48). Greater A1C reductions are demonstrated with increased patient engagement (49), although data from trials is preliminary in nature and quite heterogeneous.

Technology-enabled diabetes self-management solutions improve A1C most effectively when there is two-way communication between the patient and the health care team, individualized feedback, use of patient-generated health data, and education (40). Incorporating a systematic approach for technology assessment, adoption, and integration into the care plan may help ensure equity in access and standardized application of technology-enabled solutions (8,50–53).

Current research supports diabetes care and education specialists including nurses, dietitians, and pharmacists as providers of DSMES who may also tailor curriculum to the person's needs (54–56). Members of the DSMES team should have specialized clinical knowledge in diabetes and behavior change principles. In addition, a diabetes care and education specialist needs to be knowledgeable about technology-enabled services and may serve as a technology champion within their practice (50). Certification as a diabetes care and education specialist (see [www.cbdce.org/](http://www.cbdce.org/)) and/or board certification in advanced diabetes management (see [www.diabeteseducator.org/education/certification/bc\\_adm](http://www.diabeteseducator.org/education/certification/bc_adm)) demonstrates an individual's specialized training in and understanding of diabetes management and support (13), and engagement with qualified providers has been shown to improve disease-related outcomes. Additionally, there is growing evidence for the role of community health workers (57,58), as well as peer (57–62) and lay leaders (63), in providing ongoing support.

Evidence suggests people with diabetes who completed more than 10 h of DSMES over the course of 6–12 months and those who participated on an ongoing basis had significant reductions in mortality (24) and A1C (decrease of 0.57%) (20) compared with those who spent less time with a diabetes care and education specialist. Given individual needs and access to resources, a variety of culturally adapted DSMES programs need to be offered in a variety of settings. Use of technology to facilitate access to DSMES services, support self-management decisions, and decrease therapeutic inertia suggests that these approaches need broader adoption.

DSMES is associated with an increased use of primary care and

preventive services (26,52,64) and less frequent use of acute care and inpatient hospital services (22). Patients who participate in DSMES are more likely to follow best practice treatment recommendations, particularly among the Medicare population, and have lower Medicare and insurance claim costs (27,64). Despite these benefits, reports indicate that only 5–7% of individuals eligible for DSMES through Medicare or a private insurance plan actually receive it (65,66). Barriers to DSMES exist at the health system, payer, provider, and patient levels. This low participation may be due to lack of referral or other identified barriers such as logistical issues (accessibility, timing, costs) and the lack of a perceived benefit (66). Health system, programmatic, and payer barriers include lack of administrative leadership support, limited numbers of DSMES providers, not having referral to DSMES services effectively embedded in the health system service structure, and limited reimbursement rates (67). Thus, in addition to educating referring providers about the benefits of DSMES and the critical times to refer, efforts need to be made to identify and address all of the various potential barriers (2). Alternative and innovative models of DSMES delivery (47) need to be explored and evaluated, including the integration of technology-enabled diabetes and cardiometabolic health services (8,50).

#### Reimbursement

Medicare reimburses DSMES when that service meets the national standards (2,13) and is recognized by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) through the Education Recognition Program (<https://professional.diabetes.org/diabetes-education>) or Association of Diabetes Care & Education Specialists. DSMES is also covered by most health insurance plans. Ongoing support has been shown to be instrumental for improving outcomes when it is implemented after the completion of education services. DSMES is frequently reimbursed when performed in person. However, although DSMES can also be provided via phone calls and telehealth, these remote versions may not always be reimbursed. Some barriers to DSMES access may be mitigated through telemedicine approaches.

Changes in reimbursement policies that increase DSMES access and utilization will result in a positive impact to beneficiaries' clinical outcomes, quality of life, health care utilization, and costs (68–70). During the time of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, reimbursement policies have changed ([professional.diabetes.org/content-page/dsmes-and-mnt-during-covid-19-national-pandemic](http://professional.diabetes.org/content-page/dsmes-and-mnt-during-covid-19-national-pandemic)), and these changes may provide a new reimbursement paradigm for future provision of DSMES through telehealth channels.

#### MEDICAL NUTRITION THERAPY

Please refer to the ADA consensus report “Nutrition Therapy for Adults With Diabetes or Prediabetes: A Consensus Report” for more information on nutrition therapy (56). For many individuals with diabetes, the most challenging part of the treatment plan is determining what to eat. There is not a “one-size-fits-all” eating pattern for individuals with diabetes, and meal planning should be individualized. Nutrition therapy plays an integral role in overall diabetes management, and each person with diabetes should be actively engaged in education, self-management, and treatment planning with his or her health care team, including the collaborative development of an individualized eating plan (56,71). All providers should refer people with diabetes for individualized MNT provided by a registered dietitian nutritionist (RD/RDN) who is knowledgeable and skilled in providing diabetes-specific MNT (72) at diagnosis and as needed throughout the life span, similar to DSMES. MNT delivered by an RD/RDN is associated with A1C absolute decreases of 1.0–1.9% for people with type 1 diabetes (73) and 0.3–2.0% for people with type 2 diabetes (73). See **Table 5.1** for specific nutrition recommendations. Because of the progressive nature of type 2 diabetes, behavior modification alone may not be adequate to maintain euglycemia over time. However, after medication is initiated, nutrition therapy continues to be an important component, and RD/RDNs providing MNT in diabetes care should assess and monitor medication changes in relation to the nutrition care plan (56,71).



**Table 5.1—Medical nutrition therapy recommendations**

Topic	Recommendation
Effectiveness of nutrition therapy	<p><b>5.9</b> An individualized medical nutrition therapy program as needed to achieve treatment goals, provided by a registered dietitian nutritionist (RD/RDN), preferably one who has comprehensive knowledge and experience in diabetes care, is recommended for all people with type 1 or type 2 diabetes, prediabetes, and gestational diabetes mellitus. <b>A</b></p> <p><b>5.10</b> Because diabetes medical nutrition therapy can result in cost savings <b>B</b> and improved outcomes (e.g., A1C reduction, reduced weight, decrease in cholesterol) <b>A</b>, medical nutrition therapy should be adequately reimbursed by insurance and other payers. <b>E</b></p>
Energy balance	<p><b>5.11</b> For all patients with overweight or obesity, behavioral modification to achieve and maintain a minimum weight loss of 5% is recommended. <b>A</b></p>
Eating patterns and macronutrient distribution	<p><b>5.12</b> There is no ideal macronutrient pattern for people with diabetes; meal plans should be individualized while keeping total calorie and metabolic goals in mind. <b>E</b></p> <p><b>5.13</b> A variety of eating patterns can be considered for the management of type 2 diabetes and to prevent diabetes in individuals with prediabetes. <b>B</b></p> <p><b>5.14</b> Reducing overall carbohydrate intake for individuals with diabetes has demonstrated the most evidence for improving glycemia and may be applied in a variety of eating patterns that meet individual needs and preferences. <b>B</b></p>
Carbohydrates	<p><b>5.15</b> Carbohydrate intake should emphasize nutrient-dense carbohydrate sources that are high in fiber (at least 14 g fiber per 1,000 kcal) and minimally processed. Eating plans should emphasize nonstarchy vegetables, fruits, and whole grains, as well as dairy products, with minimal added sugars. <b>B</b></p> <p><b>5.16</b> People with diabetes and those at risk are advised to replace sugar-sweetened beverages (including fruit juices) with water as much as possible in order to control glycemia and weight and reduce their risk for cardiovascular disease and fatty liver <b>B</b> and should minimize the consumption of foods with added sugar that have the capacity to displace healthier, more nutrient-dense food choices. <b>A</b></p> <p><b>5.17</b> When using a flexible insulin therapy program, education on the glycemic impact of carbohydrate <b>A</b>, fat, and protein <b>B</b> should be tailored to an individual's needs and preferences and used to optimize mealtime insulin dosing.</p> <p><b>5.18</b> When using fixed insulin doses, individuals should be provided education about consistent pattern of carbohydrate intake with respect to time and amount, while considering the insulin action time, as it can result in improved glycemia and reduce the risk for hypoglycemia. <b>B</b></p>
Protein	<p><b>5.19</b> In individuals with type 2 diabetes, ingested protein appears to increase insulin response without increasing plasma glucose concentrations. Therefore, carbohydrate sources high in protein should be avoided when trying to treat or prevent hypoglycemia. <b>B</b></p>
Dietary fat	<p><b>5.20</b> An eating plan emphasizing elements of a Mediterranean-style eating pattern rich in monounsaturated and polyunsaturated fats may be considered to improve glucose metabolism and lower cardiovascular disease risk. <b>B</b></p> <p><b>5.21</b> Eating foods rich in long-chain n-3 fatty acids, such as fatty fish (EPA and DHA) and nuts and seeds (ALA), is recommended to prevent or treat cardiovascular disease. <b>B</b></p>
Micronutrients and herbal supplements	<p><b>5.22</b> There is no clear evidence that dietary supplementation with vitamins, minerals (such as chromium and vitamin D), herbs, or spices (such as cinnamon or aloe vera) can improve outcomes in people with diabetes who do not have underlying deficiencies, and they are not generally recommended for glycemic control. <b>C</b></p>
Alcohol	<p><b>5.23</b> Adults with diabetes who drink alcohol should do so in moderation (no more than one drink per day for adult women and no more than two drinks per day for adult men). <b>C</b></p> <p><b>5.24</b> Educating people with diabetes about the signs, symptoms, and self-management of delayed hypoglycemia after drinking alcohol, especially when using insulin or insulin secretagogues, is recommended. The importance of glucose monitoring after drinking alcoholic beverages to reduce hypoglycemia risk should be emphasized. <b>B</b></p>
Sodium	<p><b>5.25</b> Sodium consumption should be limited to &lt;2,300 mg/day. <b>B</b></p>
Nonnutritive sweeteners	<p><b>5.26</b> The use of nonnutritive sweeteners as a replacement for sugar-sweetened products may reduce overall calorie and carbohydrate intake as long as there is not a compensatory increase of energy intake from other sources. Overall, people are encouraged to decrease both sweetened and nonnutritive-sweetened beverages, with an emphasis on water intake. <b>B</b></p>

### Goals of Nutrition Therapy for Adults With Diabetes

1. To promote and support healthful eating patterns, emphasizing a variety of nutrient-dense foods in appropriate portion sizes, to improve overall health and:
  - achieve and maintain body weight goals
  - attain individualized glycemic, blood pressure, and lipid goals
  - delay or prevent the complications of diabetes
2. To address individual nutrition needs based on personal and cultural preferences, health literacy and numeracy, access to healthful foods, willingness and ability to make behavioral changes, and existing barriers to change
3. To maintain the pleasure of eating by providing nonjudgmental messages about food choices while limiting food choices only when indicated by scientific evidence
4. To provide an individual with diabetes the practical tools for developing healthy eating patterns rather than focusing on individual macronutrients, micronutrients, or single foods

### Weight Management

Management and reduction of weight is important for people with type 1 diabetes, type 2 diabetes, or prediabetes with overweight or obesity. To support weight loss and improve A1C, cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk factors, and well-being in adults with overweight/obesity and prediabetes or diabetes, MNT and DSMES services should include an individualized eating plan in a format that results in an energy deficit in combination with enhanced physical activity (56). Lifestyle intervention programs should be intensive and have frequent follow-up to achieve significant reductions in excess body weight and improve clinical indicators. There is strong and consistent evidence that modest, sustained weight loss can delay the progression from prediabetes to type 2 diabetes (73–75) (see Section 3, “Prevention or Delay of Type 2 Diabetes and Associated Comorbidities,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S003>) and is beneficial for the management of type 2 diabetes (see Section 8, “Obesity and Weight Management for the Prevention and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S008>).

In prediabetes, the weight loss goal is 7–10% for preventing progression to type 2 diabetes (76). In conjunction with support for healthy lifestyle behaviors, medication-assisted weight loss can be considered for people at risk for type 2 diabetes when needed to achieve and sustain 7–10% weight loss (77,78) (see Section 8, “Obesity and Weight Management for the Prevention and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S008>). People with prediabetes at a healthy weight should also be considered for behavioral interventions to help establish routine aerobic and resistance exercise (76,79,80), as well as to establish healthy eating patterns. Services delivered by practitioners familiar with diabetes and its management, such as an RD/RDN, have been found to be effective (72).

For many individuals with overweight and obesity with type 2 diabetes, 5% weight loss is needed to achieve beneficial outcomes in glycemic control, lipids, and blood pressure (81). It should be noted, however, that the clinical benefits of weight loss are progressive, and more intensive weight loss goals (i.e., 15%) may be appropriate to maximize benefit depending on need, feasibility, and safety (82,83). In select individuals with type 2 diabetes, an overall healthy eating plan that results in energy deficit in conjunction with weight loss medications and/or metabolic surgery should be considered to help achieve weight loss and maintenance goals, lower A1C, and reduce CVD risk (77,84,85). Overweight and obesity are also increasingly prevalent in people with type 1 diabetes and present clinical challenges regarding diabetes treatment and CVD risk factors (86,87). Sustaining weight loss can be challenging (81,88) but has long-term benefits; maintaining weight loss for 5 years is associated with sustained improvements in A1C and lipid levels (89). MNT guidance from an RD/RDN with expertise in diabetes and weight management, throughout the course of a structured weight loss plan, is strongly recommended.

Along with routine medical management visits, people with diabetes and prediabetes should be screened during DSMES and MNT encounters for a history of dieting and past or current disordered eating behaviors. Nutrition therapy should be individualized to help address maladaptive eating behavior

(e.g., purging) or compensatory changes in medical regimen (e.g., overtreatment of hypoglycemic episodes, reduction in medication dosing to reduce hunger) (56) (see DISORDERED EATING BEHAVIOR below). Disordered eating and/or eating disorders can increase challenges for weight and diabetes management. For example, caloric restriction may be essential for glycemic control and weight maintenance, but rigid meal plans may be contraindicated for individuals who are at increased risk of clinically significant maladaptive eating behaviors (90). If clinically significant eating disorders are identified during screening with diabetes-specific questionnaires, individuals should be referred to a mental health professional as needed (1).

Studies have demonstrated that a variety of eating plans, varying in macronutrient composition, can be used effectively and safely in the short term (1–2 years) to achieve weight loss in people with diabetes. These plans include structured low-calorie meal plans with meal replacements (82,89,91), a Mediterranean-style eating pattern (92), and low-carbohydrate meal plans with additional support (93,94). However, no single approach has been proven to be consistently superior (56,95–97), and more data are needed to identify and validate those meal plans that are optimal with respect to long-term outcomes and patient acceptability. The importance of providing guidance on an individualized meal plan containing nutrient-dense foods, such as vegetables, fruits, legumes, dairy, lean sources of protein (including plant-based sources as well as lean meats, fish, and poultry), nuts, seeds, and whole grains, cannot be overemphasized (96), as well as guidance on achieving the desired energy deficit (98–101). Any approach to meal planning should be individualized considering the health status, personal preferences, and ability of the person with diabetes to sustain the recommendations in the plan.

### Eating Patterns and Meal Planning

Evidence suggests that there is not an ideal percentage of calories from carbohydrate, protein, and fat for people with diabetes. Therefore, macronutrient distribution should be based on an individualized assessment of current eating patterns, preferences, and metabolic goals. Dietary

guidance should emphasize the importance of a healthy dietary pattern as a whole rather than focusing on individual nutrients, foods, or food groups, given that individuals rarely eat foods in isolation. Personal preferences (e.g., tradition, culture, religion, health beliefs and goals, economics) as well as metabolic goals need to be considered when working with individuals to determine the best eating pattern for them (56, 73,102). Members of the health care team should complement MNT by providing evidence-based guidance that helps people with diabetes make healthy food choices that meet their individualized needs and improve overall health. A variety of eating patterns are acceptable for the management of diabetes (56,103–105). Until the evidence surrounding comparative benefits of different eating patterns in specific individuals strengthens, health care providers should focus on the key factors that are common among the patterns: 1) emphasize nonstarchy vegetables, 2) minimize added sugars and refined grains, and 3) choose whole foods over highly processed foods to the extent possible (56). An individualized eating pattern also considers the individual's health status, food and numeracy skills, resources, food preferences, and health goals. Referral to an RD/RDN is essential to assess the overall nutrition status of, and to work collaboratively with, the patient to create a personalized meal plan that coordinates and aligns with the overall treatment plan, including physical activity and medication use. The Mediterranean-style (102,106–108), low-carbohydrate (109–111), and vegetarian or plant-based (107,108,112,113) eating patterns are all examples of healthful eating patterns that have shown positive results in research for individuals with type 2 diabetes, but individualized meal planning should focus on personal preferences, needs, and goals. There is currently inadequate research in type 1 diabetes to support one eating pattern over another.

For individuals with type 2 diabetes not meeting glycemic targets or for whom reducing glucose-lowering drugs is a priority, reducing overall carbohydrate intake with a low- or very-low-carbohydrate eating pattern is a viable option (109–111). As research studies on low-carbohydrate eating plans generally indicate challenges with long-term

sustainability (114), it is important to reassess and individualize meal plan guidance regularly for those interested in this approach. Most individuals with diabetes report a moderate intake of carbohydrate (44–46% of total calories) (103). Efforts to modify habitual eating patterns are often unsuccessful in the long term; people generally go back to their usual macronutrient distribution (103). Thus, the recommended approach is to individualize meal plans with a macronutrient distribution that is more consistent with personal preference and usual intake to increase the likelihood for long-term maintenance.

An RCT found that two meal planning approaches were effective in helping achieve improved A1C, particularly for individuals with an A1C between 7% and 10% (115). The diabetes plate method is a commonly used visual approach for providing basic meal planning guidance. This simple graphic (featuring a 9-inch plate) shows how to portion foods (1/2 of the plate for nonstarchy vegetables, 1/4 of the plate for protein, and 1/4 of the plate for carbohydrates). Carbohydrate counting is a more advanced skill that helps plan for and track how much carbohydrate is consumed at meals and snacks. Meal planning approaches should be customized to the individual, including their numeracy (115) and food literacy level. Food literacy generally describes proficiency in food-related knowledge and skills that ultimately impact health, although specific definitions vary across initiatives (116,117).

### **Carbohydrates**

Studies examining the ideal amount of carbohydrate intake for people with diabetes are inconclusive, although monitoring carbohydrate intake and considering the blood glucose response to dietary carbohydrate are key for improving postprandial glucose management (118, 119). The literature concerning glycemic index and glycemic load in individuals with diabetes is complex, often with varying definitions of low and high glycemic index foods (120,121). The glycemic index ranks carbohydrate foods on their postprandial glycemic response, and glycemic load takes into account both the glycemic index of foods and the amount of carbohydrate eaten. Studies have found mixed results regarding the effect

of glycemic index and glycemic load on fasting glucose levels and A1C, with one systematic review finding no significant impact on A1C (122), while two others demonstrated A1C reductions of 0.15% (120) to 0.5% (123).

Reducing overall carbohydrate intake for individuals with diabetes has demonstrated evidence for improving glycemia and may be applied in a variety of eating patterns that meet individual needs and preferences (56). For people with type 2 diabetes, low-carbohydrate and very-low-carbohydrate eating patterns, in particular, have been found to reduce A1C and the need for antihyperglycemic medications (56,102,114,124–126). Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of RCTs found carbohydrate-restricted eating patterns, particularly those considered low-carbohydrate (<26% total energy), were effective in reducing A1C in the short term (<6 months), with less difference in eating patterns beyond 1 year (97,98,109, 110,125). Part of the challenge in interpreting low-carbohydrate research has been due to the wide range of definitions for a low-carbohydrate eating plan (111,123). Weight reduction was also a goal in many low-carbohydrate studies, which further complicates evaluating the distinct contribution of the eating pattern (41,93,97,127). As research studies on low-carbohydrate eating plans generally indicate challenges with long-term sustainability (114), it is important to reassess and individualize meal plan guidance regularly for those interested in this approach. Providers should maintain consistent medical oversight and recognize that insulin and other diabetes medications may need to be adjusted to prevent hypoglycemia; and blood pressure will need to be monitored. In addition, very-low-carbohydrate eating plans are not currently recommended for women who are pregnant or lactating, children, people who have renal disease, or people who or at risk for disordered eating, and these plans should be used with caution in those taking sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors because of the potential risk of ketoacidosis (128,129).

Regardless of amount of carbohydrate in the meal plan, focus should be placed on high-quality, nutrient-dense carbohydrate sources that are high in fiber and minimally processed. Both children and adults with diabetes are encouraged to minimize intake of refined carbohydrates

with added sugars, fat, and sodium and instead focus on carbohydrates from vegetables, legumes, fruits, dairy (milk and yogurt), and whole grains. People with diabetes and those at risk for diabetes are encouraged to consume a minimum of 14 g of fiber/1,000 kcal, with at least half of grain consumption being whole, intact grains, according to the Dietary Guidelines for Americans (130). Regular intake of sufficient dietary fiber is associated with lower all-cause mortality in people with diabetes (131,132), and prospective cohort studies have found dietary fiber intake is inversely associated with risk of type 2 diabetes (133–135). The consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages and processed food products with high amounts of refined grains and added sugars is strongly discouraged (130,136–138), as these have the capacity to displace healthier, more nutrient-dense food choices.

Individuals with type 1 or type 2 diabetes taking insulin at mealtime should be offered intensive and ongoing education on the need to couple insulin administration with carbohydrate intake. For people whose meal schedule or carbohydrate consumption is variable, regular education to increase understanding of the relationship between carbohydrate intake and insulin needs is important. In addition, education on using insulin-to-carbohydrate ratios for meal planning can assist individuals with effectively modifying insulin dosing from meal to meal to improve glycemic management (103,118,139–142). When consuming a mixed meal that contains carbohydrate and is high in fat and/or protein, insulin dosing should not be based solely on carbohydrate counting (56). Studies have shown that dietary fat and protein can impact early and delayed postprandial glycemia (143–146), and it appears to have a dose-dependent response (147–149). Results from high-fat, high-protein meal studies highlight the need for additional insulin to cover these meals; however, more studies are needed to determine the optimal insulin dose and delivery strategy. The results from these studies also point to individual differences in postprandial glycemic response; therefore, a cautious approach to increasing insulin doses for high-fat and/or high-protein mixed meals is recommended to address delayed hyperglycemia that may

occur 3 h or more after eating (56). If using an insulin pump, a split bolus feature (part of the bolus delivered immediately, the remainder over a programmed duration of time) may provide better insulin coverage for high-fat and/or high-protein mixed meals (144,150).

The effectiveness of insulin dosing decisions should be confirmed with a structured approach to blood glucose monitoring or continuous glucose monitoring to evaluate individual responses and guide insulin dose adjustments. Checking glucose 3 h after eating may help to determine if additional insulin adjustments are required (i.e., increasing or stopping bolus) (144,150,151). Refining insulin doses to account for high-fat and/or -protein meals requires determination of anticipated nutrient intake to calculate the mealtime dose. Food literacy, numeracy, interest, and capability should be evaluated (56). For individuals on a fixed daily insulin schedule, meal planning should emphasize a relatively fixed carbohydrate consumption pattern with respect to both time and amount, while considering insulin action. Attention to resultant hunger and satiety cues will also help with nutrient modifications throughout the day (56,152).

### Protein

There is no evidence that adjusting the daily level of protein intake (typically 1–1.5 g/kg body wt/day or 15–20% total calories) will improve health, and research is inconclusive regarding the ideal amount of dietary protein to optimize either glycemic management or CVD risk (121,153). Therefore, protein intake goals should be individualized based on current eating patterns. Some research has found successful management of type 2 diabetes with meal plans including slightly higher levels of protein (20–30%), which may contribute to increased satiety (154).

Historically, low-protein eating plans were advised for individuals with diabetic kidney disease (DKD) (with albuminuria and/or reduced estimated glomerular filtration rate); however, new evidence does not suggest that people with DKD need to restrict protein to less than the generally recommended protein intake (56). Reducing the amount of dietary protein below the recommended daily allowance of 0.8 g/kg is not recommended

because it does not alter glycemic measures, cardiovascular risk measures, or the rate at which glomerular filtration rate declines and may increase risk for malnutrition (155,156).

In individuals with type 2 diabetes, protein intake may enhance or increase the insulin response to dietary carbohydrates (157). Therefore, use of carbohydrate sources high in protein (such as milk and nuts) to treat or prevent hypoglycemia should be avoided due to the potential concurrent rise in endogenous insulin. Providers should counsel patients to treat hypoglycemia with pure glucose (i.e., glucose tablets) or carbohydrate-containing foods at the hypoglycemia alert value of <70 mg/dL. See Section 6, “Glycemic Targets” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>), for more information.

### Fats

The ideal amount of dietary fat for individuals with diabetes is controversial. New evidence suggests that there is not an ideal percentage of calories from fat for people with or at risk for diabetes and that macronutrient distribution should be individualized according to the patient’s eating patterns, preferences, and metabolic goals (56). The type of fats consumed is more important than total amount of fat when looking at metabolic goals and CVD risk, and it is recommended that the percentage of total calories from saturated fats should be limited (92,130,158–160). Multiple RCTs including patients with type 2 diabetes have reported that a Mediterranean-style eating pattern (92,161–166), rich in polyunsaturated and monounsaturated fats, can improve both glycemic management and blood lipids.

Evidence does not conclusively support recommending n-3 (eicosapentaenoic acid [EPA] and docosahexaenoic acid [DHA]) supplements for all people with diabetes for the prevention or treatment of cardiovascular events (56,167,168). In individuals with type 2 diabetes, two systematic reviews with n-3 and n-6 fatty acids concluded that the dietary supplements did not improve glycemic management (121,169). In the ASCEND trial (A Study of Cardiovascular Events in Diabetes), when compared with placebo, supplementation with n-3 fatty acids at the dose of 1 g/day did not lead to cardiovascular benefit in people with diabetes



without evidence of CVD (170). However, results from the Reduction of Cardiovascular Events With Icosapent Ethyl—Intervention Trial (REDUCE-IT) did find that supplementation with 4 g/day of pure EPA significantly lowered the risk of adverse cardiovascular events. This trial of 8,179 participants, in which over 50% had diabetes, found a 5% absolute reduction in cardiovascular events for individuals with established atherosclerotic CVD taking a preexisting statin with residual hypertriglyceridemia (135–499 mg/dL) (171). See Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>), for more information. People with diabetes should be advised to follow the guidelines for the general population for the recommended intakes of saturated fat, dietary cholesterol, and *trans* fat (130). *Trans* fats should be avoided. In addition, as saturated fats are progressively decreased in the diet, they should be replaced with unsaturated fats and not with refined carbohydrates (165).

### Sodium

As for the general population, people with diabetes are advised to limit their sodium consumption to <2,300 mg/day (56). Restriction to <1,500 mg, even for those with hypertension, is generally not recommended (172–174). Sodium recommendations should take into account palatability, availability, affordability, and the difficulty of achieving low-sodium recommendations in a nutritionally adequate diet (175).

### Micronutrients and Supplements

There continues to be no clear evidence of benefit from herbal or nonherbal (i.e., vitamin or mineral) supplementation for people with diabetes without underlying deficiencies (56). Metformin is associated with vitamin B12 deficiency per a report from the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study (DPPOS), suggesting that periodic testing of vitamin B12 levels should be considered in patients taking metformin, particularly in those with anemia or peripheral neuropathy (176). Routine supplementation with antioxidants, such as vitamins E and C and carotene, is not advised due to lack of evidence of efficacy and concern related to long-term safety. In addition, there is insuffi-

cient evidence to support the routine use of herbal supplements and micronutrients, such as cinnamon (177), curcumin, vitamin D (178), aloe vera, or chromium, to improve glycemia in people with diabetes (56,179).

Although the Vitamin D and Type 2 Diabetes (D2d) prospective RCT showed no significant benefit of vitamin D versus placebo on the progression to type 2 diabetes in individuals at high risk (180), post hoc analyses and meta-analyses suggest a potential benefit in specific populations (180–183). Further research is needed to define patient characteristics and clinical indicators where vitamin D supplementation may be of benefit.

For special populations, including pregnant or lactating women, older adults, vegetarians, and people following very-low-calorie or low-carbohydrate diets, a multivitamin may be necessary.

### Alcohol

Moderate alcohol intake does not have major detrimental effects on long-term blood glucose management in people with diabetes. Risks associated with alcohol consumption include hypoglycemia and/or delayed hypoglycemia (particularly for those using insulin or insulin secretagogue therapies), weight gain, and hyperglycemia (for those consuming excessive amounts) (56,179). People with diabetes should be educated about these risks and encouraged to monitor blood glucose frequently after drinking alcohol to minimize such risks. People with diabetes can follow the same guidelines as those without diabetes if they choose to drink. For women, no more than one drink per day, and for men, no more than two drinks per day is recommended (one drink is equal to a 12-oz beer, a 5-oz glass of wine, or 1.5 oz of distilled spirits).

### Nonnutritive Sweeteners

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has approved many nonnutritive sweeteners for consumption by the general public, including people with diabetes (56,184). For some people with diabetes who are accustomed to regularly consuming sugar-sweetened products, nonnutritive sweeteners (containing few or no calories) may be an acceptable substitute for nutritive sweeteners (those

containing calories, such as sugar, honey, and agave syrup) when consumed in moderation (185,186). Nonnutritive sweeteners do not appear to have a significant effect on glycemic management (103,187,188), but they can reduce overall calorie and carbohydrate intake (103,185) as long as individuals are not compensating with additional calories from other food sources (56,189). There is mixed evidence from systematic reviews and meta-analyses for nonnutritive sweetener use with regard to weight management, with some finding benefit in weight loss (190–192), while other research suggests an association with weight gain (193). The addition of nonnutritive sweeteners to diets poses no benefit for weight loss or reduced weight gain without energy restriction (194). Low-calorie or nonnutritive-sweetened beverages may serve as a short-term replacement strategy; however, people with diabetes should be encouraged to decrease both sweetened and nonnutritive-sweetened beverages, with an emphasis on water intake (186). Additionally, some research has found that higher nonnutritive-sweetened beverage and sugar-sweetened beverage consumption may be associated with the development of type 2 diabetes, although substantial heterogeneity makes interpreting the results difficult (195–198).

## PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

### Recommendations

- 5.27** Children and adolescents with type 1 or type 2 diabetes or prediabetes should engage in 60 min/day or more of moderate- or vigorous-intensity aerobic activity, with vigorous muscle-strengthening and bone-strengthening activities at least 3 days/week. **C**
- 5.28** Most adults with type 1 **C** and type 2 **B** diabetes should engage in 150 min or more of moderate- to vigorous-intensity aerobic activity per week, spread over at least 3 days/week, with no more than 2 consecutive days without activity. Shorter durations (minimum 75 min/week) of vigorous-intensity or interval training may be

sufficient for younger and more physically fit individuals.

- 5.29** Adults with type 1 **C** and type 2 **B** diabetes should engage in 2–3 sessions/week of resistance exercise on nonconsecutive days.
- 5.30** All adults, and particularly those with type 2 diabetes, should decrease the amount of time spent in daily sedentary behavior. **B** Prolonged sitting should be interrupted every 30 min for blood glucose benefits. **C**
- 5.31** Flexibility training and balance training are recommended 2–3 times/week for older adults with diabetes. Yoga and tai chi may be included based on individual preferences to increase flexibility, muscular strength, and balance. **C**
- 5.32** Evaluate baseline physical activity and sedentary time. Promote increase in nonsedentary activities above baseline for sedentary individuals with type 1 **E** and type 2 **B** diabetes. Examples include walking, yoga, housework, gardening, swimming, and dancing.

Physical activity is a general term that includes all movement that increases energy use and is an important part of the diabetes management plan. Exercise is a more specific form of physical activity that is structured and designed to improve physical fitness. Both physical activity and exercise are important. Exercise has been shown to improve blood glucose control, reduce cardiovascular risk factors, contribute to weight loss, and improve well-being (199). Physical activity is as important for those with type 1 diabetes as it is for the general population, but its specific role in the prevention of diabetes complications and the management of blood glucose is not as clear as it is for those with type 2 diabetes. A recent study suggested that the percentage of people with diabetes who achieved the recommended exercise level per week (150 min) varied by race. Objective measurement by accelerometer showed that 44.2%, 42.6%, and 65.1% of Whites, African Americans, and Hispanics, respectively, met the threshold

(200). It is important for diabetes care management teams to understand the difficulty that many patients have reaching recommended treatment targets and to identify individualized approaches to improve goal achievement.

Moderate to high volumes of aerobic activity are associated with substantially lower cardiovascular and overall mortality risks in both type 1 and type 2 diabetes (201). A recent prospective observational study of adults with type 1 diabetes suggested that higher amounts of physical activity led to reduced cardiovascular mortality after a mean follow-up time of 11.4 years for patients with and without chronic kidney disease (202). Additionally, structured exercise interventions of at least 8 weeks' duration have been shown to lower A1C by an average of 0.66% in people with type 2 diabetes, even without a significant change in BMI (203). There are also considerable data for the health benefits (e.g., increased cardiovascular fitness, greater muscle strength, improved insulin sensitivity, etc.) of regular exercise for those with type 1 diabetes (204). A recent study suggested that exercise training in type 1 diabetes may also improve several important markers such as triglyceride level, LDL, waist circumference, and body mass (205). In adults with type 2 diabetes, higher levels of exercise intensity are associated with greater improvements in A1C and in cardiorespiratory fitness (206); sustained improvements in cardiorespiratory fitness and weight loss have also been associated with a lower risk of heart failure (207). Other benefits include slowing the decline in mobility among overweight patients with diabetes (208). The ADA position statement "Physical Activity/Exercise and Diabetes" reviews the evidence for the benefits of exercise in people with type 1 and type 2 diabetes and offers specific recommendations (209). Increased physical activity (soccer training) has also been shown to be beneficial for improving overall fitness in Latino men with obesity, demonstrating feasible methods to increase physical activity in an often hard-to-engage population (210). Physical activity and exercise should be recommended and prescribed to all individuals who are at risk for or with diabetes as part of management of glycemia and overall health. Specific recommendations and precautions will vary

by the type of diabetes, age, activity done, and presence of diabetes-related health complications. Recommendations should be tailored to meet the specific needs of each individual (209).

### Exercise and Children

All children, including children with diabetes or prediabetes, should be encouraged to engage in regular physical activity. Children should engage in at least 60 min of moderate to vigorous aerobic activity every day, with muscle- and bone-strengthening activities at least 3 days per week (211). In general, youth with type 1 diabetes benefit from being physically active, and an active lifestyle should be recommended to all (212). Youth with type 1 diabetes who engage in more physical activity may have better health outcomes and health-related quality of life (213,214).

### Frequency and Type of Physical Activity

People with diabetes should perform aerobic and resistance exercise regularly (209). Aerobic activity bouts should ideally last at least 10 min, with the goal of ~30 min/day or more most days of the week for adults with type 2 diabetes. Daily exercise, or at least not allowing more than 2 days to elapse between exercise sessions, is recommended to decrease insulin resistance, regardless of diabetes type (215,216). A study in adults with type 1 diabetes found a dose-response inverse relationship between self-reported bouts of physical activity per week and A1C, BMI, hypertension, dyslipidemia, and diabetes-related complications such as hypoglycemia, diabetic ketoacidosis, retinopathy, and microalbuminuria (217). Over time, activities should progress in intensity, frequency, and/or duration to at least 150 min/week of moderate-intensity exercise. Adults able to run at 6 miles/h (9.7 km/h) for at least 25 min can benefit sufficiently from shorter-intensity activity (75 min/week) (209). Many adults, including most with type 2 diabetes, may be unable or unwilling to participate in such intense exercise and should engage in moderate exercise for the recommended duration. Adults with diabetes should engage in 2–3 sessions/week of resistance exercise on nonconsecutive days (218). Although heavier resistance training with free weights and weight

machines may improve glycemic control and strength (219), resistance training of any intensity is recommended to improve strength, balance, and the ability to engage in activities of daily living throughout the life span. Providers and staff should help patients set stepwise goals toward meeting the recommended exercise targets. As individuals intensify their exercise program, medical monitoring may be indicated to ensure safety and evaluate the effects on glucose management. (See the section *PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND GLYCEMIC CONTROL* below.)

Recent evidence supports that all individuals, including those with diabetes, should be encouraged to reduce the amount of time spent being sedentary—waking behaviors with low energy expenditure (e.g., working at a computer, watching television)—by breaking up bouts of sedentary activity (>30 min) by briefly standing, walking, or performing other light physical activities (220,221). Participating in leisure-time activity and avoiding extended sedentary periods may help prevent type 2 diabetes for those at risk (222,223) and may also aid in glycemic control for those with diabetes.

A systematic review and meta-analysis found higher frequency of regular leisure-time physical activity was more effective in reducing A1C levels (224). A wide range of activities, including yoga, tai chi, and other types, can have significant impacts on A1C, flexibility, muscle strength, and balance (199,225–227). Flexibility and balance exercises may be particularly important in older adults with diabetes to maintain range of motion, strength, and balance (209).

### Physical Activity and Glycemic Control

Clinical trials have provided strong evidence for the A1C-lowering value of resistance training in older adults with type 2 diabetes (228) and for an additive benefit of combined aerobic and resistance exercise in adults with type 2 diabetes (229). If not contraindicated, patients with type 2 diabetes should be encouraged to do at least two weekly sessions of resistance exercise (exercise with free weights or weight machines), with each session consisting of at least one set (group of consecutive repetitive exercise motions) of five or more different resistance

exercises involving the large muscle groups (228).

For type 1 diabetes, although exercise in general is associated with improvement in disease status, care needs to be taken in titrating exercise with respect to glycemic management. Each individual with type 1 diabetes has a variable glycemic response to exercise. This variability should be taken into consideration when recommending the type and duration of exercise for a given individual (204).

Women with preexisting diabetes, particularly type 2 diabetes, and those at risk for or presenting with gestational diabetes mellitus should be advised to engage in regular moderate physical activity prior to and during their pregnancies as tolerated (209).

### Pre-exercise Evaluation

As discussed more fully in Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>), the best protocol for assessing asymptomatic patients with diabetes for coronary artery disease remains unclear. The ADA consensus report “Screening for Coronary Artery Disease in Patients With Diabetes” (230) concluded that routine testing is not recommended. However, providers should perform a careful history, assess cardiovascular risk factors, and be aware of the atypical presentation of coronary artery disease, such as recent patient-reported or tested decrease in exercise tolerance, in patients with diabetes. Certainly, high-risk patients should be encouraged to start with short periods of low-intensity exercise and slowly increase the intensity and duration as tolerated. Providers should assess patients for conditions that might contraindicate certain types of exercise or predispose to injury, such as uncontrolled hypertension, untreated proliferative retinopathy, autonomic neuropathy, peripheral neuropathy, and a history of foot ulcers or Charcot foot. The patient’s age and previous physical activity level should be considered when customizing the exercise regimen to the individual’s needs. Those with complications may need a more thorough evaluation prior to starting an exercise program (204,231).

### Hypoglycemia

In individuals taking insulin and/or insulin secretagogues, physical activity may cause hypoglycemia if the medication dose or carbohydrate consumption is not adjusted for the exercise bout and post-bout impact on glucose. Individuals on these therapies may need to ingest some added carbohydrate if pre-exercise glucose levels are <90 mg/dL (5.0 mmol/L), depending on whether they are able to lower insulin doses during the workout (such as with an insulin pump or reduced pre-exercise insulin dosage), the time of day exercise is done, and the intensity and duration of the activity (204,231). In some patients, hypoglycemia after exercise may occur and last for several hours due to increased insulin sensitivity. Hypoglycemia is less common in patients with diabetes who are not treated with insulin or insulin secretagogues, and no routine preventive measures for hypoglycemia are usually advised in these cases. Intense activities may actually raise blood glucose levels instead of lowering them, especially if pre-exercise glucose levels are elevated (204). Because of the variation in glycemic response to exercise bouts, patients need to be educated to check blood glucose levels before and after periods of exercise and about the potential prolonged effects (depending on intensity and duration) (see the section *DIABETES SELF-MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND SUPPORT* above).

### Exercise in the Presence of Microvascular Complications

See Section 11, “Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>), and Section 12, “Retinopathy, Neuropathy, and Foot Care” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S012>), for more information on these long-term complications.

### Retinopathy

If proliferative diabetic retinopathy or severe nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy is present, then vigorous-intensity aerobic or resistance exercise may be contraindicated because of the risk of triggering vitreous hemorrhage or retinal detachment (232). Consultation with an ophthalmologist prior to engaging in an intense exercise regimen may be appropriate.



**Peripheral Neuropathy**

Decreased pain sensation and a higher pain threshold in the extremities can result in an increased risk of skin breakdown, infection, and Charcot joint destruction with some forms of exercise. Therefore, a thorough assessment should be done to ensure that neuropathy does not alter kinesthetic or proprioceptive sensation during physical activity, particularly in those with more severe neuropathy. Studies have shown that moderate-intensity walking may not lead to an increased risk of foot ulcers or reulceration in those with peripheral neuropathy who use proper footwear (233). In addition, 150 min/week of moderate exercise was reported to improve outcomes in patients with prediabetic neuropathy (234). All individuals with peripheral neuropathy should wear proper footwear and examine their feet daily to detect lesions early. Anyone with a foot injury or open sore should be restricted to non-weight-bearing activities.

**Autonomic Neuropathy**

Autonomic neuropathy can increase the risk of exercise-induced injury or adverse events through decreased cardiac responsiveness to exercise, postural hypotension, impaired thermoregulation, impaired night vision due to impaired papillary reaction, and greater susceptibility to hypoglycemia (235). Cardiovascular autonomic neuropathy is also an independent risk factor for cardiovascular death and silent myocardial ischemia (236). Therefore, individuals with diabetic autonomic neuropathy should undergo cardiac investigation before beginning physical activity more intense than that to which they are accustomed.

**Diabetic Kidney Disease**

Physical activity can acutely increase urinary albumin excretion. However, there is no evidence that vigorous-intensity exercise accelerates the rate of progression of DKD, and there appears to be no need for specific exercise restrictions for people with DKD in general (232).

**SMOKING CESSATION: TOBACCO AND E-CIGARETTES****Recommendations**

**5.33** Advise all patients not to use cigarettes and other tobacco products or e-cigarettes. **A**

**5.34** After identification of tobacco or e-cigarette use, include smoking cessation counseling and other forms of treatment as a routine component of diabetes care. **A**

**5.35** Address smoking cessation as part of diabetes education programs for those in need. **B**

Results from epidemiologic, case-control, and cohort studies provide convincing evidence to support the causal link between cigarette smoking and health risks (237). Recent data show tobacco use is higher among adults with chronic conditions (238) as well as in adolescents and young adults with diabetes (239). People with diabetes who smoke (and people with diabetes exposed to second-hand smoke) have a heightened risk of CVD, premature death, microvascular complications, and worse glycemic control when compared with those who do not smoke (240–242). Smoking may have a role in the development of type 2 diabetes (243–245).

The routine and thorough assessment of tobacco use is essential to prevent smoking or encourage cessation. Numerous large randomized clinical trials have demonstrated the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of brief counseling in smoking cessation, including the use of telephone quit lines, in reducing tobacco use. Pharmacologic therapy to assist with smoking cessation in people with diabetes has been shown to be effective (246), and for the patient motivated to quit, the addition of pharmacologic therapy to counseling is more effective than either treatment alone (247). Special considerations should include assessment of level of nicotine dependence, which is associated with difficulty in quitting and relapse (248). Although some people may gain weight in the period shortly after smoking cessation (249), recent research has demonstrated that this weight gain does not diminish the substantial CVD benefit realized from smoking cessation (250). One study in people who smoke who had newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes found that smoking cessation was associated with amelioration of metabolic parameters and reduced blood pressure and albuminuria at 1 year (251).

In recent years, e-cigarettes have gained public awareness and popularity because of perceptions that e-cigarette use is less harmful than regular cigarette smoking (252,253). However, in light of recent Centers for Disease Control and Prevention evidence (254) of deaths related to e-cigarette use, no individuals should be advised to use e-cigarettes, either as a way to stop smoking tobacco or as a recreational drug.

Diabetes education programs offer potential to systematically reach and engage individuals with diabetes in smoking cessation efforts. A cluster randomized trial found statistically significant increases in quit rates and long-term abstinence rates (>6 months) when smoking cessation interventions were offered through diabetes education clinics, regardless of motivation to quit at baseline (255).

**PSYCHOSOCIAL ISSUES****Recommendations**

**5.36** Psychosocial care should be integrated with a collaborative, patient-centered approach and provided to all people with diabetes, with the goals of optimizing health outcomes and health-related quality of life. **A**

**5.37** Psychosocial screening and follow-up may include, but are not limited to, attitudes about diabetes, expectations for medical management and outcomes, affect or mood, general and diabetes-related quality of life, available resources (financial, social, and emotional), and psychiatric history. **E**

**5.38** Providers should consider assessment for symptoms of diabetes distress, depression, anxiety, disordered eating, and cognitive capacities using age-appropriate standardized and validated tools at the initial visit, at periodic intervals, and when there is a change in disease, treatment, or life circumstance. Including caregivers and family members in this assessment is recommended. **B**

**5.39** Consider screening older adults (aged  $\geq 65$  years) with diabetes for cognitive impairment and



depression. **B** Monitoring of cognitive capacity, i.e., the ability to actively engage in decision-making regarding regimen behaviors, is advised. **B**

Please refer to the ADA position statement “Psychosocial Care for People With Diabetes” for a list of assessment tools and additional details (1).

Complex environmental, social, behavioral, and emotional factors, known as psychosocial factors, influence living with diabetes, both type 1 and type 2, and achieving satisfactory medical outcomes and psychological well-being. Thus, individuals with diabetes and their families are challenged with complex, multifaceted issues when integrating diabetes care into daily life (142).

Emotional well-being is an important part of diabetes care and self-management. Psychological and social problems can impair the individual’s (13,256–260) or family’s (259) ability to carry out diabetes care tasks and therefore potentially compromise health status. There are opportunities for the clinician to routinely assess psychosocial status in a timely and efficient manner for referral to appropriate services (261,262). A systematic review and meta-analysis showed that psychosocial interventions modestly but significantly improved A1C (standardized mean difference –0.29%) and mental health outcomes (263). There was a limited association between the effects on A1C and mental health, and no intervention characteristics predicted benefit on both outcomes. However, cost analyses have shown that behavioral health interventions are both effective and cost-efficient approaches to the prevention of diabetes (264).

### Screening

Key opportunities for psychosocial screening occur at diabetes diagnosis, during regularly scheduled management visits, during hospitalizations, with new onset of complications, during significant transitions in care such as from pediatric to adult care teams (265), or when problems with achieving A1C goals, quality of life, or self-management are identified (2). Patients are likely to exhibit psychological vulnerability at diagnosis, when their medical status changes (e.g., end of

the honeymoon period), when the need for intensified treatment is evident, and when complications are discovered. Significant changes in life circumstances, often called social determinants of health, are known to considerably affect a person’s ability to self-manage their condition. Thus, screening for social determinants of health (e.g., loss of employment, birth of a child, or other family-based stresses) should also be incorporated into routine care (266).

Providers can start with informal verbal inquiries, for example, by asking whether there have been persistent changes in mood during the past 2 weeks or since the patient’s last visit and whether the person can identify a triggering event or change in circumstances. Providers should also ask whether there are new or different barriers to treatment and self-management, such as feeling overwhelmed or stressed by having diabetes (see the section *DIABETES DISTRESS* below), changes in finances, or competing medical demands (e.g., the diagnosis of a comorbid condition). In circumstances where individuals other than the patient are significantly involved in diabetes management, these issues should be explored with nonmedical care providers (265). Standardized and validated tools for psychosocial monitoring and assessment can also be used by providers (1), with positive findings leading to referral to a mental health provider specializing in diabetes for comprehensive evaluation, diagnosis, and treatment.

### Diabetes Distress

#### Recommendation

**5.40** Routinely monitor people with diabetes for diabetes distress, particularly when treatment targets are not met and/or at the onset of diabetes complications. **B**

Diabetes distress is very common and is distinct from other psychological disorders (259,267,268). Diabetes distress refers to significant negative psychological reactions related to emotional burdens and worries specific to an individual’s experience in having to manage a severe, complicated, and demanding chronic disease such as diabetes (267–269). The constant behavioral demands of diabetes self-management (medication dosing,

frequency, and titration; monitoring of blood glucose, food intake, eating patterns, and physical activity) and the potential or actuality of disease progression are directly associated with reports of diabetes distress (267). The prevalence of diabetes distress is reported to be 18–45% with an incidence of 38–48% over 18 months in people with type 2 diabetes (269). In the second Diabetes Attitudes, Wishes and Needs (DAWN2) study, significant diabetes distress was reported by 45% of the participants, but only 24% reported that their health care teams asked them how diabetes affected their lives (259). High levels of diabetes distress significantly impact medication-taking behaviors and are linked to higher A1C, lower self-efficacy, and poorer dietary and exercise behaviors (5,267,269). DSMES has been shown to reduce diabetes distress (5). It may be helpful to provide counseling regarding expected diabetes-related versus generalized psychological distress, both at diagnosis and when disease state or treatment changes occur (270).

An RCT tested the effects of participation in a standardized 8-week mindful self-compassion program versus a control group among patients with type 1 and type 2 diabetes. Mindful self-compassion training increased self-compassion, reduced depression and diabetes distress, and improved A1C in the intervention group (271). An RCT of cognitive behavioral and social problem-solving approaches compared with diabetes education (272) in teens (aged 14–18 years) showed that diabetes distress and depressive symptoms were significantly reduced for up to 3 years postintervention. Neither glycemic control nor self-management behaviors were improved over time. These recent studies support that a combination of approaches is needed to address distress, depression, and metabolic status.

Diabetes distress should be routinely monitored (273) using person-based diabetes-specific validated measures (1). If diabetes distress is identified, the person should be referred for specific diabetes education to address areas of diabetes self-care causing the patient distress and impacting clinical management. Diabetes distress is associated with anxiety, depression, and reduced health-related quality of life (274). People whose self-care remains impaired

after tailored diabetes education should be referred by their care team to a behavioral health provider for evaluation and treatment.

Other psychosocial issues known to affect self-management and health outcomes include attitudes about the illness, expectations for medical management and outcomes, available resources (financial, social, and emotional) (275), and psychiatric history.

### Referral to a Mental Health Specialist

Indications for referral to a mental health specialist familiar with diabetes management may include positive screening for overall stress related to work-life balance, diabetes distress, diabetes management difficulties, depression, anxiety, disordered eating, and cognitive dysfunction (see **Table 5.2** for a complete list). It is preferable to incorporate psychosocial assessment and treatment into routine care rather than waiting for a specific problem or deterioration in metabolic or psychological status to occur (34,259). Providers should identify behavioral and mental health providers, ideally those who are knowledgeable about diabetes treatment and the psychosocial aspects of diabetes, to whom they can refer patients. The ADA provides a list of mental health providers who have received additional education in diabetes at the ADA Mental Health Provider Directory ([professional.diabetes.org/mhp\\_listing](http://professional.diabetes.org/mhp_listing)). Ideally, psychosocial care providers should be embedded in diabetes care settings. Although the provider may not feel qualified to treat psychological problems (276), optimizing the patient-provider relationship as a foundation may increase the likelihood of the patient accepting referral for other services. Collaborative care interventions and a team approach have demonstrated efficacy in diabetes self-management, outcomes of depression, and psychosocial functioning (5,6).

### Psychosocial/Emotional Distress

Clinically significant psychopathologic diagnoses are considerably more prevalent in people with diabetes than in those without (277,278). Symptoms, both clinical and subclinical, that interfere with the person's ability to carry out daily diabetes self-management tasks must be addressed. In addition to

impacting a person's ability to carry out self-management, and the association of mental health diagnosis with poorer short-term glycemic stability, symptoms of emotional distress are associated with mortality risk (277,279). Providers should consider an assessment of symptoms of depression, anxiety, disordered eating, and cognitive capacities using appropriate standardized/validated tools at the initial visit, at periodic intervals when patient distress is suspected, and when there is a change in health, treatment, or life circumstance. Inclusion of caregivers and family members in this assessment is recommended. Diabetes distress is addressed as an independent condition (see the section **DIABETES DISTRESS** above), as this state is very common and expected and is distinct from the psychological disorders discussed below (1). A list of age-appropriate screening and evaluation measures is provided in the ADA position statement "Psychosocial Care for People with Diabetes" (1).

### Anxiety Disorders

#### Recommendations

- 5.41** Consider screening for anxiety in people exhibiting anxiety or worries regarding diabetes complications, insulin administration, and taking of medications, as well as fear of hypoglycemia and/or hypoglycemia unawareness that interferes with self-management behaviors, and in those who express fear, dread, or irrational thoughts and/or show anxiety symptoms such as avoidance behaviors, excessive repetitive behaviors, or social withdrawal. Refer for treatment if anxiety is present. **B**
- 5.42** People with hypoglycemia unawareness, which can co-occur with fear of hypoglycemia, should be treated using blood glucose awareness training (or other evidence-based intervention) to help re-establish awareness of symptoms of hypoglycemia and reduce fear of hypoglycemia. **A**

Anxiety symptoms and diagnosable disorders (e.g., generalized anxiety disorder, body dysmorphic disorder, obsessive-

compulsive disorder, specific phobias, and posttraumatic stress disorder) are common in people with diabetes (280). The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) estimated the lifetime prevalence of generalized anxiety disorder to be 19.5% in people with either type 1 or type 2 diabetes (281). Common diabetes-specific concerns include fears related to hypoglycemia (282,283), not meeting blood glucose targets (280), and insulin injections or infusion (284). Onset of complications presents another critical point in the disease course when anxiety can occur (1). People with diabetes who exhibit excessive diabetes self-management behaviors well beyond what is prescribed or needed to achieve glycemic targets may be experiencing symptoms of obsessive-compulsive disorder (285).

General anxiety is a predictor of injection-related anxiety and associated with fear of hypoglycemia (283,286). Fear of hypoglycemia and hypoglycemia unawareness often co-occur. Interventions aimed at treating one often benefit both (287). Fear of hypoglycemia may explain avoidance of behaviors associated with lowering glucose such as increasing insulin doses or frequency of monitoring. If fear of hypoglycemia is identified and a person does not have symptoms of hypoglycemia, a structured program of blood glucose awareness training delivered in routine clinical practice can improve A1C, reduce the rate of severe hypoglycemia, and restore hypoglycemia awareness (288,289). If not available within the practice setting, a structured program targeting both fear of hypoglycemia and unawareness should be sought out and implemented by a qualified behavioral practitioner (287,289–291).

### Depression

#### Recommendations

- 5.43** Providers should consider annual screening of all patients with diabetes, especially those with a self-reported history of depression, for depressive symptoms with age-appropriate depression screening measures, recognizing that further evaluation will be necessary for individuals who have a positive screen. **B**
- 5.44** Beginning at diagnosis of complications or when there are

**Table 5.2—Situations that warrant referral of a person with diabetes to a mental health provider for evaluation and treatment**

- Self-care remains impaired in a person with diabetes distress after tailored diabetes education
- A positive screen on a validated screening tool for depressive symptoms
- The presence of symptoms or suspicions of disordered eating behavior, an eating disorder, or disrupted patterns of eating
- Intentional omission of insulin or oral medication to cause weight loss is identified
- A positive screen for anxiety or fear of hypoglycemia
- A serious mental illness is suspected
- In youth and families with behavioral self-care difficulties, repeated hospitalizations for diabetic ketoacidosis, or significant distress
- A positive screening for cognitive impairment
- Declining or impaired ability to perform diabetes self-care behaviors
- Before undergoing bariatric or metabolic surgery and after surgery, if assessment reveals an ongoing need for adjustment support

significant changes in medical status, consider assessment for depression. **B**

**5.45** Referrals for treatment of depression should be made to mental health providers with experience using cognitive behavioral therapy, interpersonal therapy, or other evidence-based treatment approaches in conjunction with collaborative care with the patient's diabetes treatment team. **A**

History of depression, current depression, and antidepressant medication use are risk factors for the development of type 2 diabetes, especially if the individual has other risk factors such as obesity and family history of type 2 diabetes (292–294). Elevated depressive symptoms and depressive disorders affect one in four patients with type 1 or type 2 diabetes (258). Thus, routine screening for depressive symptoms is indicated in this high-risk population, including people with type 1 or type 2 diabetes, gestational diabetes mellitus, and postpartum diabetes. Regardless of diabetes type, women have significantly higher rates of depression than men (295).

Routine monitoring with age-appropriate validated measures (1) can help to identify if referral is warranted (296). Adult patients with a history of depressive symptoms need ongoing monitoring of depression recurrence within the context of routine care (292). Integrating mental and physical health care can improve outcomes. When a patient is in psychological therapy (talk or cognitive

behavioral therapy), the mental health provider should be incorporated into the diabetes treatment team (297). As with DSMES, person-centered collaborative care approaches have been shown to improve both depression and medical outcomes (297). Depressive symptoms may also be a manifestation of reduced quality of life secondary to disease burden (also see *Diabetes Distress*) and resultant changes in resource allocation impacting the person and their family. When depressive symptoms are identified, it is important to query origins both diabetes-specific and due to other life circumstances (274,298).

Various RCTs have shown improvements in diabetes and related health outcomes when depression is simultaneously treated (297,299,300). It is important to note that medical regimen should also be monitored in response to reduction in depressive symptoms. People may agree to or adopt previously refused treatment strategies (improving ability to follow recommended treatment behaviors), which may include increased physical activity and intensification of regimen behaviors and monitoring, resulting in changed glucose profiles.

### Disordered Eating Behavior

#### Recommendations

**5.46** Providers should consider re-evaluating the treatment regimen of people with diabetes who present with symptoms of disordered eating behavior, an eating disorder, or disrupted patterns of eating. **B**

**5.47** Consider screening for disordered or disrupted eating using validated screening measures

when hyperglycemia and weight loss are unexplained based on self-reported behaviors related to medication dosing, meal plan, and physical activity. In addition, a review of the medical regimen is recommended to identify potential treatment-related effects on hunger/caloric intake. **B**

Estimated prevalence of disordered eating behavior and diagnosable eating disorders in people with diabetes varies (301–303). For people with type 1 diabetes, insulin omission causing glycosuria in order to lose weight is the most commonly reported disordered eating behavior (304,305); in people with type 2 diabetes, bingeing (excessive food intake with an accompanying sense of loss of control) is most commonly reported. For people with type 2 diabetes treated with insulin, intentional omission is also frequently reported (306). People with diabetes and diagnosable eating disorders have high rates of comorbid psychiatric disorders (307). People with type 1 diabetes and eating disorders have high rates of diabetes distress and fear of hypoglycemia (308).

When evaluating symptoms of disordered or disrupted eating (when the individual exhibits eating behaviors that appear maladaptive but are not volitional, such as bingeing caused by loss of satiety cues), etiology and motivation for the behavior should be evaluated (303,309). Mixed intervention results point to the need for treatment of eating disorders and disordered eating behavior in the context of the disease

and its treatment. More rigorous methods to identify underlying mechanisms of action that drive change in eating and treatment behaviors, as well as associated mental distress, are needed (310). Adjunctive medication such as glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists (311) may help individuals not only to meet glycemic targets but also to regulate hunger and food intake, thus having the potential to reduce uncontrollable hunger and bulimic symptoms. Caution should be taken in labeling individuals with diabetes as having a diagnosable psychiatric disorder, i.e., an eating disorder, when disordered or disrupted eating patterns are found to be associated with the disease and its treatment. In other words, patterns of maladaptive food intake that appear to have a psychological origin may be driven by physiologic disruption in hunger and satiety cues, metabolic perturbations, and/or secondary distress because of the individual's inability to control their hunger and satiety (303,309).

### Serious Mental Illness

#### Recommendations

- 5.48** Incorporate active monitoring of diabetes self-care activities into treatment goals for people with diabetes and serious mental illness. **B**
- 5.49** In people who are prescribed atypical antipsychotic medications, screen for prediabetes and diabetes 4 months after medication initiation and at least annually thereafter. **B**
- 5.50** If a second-generation antipsychotic medication is prescribed for adolescents or adults with diabetes, changes in weight, glycemic control, and cholesterol levels should be carefully monitored and the treatment regimen should be reassessed. **C**

Studies of individuals with serious mental illness, particularly schizophrenia and other thought disorders, show significantly increased rates of type 2 diabetes (312). People with schizophrenia should be monitored for type 2 diabetes because of the known comorbidity. Disordered thinking

and judgment can be expected to make it difficult to engage in behavior that reduces risk factors for type 2 diabetes, such as restrained eating for weight management. Further, people with serious mental health disorders and diabetes frequently experience moderate psychological distress, suggesting pervasive intrusion of mental health issues into daily functioning (313). Coordinated management of diabetes or prediabetes and serious mental illness is recommended to achieve diabetes treatment targets. In addition, those taking second-generation (atypical) antipsychotics, such as olanzapine, require greater monitoring because of an increase in risk of type 2 diabetes associated with this medication (314–316). Because of this increased risk, people should be screened for prediabetes or diabetes 4 months after medication initiation and at least annually thereafter. Serious mental illness is often associated with the inability to evaluate and utilize information to make judgments about treatment options. When a person has an established diagnosis of a mental illness that impacts judgment, activities of daily living, and ability to establish a collaborative relationship with care providers, it is wise to include a nonmedical caretaker in decision-making regarding the medical regimen. This person can help improve the patient's ability to follow the agreed-upon regimen through both monitoring and caretaking functions (317).

### Cognitive Capacity/Impairment

#### Recommendations

- 5.51** Cognitive capacity should be monitored throughout the life span for all individuals with diabetes, particularly in those who have documented cognitive disabilities, those who experience severe hypoglycemia, very young children, and older adults. **B**
- 5.52** If cognitive capacity changes or appears to be suboptimal for provider-patient decision-making and/or behavioral self-management, referral for a formal assessment should be considered. **E**

Cognitive capacity is generally defined as attention, memory, logic and reasoning,

and auditory and visual processing, all of which are involved in diabetes self-management behavior (318). Having diabetes over decades—type 1 and type 2—has been shown to be associated with cognitive decline (319–321). Declines have been shown to impact executive function and information processing speed; they are not consistent between people, and evidence is lacking regarding a known course of decline (322). Diagnosis of dementia is also more prevalent in the population of individuals with diabetes, both type 1 and type 2 (323). Thus, monitoring of cognitive capacity of individuals is recommended, particularly regarding their ability to self-monitor and make judgements about their symptoms, physical status, and needed alterations to their self-management behaviors, all of which are mediated by executive function (323). As with other disorders affecting mental capacity (e.g., major psychiatric disorders), the key issue is whether the person can enter into a collaboration with the care team to achieve optimal metabolic outcomes and prevent complications, both short and long term (313). When this ability is shown to be altered, declining, or absent, a lay care provider should be introduced into the care team who serves in the capacities of day-to-day monitoring as well as a liaison with the rest of the care team (1). Cognitive capacity also contributes to ability to benefit from diabetes education and may indicate the need for alternative teaching approaches as well as remote monitoring. Youth will need second-party monitoring (e.g., parents and adult caregivers) until they are developmentally able to evaluate necessary information for self-management decisions and to inform resultant behavior changes.

Episodes of severe hypoglycemia are independently associated with decline, as well as the more immediate symptoms of mental confusion (324). Early-onset type 1 diabetes has been shown to be associated with potential deficits in intellectual abilities, especially in the context of repeated episodes of severe hypoglycemia (325). (See Section 14, “Children and Adolescents,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>, for information on early-onset diabetes and cognitive abilities and the effects of severe hypoglycemia on children's cognitive and academic performance.) Thus, for myriad reasons, cognitive capacity should be



assessed during routine care to ascertain the person's ability to maintain and adjust self-management behaviors, such as dosing of medications, remediation approaches to glycemic excursions, etc., and to determine whether to enlist a caregiver in monitoring and decision-making regarding management behaviors. If cognitive capacity to carry out self-maintenance behaviors is questioned, an age-appropriate test of cognitive capacity is recommended (1). Cognitive capacity should be evaluated in the context of the age of the person, for example, in very young children who are not expected to manage their disease independently and in older adults who may need active monitoring of regimen behaviors.

## References

- Young-Hyman D, de Groot M, Hill-Briggs F, Gonzalez JS, Hood K, Peyrot M. Psychosocial care for people with diabetes: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2126–2140
- Powers MA, Bardsley JK, Cypress M, et al. Diabetes self-management education and support in adults with type 2 diabetes: a consensus report of the American Diabetes Association, the Association of Diabetes Care & Education Specialists, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of PAs, the American Association of Nurse Practitioners, and the American Pharmacists Association. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1636–1649
- Rutten GEHM, Alzaid A. Person-centred type 2 diabetes care: time for a paradigm shift. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2018;6:264–266
- Dickinson JK, Guzman SJ, Maryniuk MD, et al. The use of language in diabetes care and education. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1790–1799
- Fisher L, Hessler D, Glasgow RE, et al. REDEEM: a pragmatic trial to reduce diabetes distress. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2551–2558
- Huang Y, Wei X, Wu T, Chen R, Guo A. Collaborative care for patients with depression and diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Psychiatry* 2013;13:260
- Hill-Briggs F. Problem solving in diabetes self-management: a model of chronic illness self-management behavior. *Ann Behav Med* 2003;25:182–193
- Greenwood DA, Howell F, Scher L, et al. A framework for optimizing technology-enabled diabetes and cardiometabolic care and education: the role of the diabetes care and education specialist. *Diabetes Educ* 2020;46:315–322
- Tran V-T, Barnes C, Montori VM, Falissard B, Ravaud P. Taxonomy of the burden of treatment: a multi-country web-based qualitative study of patients with chronic conditions. *BMC Med* 2015;13:115
- Fitzpatrick SL, Golden SH, Stewart K, et al. Effect of DECIDE (Decision-making Education for Choices In Diabetes Everyday) program delivery modalities on clinical and behavioral outcomes in urban African Americans with type 2 diabetes: a randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2149–2157
- Brunisholz KD, Briot P, Hamilton S, et al. Diabetes self-management education improves quality of care and clinical outcomes determined by a diabetes bundle measure. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2014;7:533–542
- Dickinson JK, Maryniuk MD. Building therapeutic relationships: choosing words that put people first. *Clin Diabetes* 2017;35:51–54
- Beck J, Greenwood DA, Blanton L, et al.; 2017 Standards Revision Task Force. 2017 national standards for diabetes self-management education and support. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1409–1419
- Tang TS, Funnell MM, Brown MB, Kurlander JE. Self-management support in “real-world” settings: an empowerment-based intervention. *Patient Educ Couns* 2010;79:178–184
- Marrero DG, Ard J, Delamater AM, et al. Twenty-first century behavioral medicine: a context for empowering clinicians and patients with diabetes: a consensus report. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:463–470
- Norris SL, Lau J, Smith SJ, Schmid CH, Engelgau MM. Self-management education for adults with type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis of the effect on glycemic control. *Diabetes Care* 2002;25:1159–1171
- Haas L, Maryniuk M, Beck J, et al.; 2012 Standards Revision Task Force. National standards for diabetes self-management education and support. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37(Suppl. 1):S144–S153
- Frosch DL, Uy V, Ochoa S, Mangione CM. Evaluation of a behavior support intervention for patients with poorly controlled diabetes. *Arch Intern Med* 2011;171:2011–2017
- Cooke D, Bond R, Lawton J, et al.; U.K. NIHR DAFNE Study Group. Structured type 1 diabetes education delivered within routine care: impact on glycemic control and diabetes-specific quality of life. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:270–272
- Chrvala CA, Sherr D, Lipman RD. Diabetes self-management education for adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review of the effect on glycemic control. *Patient Educ Couns* 2016;99:926–943
- Marincic PZ, Salazar MV, Hardin A, et al. Diabetes self-management education and medical nutrition therapy: a multisite study documenting the efficacy of registered dietitian nutritionist interventions in the management of glycemic control and diabetic dyslipidemia through retrospective chart review. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2019;119:449–463
- Steinsbekk A, Rygg LØ, Lisulo M, Rise MB, Fretheim A. Group based diabetes self-management education compared to routine treatment for people with type 2 diabetes mellitus. A systematic review with meta-analysis. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2012;12:213
- Cochran J, Conn VS. Meta-analysis of quality of life outcomes following diabetes self-management training. *Diabetes Educ* 2008;34:815–823
- He X, Li J, Wang B, et al. Diabetes self-management education reduces risk of all-cause mortality in type 2 diabetes patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Endocrine* 2017;55:712–731
- Thorpe CT, Fahey LE, Johnson H, Deshpande M, Thorpe JM, Fisher EB. Facilitating healthy coping in patients with diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Educ* 2013;39:33–52
- Robbins JM, Thatcher GE, Webb DA, Valdmanis VG. Nutritionist visits, diabetes classes, and hospitalization rates and charges: the Urban Diabetes Study. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:655–660
- Duncan I, Ahmed T, Li QE, et al. Assessing the value of the diabetes educator. *Diabetes Educ* 2011;37:638–657
- Strawbridge LM, Lloyd JT, Meadow A, Riley GF, Howell BL. One-year outcomes of diabetes self-management training among Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with diabetes. *Med Care* 2017;55:391–397
- Piatt GA, Anderson RM, Brooks MM, et al. 3-year follow-up of clinical and behavioral improvements following a multifaceted diabetes care intervention: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Educ* 2010;36:301–309
- Glazier RH, Bajcar J, Kennie NR, Willson K. A systematic review of interventions to improve diabetes care in socially disadvantaged populations. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:1675–1688
- Hawthorne K, Robles Y, Cannings-John R, Edwards AGK. Culturally appropriate health education for type 2 diabetes mellitus in ethnic minority groups. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 1996;3:CD006424
- Chodosh J, Morton SC, Mojica W, et al. Meta-analysis: chronic disease self-management programs for older adults. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;143:427–438
- Sarkisian CA, Brown AF, Norris KC, Wintz RL, Mangione CM. A systematic review of diabetes self-care interventions for older, African American, or Latino adults. *Diabetes Educ* 2003;29:467–479
- Peyrot M, Rubin RR. Behavioral and psychosocial interventions in diabetes: a conceptual review. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2433–2440
- Naik AD, Palmer N, Petersen NJ, et al. Comparative effectiveness of goal setting in diabetes mellitus group clinics: randomized clinical trial. *Arch Intern Med* 2011;171:453–459
- Duke S-AS, Colagiuri S, Colagiuri R. Individual patient education for people with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009;1:CD005268
- Oggers-Jewell K, Ball LE, Kelly JT, Isenring EA, Reidlinger DP, Thomas R. Effectiveness of group-based self-management education for individuals with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review with meta-analyses and meta-regression. *Diabet Med* 2017;34:1027–1039
- Pereira K, Phillips B, Johnson C, Vorderstrasse A. Internet delivered diabetes self-management education: a review. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2015;17:55–63
- Sepah SC, Jiang L, Peters AL. Long-term outcomes of a web-based diabetes prevention program: 2-year results of a single-arm longitudinal study. *J Med Internet Res* 2015;17:e92
- Greenwood DA, Gee PM, Fatkin KJ, Peebles M. A systematic review of reviews evaluating technology-enabled diabetes self-management

- education and support. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2017;11:1015–1027
41. Athinarayanan SJ, Adams RN, Hallberg SJ, et al. Long-term effects of a novel continuous remote care intervention including nutritional ketosis for the management of type 2 diabetes: a 2-year non-randomized clinical trial. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)* 2019;10:348
42. Kumar S, Moseson H, Uppal J, Juusola JL. A diabetes mobile app with in-app coaching from a certified diabetes educator reduces A1C for individuals with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Educ* 2018;44:226–236
43. Hallberg SJ, McKenzie AL, Williams PT, et al. Effectiveness and safety of a novel care model for the management of type 2 diabetes at 1 year: an open-label, non-randomized, controlled study. *Diabetes Ther* 2018;9:583–612
44. Xu T, Pujara S, Sutton S, Rhee M. Telemedicine in the management of type 1 diabetes. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2018;15:E13
45. Dening J, Islam SMS, George E, Maddison R. Web-based interventions for dietary behavior in adults with type 2 diabetes: systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *J Med Internet Res* 2020;22:e16437
46. Omar MA, Hasan S, Palaian S, Mahameed S. The impact of a self-management educational program coordinated through WhatsApp on diabetes control. *Pharm Pract (Granada)* 2020; 18:1841
47. Liang K, Xie Q, Nie J, Deng J. Study on the effect of education for insulin injection in diabetic patients with new simulation tools. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2021;100:e25424
48. Gershkowitz BD, Hillert CJ, Crotty BH. Digital coaching strategies to facilitate behavioral change in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2021;106:e1513–e1520
49. Lee M-K, Lee DY, Ahn H-Y, Park C-Y. A novel user utility score for diabetes management using tailored mobile coaching: secondary analysis of a randomized controlled trial. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth* 2021;9:e17573
50. Isaacs D, Cox C, Schwab K, et al. Technology integration: the role of the diabetes care and education specialist in practice. *Diabetes Educ* 2020;46:323–334
51. Scalzo P. From the Association of Diabetes Care & Education Specialists: the role of the diabetes care and education specialist as a champion of technology integration. *Sci Diabetes Self Manag Care* 2021;47:120–123
52. Johnson TM, Murray MR, Huang Y. Associations between self-management education and comprehensive diabetes clinical care. *Diabetes Spectr* 2010;23:41–46
53. Greenwood DA, Litchman ML, Isaacs D, et al. A new taxonomy for technology-enabled diabetes self-management interventions: results of an umbrella review. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 11 August 2021 [Epub ahead of print]. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/19322968211036430>
54. van Eikenhorst L, Taxis K, van Dijk L, de Gier H. Pharmacist-led self-management interventions to improve diabetes outcomes: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Front Pharmacol* 2017;8:891
55. Tshiananga JKT, Kocher S, Weber C, Erny-Albrecht K, Berndt K, Neeser K. The effect of nurse-led diabetes self-management education on glycosylated hemoglobin and cardiovascular risk factors: a meta-analysis. *Diabetes Educ* 2012;38:108–123
56. Evert AB, Dennison M, Gardner CD, et al. Nutrition therapy for adults with diabetes or prediabetes: a consensus report. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:731–754
57. Shah M, Kaselitz E, Heisler M. The role of community health workers in diabetes: update on current literature. *Curr Diab Rep* 2013;13: 163–171
58. Spencer MS, Kieffer EC, Sinco B, et al. Outcomes at 18 months from a community health worker and peer leader diabetes self-management program for Latino adults. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1414–1422
59. Heisler M, Vijan S, Makki F, Piette JD. Diabetes control with reciprocal peer support versus nurse care management: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;153:507–515
60. Long JA, Jahnle EC, Richardson DM, Loewenstein G, Volpp KG. Peer mentoring and financial incentives to improve glucose control in African American veterans: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;156:416–424
61. Fisher EB, Boothroyd RI, Elstad EA, et al. Peer support of complex health behaviors in prevention and disease management with special reference to diabetes: systematic reviews. *Clin Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;3:4
62. Litchman ML, Oser TK, Hodgson L, et al. In-person and technology-mediated peer support in diabetes care: a systematic review of reviews and gap analysis. *Diabetes Educ* 2020;46:230–241
63. Foster G, Taylor SJC, Eldridge SE, Ramsay J, Griffiths CJ. Self-management education programmes by lay leaders for people with chronic conditions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007;4:CD005108
64. Duncan I, Birkmeyer C, Coughlin S, Li QE, Sherr D, Boren S. Assessing the value of diabetes education. *Diabetes Educ* 2009;35:752–760
65. Strawbridge LM, Lloyd JT, Meadow A, Riley GF, Howell BL. Use of Medicare's diabetes self-management training benefit. *Health Educ Behav* 2015;42:530–538
66. Horigan G, Davies M, Findlay-White F, Chaney D, Coates V. Reasons why patients referred to diabetes education programmes choose not to attend: a systematic review. *Diabet Med* 2017;34:14–26
67. Carey ME, Agarwal S, Horne R, Davies M, Slevin M, Coates V. Exploring organizational support for the provision of structured self-management education for people with type 2 diabetes: findings from a qualitative study. *Diabet Med* 2019;36:761–770
68. Center For Health Law and Policy Innovation. Reconsidering cost-sharing for diabetes self-management education: recommendations for policy reform. Accessed 19 October 2021. Available from [https://www.chlpi.org/health\\_library/reconsidering-cost-sharing-diabetes-self-management-education-recommendations-policy-reform/](https://www.chlpi.org/health_library/reconsidering-cost-sharing-diabetes-self-management-education-recommendations-policy-reform/)
69. Turner RM, Ma Q, Lorig K, Greenberg J, DeVries AR. Evaluation of a diabetes self-management program: claims analysis on comorbid illnesses, health care utilization, and cost. *J Med Internet Res* 2018;20:e207
70. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. COVID-19 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on Medicare Fee-for-Service (FFS) Billing. 19 October 2021. Available from <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/03092020-covid-19-faqs-508.pdf>
71. Davies MJ, D'Alessio DA, Fradkin J, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2018. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2669–2701
72. Briggs Early K, Stanley K. Position of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics: the role of medical nutrition therapy and registered dietitian nutritionists in the prevention and treatment of prediabetes and type 2 diabetes. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2018;118:343–353
73. Franz MJ, MacLeod J, Evert A, et al. Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Nutrition Practice Guideline for Type 1 and Type 2 Diabetes in Adults: systematic review of evidence for medical nutrition therapy effectiveness and recommendations for integration into the nutrition care process. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2017;117:1659–1679
74. Mudaliar U, Zabetian A, Goodman M, et al. Cardiometabolic risk factor changes observed in diabetes prevention programs in us settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* 2016;13:e1002095
75. Balk EM, Earley A, Raman G, Avendano EA, Pittas AG, Remington PL. Combined diet and physical activity promotion programs to prevent type 2 diabetes among persons at increased risk: a systematic review for the community preventive services task force combined diet and physical activity promotion programs to prevent diabetes. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;163:437–451
76. Hamman RF, Wing RR, Edelstein SL, et al. Effect of weight loss with lifestyle intervention on risk of diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29: 2102–2107
77. Garvey WT, Ryan DH, Bohannon NJV, et al. Weight-loss therapy in type 2 diabetes: effects of phentermine and topiramate extended release. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:3309–3316
78. Kahan S, Fujioka K. Obesity pharmacotherapy in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Spectr* 2017;30:250–257
79. Jeon CY, Lokken RP, Hu FB, van Dam RM. Physical activity of moderate intensity and risk of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:744–752
80. Duncan GE, Perri MG, Theriaque DW, Hutson AD, Eckel RH, Stacpoole PW. Exercise training, without weight loss, increases insulin sensitivity and postheparin plasma lipase activity in previously sedentary adults. *Diabetes Care* 2003; 26:557–562
81. Franz MJ, Boucher JL, Rutten-Ramos S, VanWormer JJ. Lifestyle weight-loss intervention outcomes in overweight and obese adults with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2015;115:1447–1463
82. Lean ME, Leslie WS, Barnes AC, et al. Primary care-led weight management for remission of type 2 diabetes (DIRECT): an open-label, cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet* 2018;391: 541–551
83. Wing RR, Lang W, Wadden TA, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Benefits of modest weight loss in improving cardiovascular risk factors in overweight and obese individuals with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34: 1481–1486

84. Sjöström L, Peltonen M, Jacobson P, et al. Association of bariatric surgery with long-term remission of type 2 diabetes and with microvascular and macrovascular complications. *JAMA* 2014;311:2297–2304
85. Cefalu WT, Leiter LA, de Bruin TWA, Gause-Nilsson I, Sugg J, Parikh SJ. Dapagliflozin's effects on glycemia and cardiovascular risk factors in high-risk patients with type 2 diabetes: a 24-week, multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study with a 28-week extension. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1218–1227
86. Prinz N, Schwandt A, Becker M, et al. Trajectories of body mass index from childhood to young adulthood among patients with type 1 diabetes—a longitudinal group-based modeling approach based on the DPV registry. *J Pediatr* 2018;201:78–85.e4
87. Lipman TH, Levitt Katz LE, Ratcliffe SJ, et al. Increasing incidence of type 1 diabetes in youth: twenty years of the Philadelphia Pediatric Diabetes Registry. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1597–1603
88. Sumithran P, Prendergast LA, Delbridge E, et al. Long-term persistence of hormonal adaptations to weight loss. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:1597–1604
89. Hamdy O, Mottalib A, Morsi A, et al. Long-term effect of intensive lifestyle intervention on cardiovascular risk factors in patients with diabetes in real-world clinical practice: a 5-year longitudinal study. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2017;5:e000259
90. Nip ASY, Reboussin BA, Dabelea D, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Disordered eating behaviors in youth and young adults with type 1 or type 2 diabetes receiving insulin therapy: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth study. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:859–866
91. Mottalib A, Salsberg V, Mohd-Yusof B-N, et al. Effects of nutrition therapy on HbA1c and cardiovascular disease risk factors in overweight and obese patients with type 2 diabetes. *Nutr J* 2018;17:42
92. Estruch R, Ros E, Salas-Salvadó J, et al.; PREDIMED Study Investigators. Primary prevention of cardiovascular disease with a Mediterranean diet supplemented with extra-virgin olive oil or nuts. *N Engl J Med* 2018;378:e34
93. Saslow LR, Daubenmier JJ, Moskowitz JT, et al. Twelve-month outcomes of a randomized trial of a moderate-carbohydrate versus very low-carbohydrate diet in overweight adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus or prediabetes. *Nutr Diabetes* 2017;7:304
94. Yancy WS, Crowley MJ, Dar MS, et al. Comparison of group medical visits combined with intensive weight management vs group medical visits alone for glycemia in patients with type 2 diabetes: a noninferiority randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020;180:70–79
95. Emadian A, Andrews RC, England CY, Wallace V, Thompson JL. The effect of macronutrients on glycaemic control: a systematic review of dietary randomised controlled trials in overweight and obese adults with type 2 diabetes in which there was no difference in weight loss between treatment groups. *Br J Nutr* 2015;114:1656–1666
96. Gardner CD, Trepanowski JF, Del Gobbo LC, et al. Effect of low-fat vs low-carbohydrate diet on 12-month weight loss in overweight adults and the association with genotype pattern or insulin secretion: the DIETFITS randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2018;319:667–679
97. Korsmo-Haugen H-K, Brurberg KG, Mann J, Aas A-M. Carbohydrate quantity in the dietary management of type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2019;21:15–27
98. Sacks FM, Bray GA, Carey VJ, et al. Comparison of weight-loss diets with different compositions of fat, protein, and carbohydrates. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:859–873
99. de Souza RJ, Bray GA, Carey VJ, et al. Effects of 4 weight-loss diets differing in fat, protein, and carbohydrate on fat mass, lean mass, visceral adipose tissue, and hepatic fat: results from the POUNDS LOST trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2012;95:614–625
100. Johnston BC, Kanters S, Bandayrel K, et al. Comparison of weight loss among named diet programs in overweight and obese adults: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2014;312:923–933
101. Fox CS, Golden SH, Anderson C, et al.; American Heart Association Diabetes Committee of the Council on Lifestyle and Cardiometabolic Health; Council on Clinical Cardiology, Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing, Council on Cardiovascular Surgery and Anesthesia, Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research; American Diabetes Association. Update on prevention of cardiovascular disease in adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus in light of recent evidence: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association and the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1777–1803
102. Schwingshackl L, Chaimani A, Hoffmann G, Schwedhelm C, Boeing H. A network meta-analysis on the comparative efficacy of different dietary approaches on glycaemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2018;33:157–170
103. MacLeod J, Franz MJ, Handu D, et al. Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Nutrition Practice Guideline for Type 1 and Type 2 Diabetes in Adults: nutrition intervention evidence reviews and recommendations. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2017;117:1637–1658
104. Schwingshackl L, Schwedhelm C, Hoffmann G, et al. Food groups and risk of all-cause mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2017;105:1462–1473
105. Benson G, Hayes J. An update on the Mediterranean, vegetarian, and DASH eating patterns in people with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Spectr* 2020;33:125–132
106. Esposito K, Maiorino MI, Ciotola M, et al. Effects of a Mediterranean-style diet on the need for antihyperglycemic drug therapy in patients with newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2009;151:306–314
107. de Carvalho GB, Dias-Vasconcelos NL, Santos RKF, Brandão-Lima PN, da Silva DG, Pires LV. Effect of different dietary patterns on glycemic control in individuals with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review. *Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr* 2020;60:1999–2010
108. Papamichou D, Panagiotakos DB, Itsiopoulos C. Dietary patterns and management of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review of randomised clinical trials. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2019;29:531–543
109. Sainsbury E, Kizirian NV, Partridge SR, Gill T, Colagiuri S, Gibson AA. Effect of dietary carbohydrate restriction on glycemic control in adults with diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2018;139:239–252
110. van Zuuren EJ, Fedorowicz Z, Kuijpers T, Pijl H. Effects of low-carbohydrate- compared with low-fat-diet interventions on metabolic control in people with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review including GRADE assessments. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2018;108:300–331
111. Snorgaard O, Poulsen GM, Andersen HK, Astrup A. Systematic review and meta-analysis of dietary carbohydrate restriction in patients with type 2 diabetes. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2017;5:e000354
112. Rinaldi S, Campbell EE, Fournier J, O'Connor C, Madill J. A comprehensive review of the literature supporting recommendations from the Canadian Diabetes Association for the use of a plant-based diet for management of type 2 diabetes. *Can J Diabetes* 2016;40:471–477
113. Pawlak R. Vegetarian diets in the prevention and management of diabetes and its complications. *Diabetes Spectr* 2017;30:82–88
114. Kirkpatrick CF, Bolick JP, Kris-Etherton PM, et al. Review of current evidence and clinical recommendations on the effects of low-carbohydrate and very-low-carbohydrate (including ketogenic) diets for the management of body weight and other cardiometabolic risk factors: a scientific statement from the National Lipid Association Nutrition and Lifestyle Task Force. *J Clin Lipidol* 2019;13:689–711.e1
115. Bowen ME, Cavanaugh KL, Wolff K, et al. The Diabetes Nutrition Education Study randomized controlled trial: a comparative effectiveness study of approaches to nutrition in diabetes self-management education. *Patient Educ Couns* 2016;99:1368–1376
116. Truman E, Lane D, Elliott C. Defining food literacy: a scoping review. *Appetite* 2017;116:365–371
117. Food Literacy Center. What is food literacy? Accessed 31 August 2021. Available from <https://www.foodliteracycenter.org/about>
118. DAFNE Study Group. Training in flexible, intensive insulin management to enable dietary freedom in people with type 1 diabetes: dose adjustment for normal eating (DAFNE) randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2002;325:746
119. Delahanty LM, Nathan DM, Lachin JM, et al.; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes. Association of diet with glycated hemoglobin during intensive treatment of type 1 diabetes in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2009;89:518–524
120. Zafar MI, Mills KE, Zheng J, et al. Low-glycemic index diets as an intervention for diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2019;110:891–902
121. Wheeler ML, Dunbar SA, Jaacks LM, et al. Macronutrients, food groups, and eating patterns in the management of diabetes: a systematic review of the literature, 2010. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:434–445
122. Vega-López S, Venn BJ, Slavin JL. Relevance of the glycemic index and glycemic load for body



- weight, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease. *Nutrients* 2018;10:E1361
123. Thomas D, Elliott EJ. Low glycaemic index, or low glycaemic load, diets for diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009;1:CD006296
124. Meng Y, Bai H, Wang S, Li Z, Wang Q, Chen L. Efficacy of low carbohydrate diet for type 2 diabetes mellitus management: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2017;131:124–131
125. Goldenberg JZ, Day A, Brinkworth GD, et al. Efficacy and safety of low and very low carbohydrate diets for type 2 diabetes remission: systematic review and meta-analysis of published and unpublished randomized trial data. *BMJ* 2021;372:m4743
126. Lennerz BS, Koutnik AP, Azova S, Wolfsdorf JL, Ludwig DS. Carbohydrate restriction for diabetes: rediscovering centuries-old wisdom. *J Clin Invest* 2021;131:142246
127. Tay J, Luscombe-Marsh ND, Thompson CH, et al. Comparison of low- and high-carbohydrate diets for type 2 diabetes management: a randomized trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2015;102:780–790
128. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA Drug Safety Communication: FDA revises labels of SGLT2 inhibitors for diabetes to include warnings about too much acid in the blood and serious urinary tract infections. Accessed 19 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/ucm475463.htm>
129. Blau JE, Tella SH, Taylor SI, Rother KI. Ketoacidosis associated with SGLT2 inhibitor treatment: analysis of FAERS data. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2017;33:e2924
130. U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Dietary guidelines for Americans 2020–2025. 9th Edition, December 2020. Accessed 19 October 2021. Available from [https://www.dietaryguidelines.gov/sites/default/files/2020-12/Dietary\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_Americans\\_2020-2025.pdf](https://www.dietaryguidelines.gov/sites/default/files/2020-12/Dietary_Guidelines_for_Americans_2020-2025.pdf)
131. He M, van Dam RM, Rimm E, Hu FB, Qi L. Whole-grain, cereal fiber, bran, and germ intake and the risks of all-cause and cardiovascular disease-specific mortality among women with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Circulation* 2010;121:2162–2168
132. Burger KNJ, Beulens JWW, van der Schouw YT, et al. Dietary fiber, carbohydrate quality and quantity, and mortality risk of individuals with diabetes mellitus. *PLoS One* 2012;7:e43127
133. Partula V, Deschasaux M, Druesne-Pecollo N, et al.; Milieu Intérieur Consortium. Associations between consumption of dietary fibers and the risk of cardiovascular diseases, cancers, type 2 diabetes, and mortality in the prospective NutriNet-Santé cohort. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2020;112:195–207
134. Reynolds A, Mann J, Cummings J, Winter N, Mete E, Te Morenga L. Carbohydrate quality and human health: a series of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Lancet* 2019;393:434–445
135. Hu Y, Ding M, Sampson L, et al. Intake of whole grain foods and risk of type 2 diabetes: results from three prospective cohort studies. *BMJ* 2020;370:m2206
136. U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Dietary guidelines for Americans 2015–2020. 8th Edition, 2015. Accessed 19 October 2021. Available from <https://www.health.gov/dietaryguidelines/2015/guidelines>
137. Nansel TR, Lipsky LM, Liu A. Greater diet quality is associated with more optimal glycemic control in a longitudinal study of youth with type 1 diabetes. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2016;104:81–87
138. Katz ML, Mehta S, Nansel T, Quinn H, Lipsky LM, Laffel LMB. Associations of nutrient intake with glycemic control in youth with type 1 diabetes: differences by insulin regimen. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2014;16:512–518
139. Rossi MCE, Nicolucci A, Di Bartolo P, et al. Diabetes Interactive Diary: a new telemedicine system enabling flexible diet and insulin therapy while improving quality of life: an open-label, international, multicenter, randomized study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:109–115
140. Laurenzi A, Bolla AM, Panigoni G, et al. Effects of carbohydrate counting on glucose control and quality of life over 24 weeks in adult patients with type 1 diabetes on continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion: a randomized, prospective clinical trial (GIOCAR). *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:823–827
141. Sämman A, Mühlhauser I, Bender R, Kloos Ch, Müller UA. Glycaemic control and severe hypoglycaemia following training in flexible, intensive insulin therapy to enable dietary freedom in people with type 1 diabetes: a prospective implementation study. *Diabetologia* 2005;48:1965–1970
142. Bell KJ, Barclay AW, Petocz P, Colagiuri S, Brand-Miller JC. Efficacy of carbohydrate counting in type 1 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2:133–140
143. Bell KJ, Smart CE, Steil GM, Brand-Miller JC, King B, Wolpert HA. Impact of fat, protein, and glycemic index on postprandial glucose control in type 1 diabetes: implications for intensive diabetes management in the continuous glucose monitoring era. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1008–1015
144. Bell KJ, Toschi E, Steil GM, Wolpert HA. Optimized mealtime insulin dosing for fat and protein in type 1 diabetes: application of a model-based approach to derive insulin doses for open-loop diabetes management. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1631–1634
145. Smart CEM, Evans M, O'Connell SM, et al. Both dietary protein and fat increase postprandial glucose excursions in children with type 1 diabetes, and the effect is additive. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:3897–3902
146. Smith TA, Smart CE, Howley PP, Lopez PE, King BR. For a high fat, high protein breakfast, preprandial administration of 125% of the insulin dose improves postprandial glycaemic excursions in people with type 1 diabetes using multiple daily injections: a cross-over trial. *Diabet Med* 2021;38:e14512
147. Paterson MA, Smart CEM, Lopez PE, et al. Increasing the protein quantity in a meal results in dose-dependent effects on postprandial glucose levels in individuals with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Diabet Med* 2017;34:851–854
148. O'Connell SM, O'Toole N, Cronin C, et al. Is the glycaemic response from fat in meals dose dependent in children and adolescents with T1DM on intensive insulin therapy? ESPE Abstracts 89 FC3.4, 2018. Accessed 19 October 2021. Available from <https://abstracts.eurospe.org/hrp/0089/hrp0089fc3.4>
149. Bell KJ, Fio CZ, Twigg S, et al. Amount and type of dietary fat, postprandial glycemia, and insulin requirements in type 1 diabetes: a randomized within-subject trial. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:59–66
150. Metwally M, Cheung TO, Smith R, Bell KJ. Insulin pump dosing strategies for meals varying in fat, protein or glycaemic index or grazing-style meals in type 1 diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2021;172:108516
151. Campbell MD, Walker M, King D, et al. Carbohydrate counting at meal time followed by a small secondary postprandial bolus injection at 3 hours prevents late hyperglycemia, without hypoglycemia, after a high-carbohydrate, high-fat meal in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:e141–e142
152. Angelopoulos T, Kokkinos A, Liaskos C, et al. The effect of slow spaced eating on hunger and satiety in overweight and obese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2014;2:e000013
153. Tuttle KR, Bakris GL, Bilous RW, et al. Diabetic kidney disease: a report from an ADA consensus conference. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2864–2883
154. Ley SH, Hamdy O, Mohan V, Hu FB. Prevention and management of type 2 diabetes: dietary components and nutritional strategies. *Lancet* 2014;383:1999–2007
155. Pan Y, Guo LL, Jin HM. Low-protein diet for diabetic nephropathy: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2008;88:660–666
156. Robertson L, Waugh N, Robertson A. Protein restriction for diabetic renal disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007;4:CD002181
157. Layman DK, Clifton P, Gannon MC, Krauss RM, Nuttall FQ. Protein in optimal health: heart disease and type 2 diabetes. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2008;87:1571S–1575S
158. Ros E. Dietary cis-monounsaturated fatty acids and metabolic control in type 2 diabetes. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2003;78(Suppl.):617S–625S
159. Forouhi NG, Imamura F, Sharp SJ, et al. Association of plasma phospholipid n-3 and n-6 polyunsaturated fatty acids with type 2 diabetes: the EPIC-InterAct case-cohort study. *PLoS Med* 2016;13:e1002094
160. Wang DD, Li Y, Chiuve SE, et al. Association of specific dietary fats with total and cause-specific mortality. *JAMA Intern Med* 2016;176:1134–1145
161. Brehm BJ, Lattin BL, Summer SS, et al. One-year comparison of a high-monounsaturated fat diet with a high-carbohydrate diet in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:215–220
162. Shai I, Schwarzfuchs D, Henkin Y, et al.; Dietary Intervention Randomized Controlled Trial (DIRECT) Group. Weight loss with a low-carbohydrate, Mediterranean, or low-fat diet. *N Engl J Med* 2008;359:229–241
163. Brunerova L, Smejkalova V, Potockova J, Andel M. A comparison of the influence of a high-fat diet enriched in monounsaturated fatty acids and conventional diet on weight loss and metabolic parameters in obese non-diabetic and type 2 diabetic patients. *Diabet Med* 2007;24:533–540



164. Bloomfield HE, Koeller E, Greer N, MacDonald R, Kane R, Wilt TJ. Effects on health outcomes of a Mediterranean Diet with no restriction on fat intake: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2016;165:491–500
165. Sacks FM, Lichtenstein AH, Wu JHY, et al.; American Heart Association. Dietary fats and cardiovascular disease: a presidential advisory from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2017;136:e1–e23
166. Jacobson TA, Maki KC, Orringer CE, et al.; NLA Expert Panel. National Lipid Association recommendations for patient-centered management of dyslipidemia: part 2. *J Clin Lipid* 2015;9:S1–S122.e1
167. Holman RR, Paul S, Farmer A, Tucker L, Stratton IM; Atorvastatin in Factorial with Omega-3 EE90 Risk Reduction in Diabetes Study Group. Atorvastatin in Factorial with Omega-3 EE90 Risk Reduction in Diabetes (AFORRD): a randomised controlled trial. *Diabetologia* 2009;52:50–59
168. Bosch J, Gerstein HC, Dagenais GR, et al.; ORIGIN Trial Investigators. n-3 fatty acids and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with dysglycemia. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367:309–318
169. Brown TJ, Brainard J, Song F, Wang X, Abdelhamid A, Hooper L, PUFARH Group. Omega-3, omega-6, and total dietary polyunsaturated fat for prevention and treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4697
170. ASCEND Study Collaborative Group; Bowman L, Maffham M, Wallendszus K, et al. Effects of n-3 fatty acid supplements in diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 2018;379:1540–1550
171. Bhatt DL, Steg PG, Miller M, et al.; REDUCE-IT Investigators. Cardiovascular risk reduction with icosapent ethyl for hypertriglyceridemia. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380:11–22
172. Thomas MC, Moran J, Forsblom C, et al.; FinnDiane Study Group. The association between dietary sodium intake, ESRD, and all-cause mortality in patients with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:861–866
173. Ekinci EI, Clarke S, Thomas MC, et al. Dietary salt intake and mortality in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:703–709
174. Lennon SL, DellaValle DM, Rodder SG, et al. 2015 Evidence Analysis Library evidence-based nutrition practice guideline for the management of hypertension in adults. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2017;117:1445–1458.e17
175. Maillot M, Drewnowski A. A conflict between nutritionally adequate diets and meeting the 2010 dietary guidelines for sodium. *Am J Prev Med* 2012;42:174–179
176. Aroda VR, Edelstein SL, Goldberg RB, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Long-term metformin use and vitamin B12 deficiency in the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2016;101:1754–1761
177. Allen RW, Schwartzman E, Baker WL, Coleman CI, Phung OJ. Cinnamon use in type 2 diabetes: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Fam Med* 2013;11:452–459
178. Mitri J, Pittas AG. Vitamin D and diabetes. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am* 2014;43:205–232
179. Mozaffarian D. Dietary and policy priorities for cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and obesity: a comprehensive review. *Circulation* 2016;133:187–225
180. Pittas AG, Dawson-Hughes B, Sheehan P, et al.; D2d Research Group. Vitamin D supplementation and prevention of type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:520–530
181. Dawson-Hughes B, Staten MA, Knowler WC, et al.; D2d Research Group. Intratrial exposure to vitamin D and new-onset diabetes among adults with prediabetes: a secondary analysis from the Vitamin D and Type 2 Diabetes (D2d) study. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2916–2922
182. Zhang Y, Tan H, Tang J, et al. Effects of vitamin D supplementation on prevention of type 2 diabetes in patients with prediabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1650–1658
183. Barbarawi M, Zayed Y, Barbarawi O, et al. Effect of vitamin D supplementation on the incidence of diabetes mellitus. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2020;105:dga335
184. National Agricultural Library, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Nutritive and nonnutritive sweetener resources. Accessed 20 October 2021. Available from <https://www.nal.usda.gov/fnic/nutritive-and-nonnutritive-sweetener-resources>
185. Arnett DK, Blumenthal RS, Albert MA, et al. 2019 ACC/AHA guideline on the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation* 2019;140:e596–e646
186. Johnson RK, Lichtenstein AH, Anderson CAM, et al.; American Heart Association Nutrition Committee of the Council on Lifestyle and Cardiometabolic Health; Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing; Council on Clinical Cardiology; Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research; Stroke Council. Low-calorie sweetened beverages and cardiometabolic health: a science advisory from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2018;138:e126–e140
187. Grotz VL, Pi-Sunyer X, Porte D Jr, Roberts A, Richard Trout J. A 12-week randomized clinical trial investigating the potential for sucralose to affect glucose homeostasis. *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol* 2017;88:22–33
188. Lohner S, Kuellenberg de Gaudry D, Toews I, Ferenci T, Meerpohl JJ. Non-nutritive sweeteners for diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;5:CD012885
189. Sylvestsky AC, Chandran A, Talegawkar SA, Welsh JA, Drews K, El Ghormli L. Consumption of beverages containing low-calorie sweeteners, diet, and cardiometabolic health in youth with type 2 diabetes. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2020;120:1348–1358.e6
190. Miller PE, Perez V. Low-calorie sweeteners and body weight and composition: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and prospective cohort studies. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2014;100:765–777
191. Rogers PJ, Hogenkamp PS, de Graaf C, et al. Does low-energy sweetener consumption affect energy intake and body weight? A systematic review, including meta-analyses, of the evidence from human and animal studies. *Int J Obes* 2016;40:381–394
192. Laviada-Molina H, Molina-Segui F, Pérez-Gaxiola G, et al. Effects of nonnutritive sweeteners on body weight and BMI in diverse clinical contexts: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obes Rev* 2020;21:e13020
193. Azad MB, Abou-Setta AM, Chauhan BF, et al. Nonnutritive sweeteners and cardiometabolic health: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and prospective cohort studies. *CMAJ* 2017;189:E929–E939
194. Mattes RD, Popkin BM. Nonnutritive sweetener consumption in humans: effects on appetite and food intake and their putative mechanisms. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2009;89:1–14
195. Hirahatake KM, Jacobs DR, Shikany JM, et al. Cumulative intake of artificially sweetened and sugar-sweetened beverages and risk of incident type 2 diabetes in young adults: the Coronary Artery Risk Development In Young Adults (CARDIA) Study. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2019;110:733–741
196. Löfvenborg JE, Andersson T, Carlsson P-O, et al. Sweetened beverage intake and risk of latent autoimmune diabetes in adults (LADA) and type 2 diabetes. *Eur J Endocrinol* 2016;175:605–614
197. Daher MI, Matta JM, Abdel Nour AM. Non-nutritive sweeteners and type 2 diabetes: should we ring the bell? *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2019;155:107786
198. Romo-Romo A, Aguilar-Salinas CA, Gómez-Díaz RA, et al. Non-nutritive sweeteners: evidence on their association with metabolic diseases and potential effects on glucose metabolism and appetite. *Rev Invest Clin* 2017;69:129–138
199. 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee. 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee Scientific Report. Washington, DC, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018
200. Bazargan-Hejazi S, Arroyo JS, Hsia S, Brojeni NR, Pan D. A racial comparison of differences between self-reported and objectively measured physical activity among US adults with diabetes. *Ethn Dis* 2017;27:403–410
201. Sliuk D, Buijse B, Muckelbauer R, et al. Physical activity and mortality in individuals with diabetes mellitus: a prospective study and meta-analysis. *Arch Intern Med* 2012;172:1285–1295
202. Tikkanen-Dolenc H, Wadén J, Forsblom C, et al.; FinnDiane Study Group. Physical activity reduces risk of premature mortality in patients with type 1 diabetes with and without kidney disease. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1727–1732
203. Boulé NG, Haddad E, Kenny GP, Wells GA, Sigal RJ. Effects of exercise on glycemic control and body mass in type 2 diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis of controlled clinical trials. *JAMA* 2001;286:1218–1227
204. Peters AL, Laffel L (Eds.). *American Diabetes Association/JDRF Type 1 Diabetes Sourcebook*. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2013
205. Ostman C, Jewiss D, King N, Smart NA. Clinical outcomes to exercise training in type 1 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2018;139:380–391
206. Boulé NG, Kenny GP, Haddad E, Wells GA, Sigal RJ. Meta-analysis of the effect of structured exercise training on cardiorespiratory fitness in

- type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetologia* 2003;46:1071–1081
207. Pandey A, Patel KV, Bahnson JL, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Association of intensive lifestyle intervention, fitness, and body mass index with risk of heart failure in overweight or obese adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus: an analysis from the Look AHEAD trial. *Circulation* 2020;141:1295–1306
208. Rejeski WJ, Ip EH, Bertoni AG, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Lifestyle change and mobility in obese adults with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366:1209–1217
209. Colberg SR, Sigal RJ, Yardley JE, et al. Physical activity/exercise and diabetes: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2065–2079
210. Frediani JK, Bienvenida AF, Li J, Higgins MK, Lobelo F. Physical fitness and activity changes after a 24-week soccer-based adaptation of the U.S diabetes prevention program intervention in Hispanic men. *Prog Cardiovasc Dis* 2020;63:775–785
211. Janssen I, Leblanc AG. Systematic review of the health benefits of physical activity and fitness in school-aged children and youth. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2010;7:40
212. Riddell MC, Gallen IW, Smart CE, et al. Exercise management in type 1 diabetes: a consensus statement. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;5:377–390
213. Anderson BJ, Laffel LM, Domenger C, et al. Factors associated with diabetes-specific health-related quality of life in youth with type 1 diabetes: the global TEENS study. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1002–1009
214. Adolfsson P, Riddell MC, Taplin CE, et al. ISPAD Clinical Practice Consensus Guidelines 2018: Exercise in children and adolescents with diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2018;19(Suppl. 27):205–226
215. Jellerman C, Yates T, O'Donovan G, et al. The effects of high-intensity interval training on glucose regulation and insulin resistance: a meta-analysis. *Obes Rev* 2015;16:942–961
216. Little JP, Gillen JB, Percival ME, et al. Low-volume high-intensity interval training reduces hyperglycemia and increases muscle mitochondrial capacity in patients with type 2 diabetes. *J Appl Physiol* (1985) 2011;111:1554–1560
217. Bohn B, Herbst A, Pfeifer M, et al.; DPV Initiative. Impact of physical activity on glycemic control and prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors in adults with type 1 diabetes: a cross-sectional multicenter study of 18,028 patients. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1536–1543
218. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, 2nd ed. Accessed 20 October 2021. Available from [https://health.gov/sites/default/files/2019-09/Physical\\_Activity\\_Guidelines\\_2nd\\_edition.pdf](https://health.gov/sites/default/files/2019-09/Physical_Activity_Guidelines_2nd_edition.pdf)
219. Willey KA, Singh MAF. Battling insulin resistance in elderly obese people with type 2 diabetes: bring on the heavy weights. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:1580–1588
220. Katzmarzyk PT, Church TS, Craig CL, Bouchard C. Sitting time and mortality from all causes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2009;41:998–1005
221. Dempsey PC, Larsen RN, Sethi P, et al. Benefits for type 2 diabetes of interrupting prolonged sitting with brief bouts of light walking or simple resistance activities. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:964–972
222. Wang Y, Lee D-C, Brellenthin AG, et al. Leisure-time running reduces the risk of incident type 2 diabetes. *Am J Med* 2019;132:1225–1232
223. Schellenberg ES, Dryden DM, Vandermeer B, Ha C, Korownyk C. Lifestyle interventions for patients with and at risk for type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;159:543–551
224. Pai L-W, Li T-C, Hwu Y-J, Chang S-C, Chen L-L, Chang P-Y. The effectiveness of regular leisure-time physical activities on long-term glycemic control in people with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2016;113:77–85
225. Cui J, Yan J-H, Yan L-M, Pan L, Le J-J, Guo Y-Z. Effects of yoga in adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis. *J Diabetes Investig* 2017;8:201–209
226. Lee MS, Jun JH, Lim H-J, Lim H-S. A systematic review and meta-analysis of tai chi for treating type 2 diabetes. *Maturitas* 2015;80:14–23
227. Rees JL, Johnson ST, Boulé NG. Aquatic exercise for adults with type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Acta Diabetol* 2017;54:895–904
228. Colberg SR, Sigal RJ, Fernhall B, et al.; American College of Sports Medicine; American Diabetes Association. Exercise and type 2 diabetes: the American College of Sports Medicine and the American Diabetes Association: joint position statement executive summary. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:2692–2696
229. Church TS, Blair SN, Cocroham S, et al. Effects of aerobic and resistance training on hemoglobin A1c levels in patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2010;304:2253–2262
230. Bax JJ, Young LH, Frye RL, Bonow RO, Steinberg HO; ADA. Screening for coronary artery disease in patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2729–2736
231. Peters A, Laffel L, Colberg SR, Riddell MC. Physical activity: regulation of glucose metabolism, clinical management strategies, and weight control. In *American Diabetes Association/JDRF Type 1 Diabetes Sourcebook*. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2013
232. Colberg SR. Exercise and Diabetes: A Clinician's Guide to Prescribing Physical Activity. 1st ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2013
233. Lemaster JW, Reiber GE, Smith DG, Heagerty PJ, Wallace C. Daily weight-bearing activity does not increase the risk of diabetic foot ulcers. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2003;35:1093–1099
234. Smith AG, Russell J, Feldman EL, et al. Lifestyle intervention for pre-diabetic neuropathy. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:1294–1299
235. Spallone V, Ziegler D, Freeman R, et al.; Toronto Consensus Panel on Diabetic Neuropathy. Cardiovascular autonomic neuropathy in diabetes: clinical impact, assessment, diagnosis, and management. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2011;27:639–653
236. Pop-Busui R, Evans GW, Gerstein HC, et al.; Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Study Group. Effects of cardiac autonomic dysfunction on mortality risk in the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) trial. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1578–1584
237. Suarez L, Barrett-Connor E. Interaction between cigarette smoking and diabetes mellitus in the prediction of death attributed to cardiovascular disease. *Am J Epidemiol* 1984;120:670–675
238. Stanton CA, Keith DR, Gaalema DE, et al. Trends in tobacco use among US adults with chronic health conditions: National Survey on Drug Use and Health 2005–2013. *Prev Med* 2016;92:160–168
239. Bae J. Differences in cigarette use behaviors by age at the time of diagnosis with diabetes from young adulthood to adulthood: results from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *J Prev Med Public Health* 2013;46:249–260
240. Śliwińska-Mossoń M, Milnerowicz H. The impact of smoking on the development of diabetes and its complications. *Diab Vasc Dis Res* 2017;14:265–276
241. Kar D, Gillies C, Zaccardi F, et al. Relationship of cardiometabolic parameters in non-smokers, current smokers, and quitters in diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Cardiovasc Diabetol* 2016;15:158
242. Pan A, Wang Y, Talaei M, Hu FB. Relation of smoking with total mortality and cardiovascular events among patients with diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Circulation* 2015;132:1795–1804
243. Jankowich M, Choudhary G, Taveira TH, Wu W-C. Age-, race-, and gender-specific prevalence of diabetes among smokers. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2011;93:e101–e105
244. Akter S, Goto A, Mizoue T. Smoking and the risk of type 2 diabetes in Japan: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Epidemiol* 2017;27:553–561
245. Liu X, Bragg F, Yang L, et al.; China Kadoorie Biobank Collaborative Group. Smoking and smoking cessation in relation to risk of diabetes in Chinese men and women: a 9-year prospective study of 0.5 million people. *Lancet Public Health* 2018;3:e167–e176
246. Tonstad S, Lawrence D. Varenicline in smokers with diabetes: a pooled analysis of 15 randomized, placebo-controlled studies of varenicline. *J Diabetes Investig* 2017;8:93–100
247. West R. Tobacco smoking: health impact, prevalence, correlates and interventions. *Psychol Health* 2017;32:1018–1036
248. Ranney L, Melvin C, Lux L, McClain E, Lohr KN. Systematic review: smoking cessation intervention strategies for adults and adults in special populations. *Ann Intern Med* 2006;145:845–856
249. Tian J, Venn A, Otahal P, Gall S. The association between quitting smoking and weight gain: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Obes Rev* 2015;16:883–901
250. Clair C, Rigotti NA, Porneala B, et al. Association of smoking cessation and weight change with cardiovascular disease among adults with and without diabetes. *JAMA* 2013;309:1014–1021
251. Voulgari C, Katsilambros N, Tentolouris N. Smoking cessation predicts amelioration of

- microalbuminuria in newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes mellitus: a 1-year prospective study. *Metabolism* 2011;60:1456–1464
252. Huerta TR, Walker DM, Mullen D, Johnson TJ, Ford EW. Trends in e-cigarette awareness and perceived harmfulness in the U.S. *Am J Prev Med* 2017;52:339–346
253. Pericot-Valverde I, Gaalema DE, Priest JS, Higgins ST. E-cigarette awareness, perceived harmfulness, and ever use among U.S. adults. *Prev Med* 2017;104:92–99
254. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Smoking & tobacco use: Outbreak of lung injury associated with e-cigarette use, or vaping, products. Accessed 20 October 2021. Available from [https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/basic\\_information/e-cigarettes/severe-lung-disease.html](https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/basic_information/e-cigarettes/severe-lung-disease.html)
255. Reid RD, Malcolm J, Wooding E, et al. Prospective, cluster-randomized trial to implement the Ottawa Model for Smoking Cessation in diabetes education programs in Ontario, Canada. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:406–412
256. Anderson RJ, Grigsby AB, Freedland KE, et al. Anxiety and poor glycemic control: a meta-analytic review of the literature. *Int J Psychiatry Med* 2002;32:235–247
257. Delahanty LM, Grant RW, Wittenberg E, et al. Association of diabetes-related emotional distress with diabetes treatment in primary care patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabet Med* 2007;24:48–54
258. Anderson RJ, Freedland KE, Clouse RE, Lustman PJ. The prevalence of comorbid depression in adults with diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2001;24:1069–1078
259. Nicolucci A, Kovacs Burns K, Holt RIG, et al.; DAWN2 Study Group. Diabetes Attitudes, Wishes and Needs second study (DAWN2™): cross-national benchmarking of diabetes-related psychosocial outcomes for people with diabetes. *Diabet Med* 2013;30:767–777
260. Ducat L, Philipson LH, Anderson BJ. The mental health comorbidities of diabetes. *JAMA* 2014;312:691–692
261. Gonzalvo JD, Hamm J, Eaves S, et al. A practical approach to mental health for the diabetes educator. *AADE Pract* 2019;7:29–44
262. Robinson DJ, Coons M, Haensel H, Vallis M; Diabetes Canada Clinical Practice Guidelines Expert Committee. Diabetes and mental health. *Can J Diabetes* 2018;42(Suppl. 1):S130–S141
263. Harkness E, Macdonald W, Valderas J, Coventry P, Gask L, Bower P. Identifying psychosocial interventions that improve both physical and mental health in patients with diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:926–930
264. Radcliff TA, Côté MJ, Whittington MD, et al. Cost-effectiveness of three doses of a behavioral intervention to prevent or delay type 2 diabetes in rural areas. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2020;120:1163–1171
265. Weissberg-Benchell J, Shapiro JB. A review of interventions aimed at facilitating successful transition planning and transfer to adult care among youth with chronic illness. *Pediatr Ann* 2017;46:e182–e187
266. O'Gurek DT, Henke C. A practical approach to screening for social determinants of health. *Fam Pract Manag* 2018;25:7–12
267. Fisher L, Hessler DM, Polonsky WH, Mullan J. When is diabetes distress clinically meaningful?: establishing cut points for the Diabetes Distress Scale. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:259–264
268. Fisher L, Glasgow RE, Strycker LA. The relationship between diabetes distress and clinical depression with glycemic control among patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1034–1036
269. Aikens JE. Prospective associations between emotional distress and poor outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:2472–2478
270. Fisher L, Skaff MM, Mullan JT, et al. Clinical depression versus distress among patients with type 2 diabetes: not just a question of semantics. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:542–548
271. Friis AM, Johnson MH, Cutfield RG, Considine NS. Kindness matters: a randomized controlled trial of a mindful self-compassion intervention improves depression, distress, and HbA<sub>1c</sub> among patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1963–1971
272. Weissberg-Benchell J, Shapiro JB, Bryant FB, Hood KK. Supporting Teen Problem-Solving (STEPS) 3 year outcomes: preventing diabetes-specific emotional distress and depressive symptoms in adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2020;88:1019–1031
273. Snoek FJ, Bremmer MA, Hermanns N. Constructs of depression and distress in diabetes: time for an appraisal. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2015;3:450–460
274. Liu X, Haagsma J, Sijbrands E, et al. Anxiety and depression in diabetes care: longitudinal associations with health-related quality of life. *Sci Rep* 2020;10:8307
275. Gary TL, Safford MM, Gerzoff RB, et al. Perception of neighborhood problems, health behaviors, and diabetes outcomes among adults with diabetes in managed care: the Translating Research Into Action for Diabetes (TRIAD) study. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:273–278
276. Beverly EA, Hultgren BA, Brooks KM, Ritholz MD, Abrahamson MJ, Weinger K. Understanding physicians' challenges when treating type 2 diabetic patients' social and emotional difficulties: a qualitative study. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1086–1088
277. Naicker K, Johnson JA, Skogen JC, et al. Type 2 diabetes and comorbid symptoms of depression and anxiety: longitudinal associations with mortality risk. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:352–358
278. de Groot M, Golden SH, Wagner J. Psychological conditions in adults with diabetes. *Am Psychol* 2016;71:552–562
279. Guerrero Fernández de Alba I, Gimeno-Miguel A, Poblador-Plou B, et al. Association between mental health comorbidity and health outcomes in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients. *Sci Rep* 2020;10:19583
280. Smith KJ, Béland M, Clyde M, et al. Association of diabetes with anxiety: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Psychosom Res* 2013;74:89–99
281. Li C, Barker L, Ford ES, Zhang X, Strine TW, Mokdad AH. Diabetes and anxiety in US adults: findings from the 2006 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System. *Diabet Med* 2008;25:878–881
282. Cox DJ, Irvine A, Gonder-Frederick L, Nowacek G, Butterfield J. Fear of hypoglycemia: quantification, validation, and utilization. *Diabetes Care* 1987;10:617–621
283. Wild D, von Maltzahn R, Brohan E, Christensen T, Clauson P, Gonder-Frederick L. A critical review of the literature on fear of hypoglycemia in diabetes: implications for diabetes management and patient education. *Patient Educ Couns* 2007;68:10–15
284. Zambanini A, Newson RB, Maisey M, Feher MD. Injection related anxiety in insulin-treated diabetes. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 1999;46:239–246
285. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition. Arlington, VA, American Psychiatric Association, 2013
286. Mitsonis C, Dimopoulos N, Psarra V. P01-138 Clinical implications of anxiety in diabetes: a critical review of the evidence base. *Eur Psychiatry* 2009;24:S526
287. Yeoh E, Choudhary P, Nwokolo M, Ayis S, Amiel SA. Interventions that restore awareness of hypoglycemia in adults with type 1 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1592–1609
288. Cox DJ, Gonder-Frederick L, Polonsky W, Schlundt D, Kovatchev B, Clarke W. Blood glucose awareness training (BGAT-2): long-term benefits. *Diabetes Care* 2001;24:637–642
289. Gonder-Frederick LA, Schmidt KM, Vajda KA, et al. Psychometric properties of the hypoglycemia fear survey-II for adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:801–806
290. Cox DJ, Kovatchev B, Koev D, et al. Hypoglycemia anticipation, awareness and treatment training (HAATT) reduces occurrence of severe hypoglycemia among adults with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Int J Behav Med* 2004;11:212–218
291. Lamounier RN, Geloneze B, Leite SO, et al.; HAT Brazil study group. Hypoglycemia incidence and awareness among insulin-treated patients with diabetes: the HAT study in Brazil. *Diabetol Metab Syndr* 2018;10:83
292. Lustman PJ, Griffith LS, Clouse RE. Depression in adults with diabetes. Results of 5-yr follow-up study. *Diabetes Care* 1988;11:605–612
293. de Groot M, Crick KA, Long M, Saha C, Shubrook JH. Lifetime duration of depressive disorders in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2174–2181
294. Rubin RR, Ma Y, Marrero DG, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Elevated depression symptoms, antidepressant medicine use, and risk of developing diabetes during the diabetes prevention program. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:420–426
295. Clouse RE, Lustman PJ, Freedland KE, Griffith LS, McGill JB, Carney RM. Depression and coronary heart disease in women with diabetes. *Psychosom Med* 2003;65:376–383
296. Watson SE, Spurling SE, Fieldhouse AM, Montgomery VL, Wintergerst KA. Depression and anxiety screening in adolescents with diabetes. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 2020;59:445–449
297. Katon WJ, Von Korff M, Lin EHB, et al. The Pathways Study: a randomized trial of collaborative care in patients with diabetes and depression. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2004;61:1042–1049
298. Cannon A, Handelsman Y, Heile M, Shannon M. Burden of illness in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm* 2018;24(Suppl.):S5–S13



299. Atlantis E, Fahey P, Foster J. Collaborative care for comorbid depression and diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2014;4:e004706
300. Ali MK, Chwastiak L, Poongothai S, et al.; INDEPENDENT Study Group. Effect of a collaborative care model on depressive symptoms and glycated hemoglobin, blood pressure, and serum cholesterol among patients with depression and diabetes in India: The INDEPENDENT randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2020;324:651–662
301. Pinhas-Hamiel O, Hamiel U, Levy-Shraga Y. Eating disorders in adolescents with type 1 diabetes: challenges in diagnosis and treatment. *World J Diabetes* 2015;6:517–526
302. Papelbaum M, Appolinário JC, Moreira R de O, Ellinger VCM, Kupfer R, Coutinho WF. Prevalence of eating disorders and psychiatric comorbidity in a clinical sample of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients. *Br J Psychiatry* 2005;27:135–138
303. Young-Hyman DL, Davis CL. Disordered eating behavior in individuals with diabetes: importance of context, evaluation, and classification. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:683–689
304. Pinhas-Hamiel O, Hamiel U, Greenfield Y, et al. Detecting intentional insulin omission for weight loss in girls with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Int J Eat Disord* 2013;46:819–825
305. Goebel-Fabbri AE, Fikkan J, Franko DL, Pearson K, Anderson BJ, Weinger K. Insulin restriction and associated morbidity and mortality in women with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:415–419
306. Weinger K, Beverly EA. Barriers to achieving glycemic targets: who omits insulin and why? *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:450–452
307. Hudson JI, Hiripi E, Pope HG Jr, Kessler RC. The prevalence and correlates of eating disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Biol Psychiatry* 2007;61:348–358
308. Martyn-Nemeth P, Quinn L, Hacker E, Park H, Kujath AS. Diabetes distress may adversely affect the eating styles of women with type 1 diabetes. *Acta Diabetol* 2014;51:683–686
309. Peterson CM, Fischer S, Young-Hyman D. Topical review: a comprehensive risk model for disordered eating in youth with type 1 diabetes. *J Pediatr Psychol* 2015;40:385–390
310. Banting R, Randle-Phillips C. A systematic review of psychological interventions for comorbid type 1 diabetes mellitus and eating disorders. *Diabetes Manag (Lond)* 2018;8:1–18
311. Garber AJ. Novel GLP-1 receptor agonists for diabetes. *Expert Opin Investig Drugs* 2012;21:45–57
312. Suvisaari J, Perälä J, Saarni SI, et al. Type 2 diabetes among persons with schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders in a general population survey. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2008;258:129–136
313. Mulligan K, McBain H, Lamontagne-Godwin F, et al. Barriers to effective diabetes management – a survey of people with severe mental illness. *BMC Psychiatry* 2018;18:165
314. Koro CE, Fedder DO, L'Italien GJ, et al. Assessment of independent effect of olanzapine and risperidone on risk of diabetes among patients with schizophrenia: population based nested case-control study. *BMJ* 2002;325:243
315. American Diabetes Association; American Psychiatric Association; American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists; North American Association for the Study of Obesity. Consensus development conference on antipsychotic drugs and obesity and diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:596–601
316. Holt RIG. Association between antipsychotic medication use and diabetes. *Curr Diab Rep* 2019;19:96
317. Kruse J, Schmitz N; German National Health Interview and Examination Survey. On the association between diabetes and mental disorders in a community sample: results from the German National Health Interview and Examination Survey. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:1841–1846
318. Biessels GJ, Whitmer RA. Cognitive dysfunction in diabetes: how to implement emerging guidelines. *Diabetologia* 2020;63:3–9
319. Brands AMA, Biessels GJ, de Haan EHF, Kappelle LJ, Kessels RPC. The effects of type 1 diabetes on cognitive performance: a meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2005;28:726–735
320. Carmichael OT, Neiberg RH, Dutton GR, et al. Long-term change in physiological markers and cognitive performance in type 2 diabetes: the Look AHEAD study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2020;105:dga591
321. Avila JC, Mejia-Arangom S, Jupiter D, Downer B, Wong R. The effect of diabetes on the cognitive trajectory of older adults in Mexico and the United States. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 2021;76:e153–e164
322. Munshi MN. Cognitive dysfunction in older adults with diabetes: what a clinician needs to know. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:461–467
323. Biessels GJ, Despa F. Cognitive decline and dementia in diabetes mellitus: mechanisms and clinical implications. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2018;14:591–604
324. Feinkohl I, Aung PP, Keller M, et al.; Edinburgh Type 2 Diabetes Study (ET2DS) Investigators. Severe hypoglycemia and cognitive decline in older people with type 2 diabetes: the Edinburgh type 2 diabetes study. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:507–515
325. Strudwick SK, Carne C, Gardiner J, Foster JK, Davis EA, Jones TW. Cognitive functioning in children with early onset type 1 diabetes and severe hypoglycemia. *J Pediatr* 2005;147:680–685





## 6. Glycemic Targets: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S83–S96 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>

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 (<http://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 (<http://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](http://professional.diabetes.org/SOC).

### ASSESSMENT OF GLYCEMIC CONTROL

Glycemic control is assessed by the A1C measurement, continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) using either time in range (TIR) and/or glucose management indicator (GMI), and blood glucose monitoring (BGM). A1C is the metric used to date in clinical trials demonstrating the benefits of improved glycemic control. Individual glucose monitoring (discussed in detail in Section 7, “Diabetes Technology,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>) is a useful tool for diabetes self-management, which includes meals, exercise, and medication adjustment, particularly in individuals taking insulin. CGM serves an increasingly important role in the management of the effectiveness and safety of treatment in many patients with type 1 diabetes and in selected patients with type 2 diabetes. Individuals on a variety of insulin regimens can benefit from CGM with improved glucose control, decreased hypoglycemia, and enhanced self-efficacy (Section 7, “Diabetes Technology,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>) (1).

### Glycemic Assessment

#### Recommendations

- 6.1 Assess glycemic status (A1C or other glycemic measurement such as time in range or glucose management indicator) *at least* two times a year in patients who are meeting treatment goals (and who have stable glycemic control). **E**
- 6.2 Assess glycemic status at least quarterly and as needed in patients whose therapy has recently changed and/or who are not meeting glycemic goals. **E**

A1C reflects average glycemia over approximately 3 months. The performance of the test is generally excellent for National Glycohemoglobin Standardization Program (NGSP)-certified assays (see [www.ngsp.org](http://www.ngsp.org)). The test is the primary tool for assessing

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

Suggested citation: American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee. 6. Glycemic targets: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S83–S96

© 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>.

glycemic control and has a strong predictive value for diabetes complications (2–4). Thus, A1C testing should be performed routinely in all patients with diabetes at initial assessment and as part of continuing care. Measurement approximately every 3 months determines whether patients' glycemic targets have been reached and maintained. A 14-day CGM assessment of TIR and GMI can serve as a surrogate for A1C for use in clinical management (5–9). The frequency of A1C testing should depend on the clinical situation, the treatment regimen, and the clinician's judgment. The use of point-of-care A1C testing or CGM-derived TIR and GMI may provide an opportunity for more timely treatment changes during encounters between patients and providers. People with type 2 diabetes with stable glycemia well within target may do well with A1C testing or other glucose assessment only twice per year. Unstable or intensively managed patients or people not at goal with treatment adjustments may require testing more frequently (every 3 months with interim assessments as needed for safety) (10). CGM parameters can be tracked in the clinic or via telemedicine to optimize diabetes management.

#### A1C Limitations

The A1C test is an indirect measure of average glycemia and, as such, is subject to limitations. As with any laboratory test, there is variability in the measurement of A1C. Although A1C variability is lower on an intraindividual basis than that of blood glucose measurements, clinicians should exercise judgment when using A1C as the sole basis for assessing glycemic control, particularly if the result is close to the threshold that might prompt a change in medication therapy. For example, conditions that affect red blood cell turnover (hemolytic and other anemias, glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency, recent blood transfusion, use of drugs that stimulate erythropoiesis, end-stage kidney disease, and pregnancy) may result in discrepancies between the A1C result and the patient's true mean glycemia. Hemoglobin variants must be considered, particularly when the A1C result does not correlate with the patient's CGM or BGM levels. However, most assays in use in the U.S.

are accurate in individuals who are heterozygous for the most common variants (see [www.ngsp.org/interf.asp](http://www.ngsp.org/interf.asp)). Other measures of average glycemia such as fructosamine and 1,5-anhydroglucitol are available, but their translation into average glucose levels and their prognostic significance are not as clear as for A1C and CGM. Though some variability in the relationship between average glucose levels and A1C exists among different individuals, in general the association between mean glucose and A1C within an individual correlates over time (11).

A1C does not provide a measure of glycemic variability or hypoglycemia. For patients prone to glycemic variability, especially patients with type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes with severe insulin deficiency, glycemic control is best evaluated by the combination of results from BGM/CGM and A1C. Discordant results between BGM/CGM and A1C can be the result of the conditions outlined above or glycemic variability, with BGM missing the extremes.

#### Correlation Between BGM and A1C

**Table 6.1** shows the correlation between A1C levels and mean glucose levels based on the international A1C-Derived Average Glucose (ADAG) study, which assessed the correlation between A1C and frequent BGM and CGM in 507 adults (83% non-Hispanic White) with type 1, type 2, and no diabetes (12), and an empirical study of the average blood glucose levels at premeal, postmeal, and bedtime associated with specified A1C levels using data from the ADAG trial (13). The American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the American Association for Clinical Chemistry have determined that the correlation ( $r = 0.92$ ) in the ADAG trial is strong enough to justify reporting both the A1C result and the estimated average glucose (eAG) result when a clinician orders the A1C test. Clinicians should note that the mean plasma glucose numbers in **Table 6.1** are based on ~2,700 readings per A1C in the ADAG trial. In a recent report, mean glucose measured with CGM versus central laboratory-measured A1C in 387 participants in three randomized trials demonstrated that A1C may underestimate or overestimate mean glucose in individuals (11). Thus, as suggested, a patient's BGM or CGM profile has considerable potential

**Table 6.1—Estimated average glucose (eAG)**

A1C (%)	mg/dL*	mmol/L
5	97 (76–120)	5.4 (4.2–6.7)
6	126 (100–152)	7.0 (5.5–8.5)
7	154 (123–185)	8.6 (6.8–10.3)
8	183 (147–217)	10.2 (8.1–12.1)
9	212 (170–249)	11.8 (9.4–13.9)
10	240 (193–282)	13.4 (10.7–15.7)
11	269 (217–314)	14.9 (12.0–17.5)
12	298 (240–347)	16.5 (13.3–19.3)

Data in parentheses are 95% CI. A calculator for converting A1C results into eAG, in either mg/dL or mmol/L, is available at [professional.diabetes.org/eAG](http://professional.diabetes.org/eAG). \*These estimates are based on ADAG data of ~2,700 glucose measurements over 3 months per A1C measurement in 507 adults with type 1, type 2, or no diabetes. The correlation between A1C and average glucose was 0.92 (12,13). Adapted from Nathan et al. (12).

for optimizing his or her glycemic management (12).

#### A1C Differences in Ethnic Populations and Children

In the ADAG study, there were no significant differences among racial and ethnic groups in the regression lines between A1C and mean glucose, although the study was underpowered to detect a difference and there was a trend toward a difference between the African and African American and the non-Hispanic White cohorts, with higher A1C values observed in Africans and African Americans compared with non-Hispanic Whites for a given mean glucose. Other studies have also demonstrated higher A1C levels in African Americans than in Whites at a given mean glucose concentration (14,15). In contrast, a recent report in Afro-Caribbeans found lower A1C relative to glucose values (16). Taken together, A1C and glucose parameters are essential for the optimal assessment of glycemic status.

A1C assays are available that do not demonstrate a statistically significant difference in individuals with hemoglobin variants. Other assays have statistically significant interference, but the difference is not clinically significant. Use of an assay with such

**Table 6.2—Standardized CGM metrics for clinical care**

1. Number of days CGM device is worn (recommend 14 days)	
2. Percentage of time CGM device is active (recommend 70% of data from 14 days)	
3. Mean glucose	
4. Glucose management indicator	
5. Glycemic variability (%CV) target $\leq 36\%$ *	
6. TAR: % of readings and time $>250$ mg/dL ( $>13.9$ mmol/L)	Level 2 hyperglycemia
7. TAR: % of readings and time 181–250 mg/dL (10.1–13.9 mmol/L)	Level 1 hyperglycemia
8. TIR: % of readings and time 70–180 mg/dL (3.9–10.0 mmol/L)	In range
9. TBR: % of readings and time 54–69 mg/dL (3.0–3.8 mmol/L)	Level 1 hypoglycemia
10. TBR: % of readings and time $<54$ mg/dL ( $<3.0$ mmol/L)	Level 2 hypoglycemia

CGM, continuous glucose monitoring; CV, coefficient of variation; TAR, time above range; TBR, time below range; TIR, time in range. \*Some studies suggest that lower %CV targets ( $<33\%$ ) provide additional protection against hypoglycemia for those receiving insulin or sulfonylureas. Adapted from Battelino et al. (34).

statistically significant interference may explain a report that for any level of mean glycemia, African Americans heterozygous for the common hemoglobin variant HbS had lower A1C by about 0.3 percentage points when compared with those without the trait (17,18). Another genetic variant, X-linked glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase G202A, carried by 11% of African Americans, was associated with a decrease in A1C of about 0.8% in hemizygous men and 0.7% in homozygous women compared with those without the trait (19).

A small study comparing A1C to CGM data in children with type 1 diabetes found a highly statistically significant correlation between A1C and mean blood glucose, although the correlation ( $r = 0.7$ ) was significantly lower than in the ADAG trial (20). Whether there are clinically meaningful differences in how A1C relates to average glucose in children or in different ethnicities is an area for further study (14,21,22). Until further evidence is available, it seems prudent to establish A1C goals in these populations with consideration of individualized CGM, BGM, and A1C results. Limitations in perfect alignment between glycemic measurements do not interfere with the usefulness of BGM/CGM for insulin dose adjustments.

### Glucose Assessment by Continuous Glucose Monitoring

#### Recommendations

**6.3** Standardized, single-page glucose reports from continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) devices with visual cues, such as the ambulatory glucose profile, should be considered as a standard summary for all CGM devices. **E**


**6.4** Time in range is associated with the risk of microvascular complications and can be used for assessment of glycemic control. Additionally, time below target and time above target are useful parameters for the evaluation of the treatment regimen (**Table 6.2**). **C**

CGM is rapidly improving diabetes management. As stated in the recommendations, time in range (TIR) is a useful metric of glycemic control and glucose patterns, and it correlates well with A1C in most studies (23–28). New data support the premise that increased TIR correlates with the risk of complications. The studies supporting this assertion are reviewed in more detail in Section 7, “Diabetes Technology” (<http://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>); they include cross-sectional data and cohort studies (29–31) demonstrating TIR as an acceptable end point for clinical trials moving

forward and that it can be used for assessment of glycemic control. Additionally, time below target ( $<70$  and  $<54$  mg/dL [ $3.9$  and  $3.0$  mmol/L]) and time above target ( $>180$  mg/dL [ $10.0$  mmol/L]) are useful parameters for insulin dose adjustments and reevaluation of the treatment regimen.


For many people with diabetes, glucose monitoring is key for achieving glycemic targets. 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 (32). BGM is thus an integral component of effective therapy of patients taking insulin. In recent years, CGM is now a standard method for glucose monitoring for most adults with type 1 diabetes (33). Both approaches to glucose monitoring allow patients to evaluate individual responses to therapy and assess whether glycemic targets are being safely achieved. The international consensus on TIR provides guidance on standardized CGM metrics (see **Table 6.2**) and considerations for clinical interpretation and care (34). To make these metrics more actionable, standardized reports with visual cues, such as the ambulatory glucose profile (see **Fig. 6.1**), are recommended (34) and may help the patient and the provider better interpret the data to guide treatment decisions (23,26). BGM and CGM can be useful to guide medical nutrition therapy and physical activity, prevent hypoglycemia, and aid medication management. While A1C is currently the primary measure to guide glucose management and a valuable risk marker for developing diabetes complications, the CGM metrics TIR (with time below range and time above range) and GMI provide the insights for a more personalized diabetes management plan. The incorporation of these metrics into clinical practice is in evolution, and remote access to these data can be critical for telemedicine. A rapid optimization and harmonization of CGM terminology and remote access is occurring to meet patient and provider needs (35–37). The patient’s specific needs and goals should dictate BGM frequency and timing and consideration of CGM use. Please refer to Section 7, “Diabetes Technology” (<http://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-SPPC>), for a more complete discussion of the use of BGM and CGM.

## AGP Report: Continuous Glucose Monitoring



### Ambulatory Glucose Profile (AGP)

AGP is a summary of glucose values from the report period, with median (50%) and other percentiles shown as if they occurred in a single day.



### Daily Glucose Profiles

Each daily profile represents a midnight-to-midnight period.




Figure 6.1—Key points included in standard ambulatory glucose profile (AGP) report. Reprinted from Holt et al. (33).



With the advent of new technology, CGM has evolved rapidly in both accuracy and affordability. As such, many patients have these data available to assist with self-management and their providers' assessment of glycemic status. Reports can be generated from CGM that will allow the provider and person with diabetes to determine TIR, calculate GMI, and assess hypoglycemia, hyperglycemia, and glycemic variability. As discussed in a recent consensus document, a report formatted as shown in **Fig. 6.1** can be generated (34). Published data suggest a strong correlation between TIR and A1C, with a goal of 70% TIR aligning with an A1C of ~7% in two prospective studies (8,25). Note the goals of therapy next to each metric in **Fig. 6.1** (e.g., low, <4%; very low, <1%) as values to guide changes in therapy.

## GLYCEMIC GOALS

For glycemic goals in older adults, please refer to Section 13, "Older Adults" (<http://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>). For glycemic goals in children, please refer to Section 14, "Children and Adolescents" (<http://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>). For glycemic goals in pregnant women, please refer to Section 15, "Management of Diabetes in Pregnancy" (<http://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S015>). Overall, regardless of the population being served, it is critical for the glycemic targets to be woven into the overall patient-centered strategy. For example, in a very young child, safety and simplicity may outweigh the need for perfect control in the short run. Simplification may decrease parental anxiety and build trust and confidence, which could support further strengthening of glycemic targets and self-efficacy. Similarly, in healthy older adults, there is no empiric need to loosen control. However, the provider needs to work with an individual and should consider adjusting targets or simplifying the regimen if this change is needed to improve safety and adherence.

### Recommendations

- 6.5a** An A1C goal for many non-pregnant adults of <7% (53 mmol/mol) without significant hypoglycemia is appropriate. **A**
- 6.5b** If using ambulatory glucose profile/glucose management indicator to assess glycemia,

a parallel goal for many non-pregnant adults is time in range of >70% with time below range <4% and time <54 mg/dL <1% (**Fig. 6.1** and **Table 6.2**). **B**

- 6.6** On the basis of provider judgment and patient preference, achievement of lower A1C levels than the goal of 7% may be acceptable and even beneficial if it can be achieved safely without significant hypoglycemia or other adverse effects of treatment. **B**
- 6.7** Less stringent A1C goals (such as <8% [64 mmol/mol]) may be appropriate for patients with limited life expectancy or where the harms of treatment are greater than the benefits. **B**
- 6.8** Reassess glycemic targets based on the individualized criteria in **Fig. 6.2**. **E**

## A1C and Microvascular Complications

Hyperglycemia defines diabetes, and glycemic control is fundamental to diabetes management. The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) (32), a prospective randomized controlled trial of intensive (mean A1C about 7% [53 mmol/mol]) versus standard (mean A1C about 9% [75 mmol/mol]) glycemic control in patients with type 1 diabetes, showed definitively that better glycemic control is associated with 50–76% reductions in rates of development and progression of microvascular (retinopathy, neuropathy, and diabetic kidney disease) complications. Follow-up of the DCCT cohorts in the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) study (38,39) demonstrated persistence of these microvascular benefits over two decades despite the fact that the glycemic separation between the treatment groups diminished and disappeared during follow-up.

The Kumamoto Study (40) and UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) (41,42) confirmed that intensive glycemic control significantly decreased rates of microvascular complications in patients with short-duration type 2 diabetes. Long-term follow-up of the UKPDS cohorts showed enduring effects of early glycemic control on

most microvascular complications (43).

Therefore, achieving A1C targets of <7% (53 mmol/mol) has been shown to reduce microvascular complications of type 1 and type 2 diabetes when instituted early in the course of disease (2,44). Epidemiologic analyses of the DCCT (32) and UKPDS (45) demonstrate a curvilinear relationship between A1C and microvascular complications. Such analyses suggest that, on a population level, the greatest number of complications will be averted by taking patients from very poor control to fair/good control. These analyses also suggest that further lowering of A1C from 7% to 6% [53 mmol/mol to 42 mmol/mol] is associated with further reduction in the risk of microvascular complications, although the absolute risk reductions become much smaller. The implication of these findings is that there is no need to deintensify therapy for an individual with an A1C between 6% and 7% in the setting of low hypoglycemia risk with a long life expectancy. There are now newer agents that do not cause hypoglycemia, making it possible to maintain glucose control without the risk of hypoglycemia (see Section 9, "Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment," <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>).

Given the substantially increased risk of hypoglycemia in type 1 diabetes and with polypharmacy in type 2 diabetes, the risks of lower glycemic targets may outweigh the potential benefits on microvascular complications. Three landmark trials (Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes [ACCORD], Action in Diabetes and Vascular Disease: Preterax and Diamicon MR Controlled Evaluation [ADVANCE], and Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial [VADT]) were conducted to test the effects of near normalization of blood glucose on cardiovascular outcomes in individuals with long-standing type 2 diabetes and either known cardiovascular disease (CVD) or high cardiovascular risk. These trials showed that lower A1C levels were associated with reduced onset or progression of some microvascular complications (46–48).

The concerning mortality findings in the ACCORD trial discussed below and the relatively intense efforts required to achieve near euglycemia should also be considered when setting glycemic

targets for individuals with long-standing diabetes, such as those populations studied in ACCORD, ADVANCE, and VADT. Findings from these studies suggest caution is needed in treating diabetes to near-normal A1C goals in people with long-standing type 2 diabetes with or at significant risk of CVD.

These landmark studies need to be considered with an important caveat; glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists and sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors were not approved at the time of these trials. As such, these agents with established cardiovascular and renal benefits appear to be safe and beneficial in this group of individuals at high risk for cardiorenal complications. Prospective randomized clinical trials examining these agents for cardiovascular safety were not designed to test higher versus lower A1C; therefore, beyond post hoc analysis of these trials, we do not have evidence that it is the glucose lowering by these agents that confers the CVD and renal benefit (49). As such, on the basis of physician judgment and patient preferences, select patients, especially those with little comorbidity and a long life expectancy, may benefit from adopting more intensive glycemic targets if they can achieve them safely and without hypoglycemia or significant therapeutic burden.

### **A1C and Cardiovascular Disease Outcomes**

**Cardiovascular Disease and Type 1 Diabetes**  
CVD is a more common cause of death than microvascular complications in populations with diabetes. There is evidence for a cardiovascular benefit of intensive glycemic control after long-term follow-up of cohorts treated early in the course of type 1 diabetes. In the DCCT, there was a trend toward lower risk of CVD events with intensive control. In the 9-year post-DCCT follow-up of the EDIC cohort, participants previously randomized to the intensive arm had a significant 57% reduction in the risk of nonfatal myocardial infarction (MI), stroke, or cardiovascular death compared with those previously randomized to the standard arm (50). The benefit of intensive glycemic control in this cohort with type 1 diabetes has been shown to persist for several decades

(51) and to be associated with a modest reduction in all-cause mortality (52).

### **Cardiovascular Disease and Type 2 Diabetes**

In type 2 diabetes, there is evidence that more intensive treatment of glycemia in newly diagnosed patients may reduce long-term CVD rates. In addition, data from the Swedish National Diabetes Registry (53) and the Joint Asia Diabetes Evaluation (JADE) demonstrate greater proportions of people with diabetes being diagnosed at <40 years of age and a demonstrably increased burden of heart disease and years of life lost in people diagnosed at a younger age (54–57). Thus, to prevent both microvascular and macrovascular complications of diabetes, there is a major call to overcome therapeutic inertia and treat to target for an individual patient (57,58). During the UKPDS, there was a 16% reduction in CVD events (combined fatal or nonfatal MI and sudden death) in the intensive glycemic control arm that did not reach statistical significance ( $P = 0.052$ ), and there was no suggestion of benefit on other CVD outcomes (e.g., stroke). Similar to the DCCT/EDIC, after 10 years of observational follow-up, those originally randomized to intensive glycemic control had significant long-term reductions in MI (15% with sulfonylurea or insulin as initial pharmacotherapy, 33% with metformin as initial pharmacotherapy) and in all-cause mortality (13% and 27%, respectively) (43).

ACCORD, ADVANCE, and VADT suggested no significant reduction in CVD outcomes with intensive glycemic control in participants followed for shorter durations (3.5–5.6 years) and who had more advanced type 2 diabetes and CVD risk than the UKPDS participants. All three trials were conducted in relatively older participants with a longer known duration of diabetes (mean duration 8–11 years) and either CVD or multiple cardiovascular risk factors. The target A1C among intensive-control subjects was <6% (42 mmol/mol) in ACCORD, <6.5% (48 mmol/mol) in ADVANCE, and a 1.5% reduction in A1C compared with control subjects in VADT, with achieved A1C of 6.4% vs. 7.5% (46 mmol/mol vs. 58 mmol/mol) in ACCORD, 6.5% vs. 7.3% (48 mmol/mol vs. 56 mmol/mol) in ADVANCE, and

6.9% vs. 8.4% (52 mmol/mol vs. 68 mmol/mol) in VADT. Details of these studies are reviewed extensively in the joint ADA position statement “Intensive Glycemic Control and the Prevention of Cardiovascular Events: Implications of the ACCORD, ADVANCE, and VA Diabetes Trials” (58).


The glycemic control comparison in ACCORD was halted early due to an increased mortality rate in the intensive compared with the standard treatment arm (1.41% vs. 1.14% per year; hazard ratio 1.22 [95% CI 1.01–1.46]), with a similar increase in cardiovascular deaths. Analysis of the ACCORD data did not identify a clear explanation for the excess mortality in the intensive treatment arm (59).

Longer-term follow-up has shown no evidence of cardiovascular benefit, or harm, in the ADVANCE trial (60). The end-stage renal disease rate was lower in the intensive treatment group over follow-up. However, 10-year follow-up of the VADT cohort (61) did demonstrate a reduction in the risk of cardiovascular events (52.7 [control group] vs. 44.1 [intervention group] events per 1,000 person-years) with no benefit in cardiovascular or overall mortality. Heterogeneity of mortality effects across studies was noted, which may reflect differences in glycemic targets, therapeutic approaches, and, importantly, population characteristics (62).

Mortality findings in ACCORD (59) and subgroup analyses of VADT (63) suggest that the potential risks of intensive glycemic control may outweigh its benefits in higher-risk individuals. In all three trials, severe hypoglycemia was significantly more likely in participants who were randomly assigned to the intensive glycemic control arm. Those patients with a long duration of diabetes, a known history of hypoglycemia, advanced atherosclerosis, or advanced age/frailty may benefit from less aggressive targets (64,65).

As discussed further below, severe hypoglycemia is a potent marker of high absolute risk of cardiovascular events and mortality (66). Therefore, providers should be vigilant in preventing hypoglycemia and should not aggressively attempt to achieve near-normal A1C levels in people in whom such targets cannot be safely and reasonably achieved. As discussed in Section 9, “Pharmacologic

## Approach to Individualization of Glycemic Targets



**Figure 6.2**—Patient and disease factors used to determine optimal glycemic targets. Characteristics and predicaments toward the left justify more stringent efforts to lower A1C; those toward the right suggest less stringent efforts. A1C 7% = 53 mmol/mol. Adapted with permission from Inzucchi et al. (68).

Approaches to Glycemic Treatment” (<http://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>), addition of specific SGLT2 inhibitors or GLP-1 receptor agonists that have demonstrated CVD benefit is recommended in patients with established CVD, chronic kidney disease, and heart failure. As outlined in more detail in Section 9, “Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment” (<http://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>) and Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>), the cardiovascular benefits of SGLT2 inhibitors or GLP-1 receptor agonists are not contingent upon A1C lowering; therefore, initiation can be considered in people with type 2 diabetes and CVD independent of the current A1C or A1C goal or metformin therapy. Based on these considerations, the following two strategies are offered (67):

1. If already on dual therapy or multiple glucose-lowering therapies and not on an SGLT2 inhibitor or GLP-1 receptor agonist, consider switching to one of these agents with proven cardiovascular benefit.

2. Introduce SGLT2 inhibitors or GLP-1 receptor agonists in people with CVD at A1C goal (independent of metformin) for cardiovascular benefit, independent of baseline A1C or individualized A1C target.

### Setting and Modifying A1C Goals

Numerous factors must be considered when setting glycemic targets. The ADA proposes general targets appropriate for many people but emphasizes the importance of individualization based on key patient characteristics. Glycemic targets must be individualized in the context of shared decision-making to address individual needs and preferences and consider characteristics that influence risks and benefits of therapy; this approach will optimize engagement and self-efficacy.

The factors to consider in individualizing goals are depicted in **Fig. 6.2**. This figure is not designed to be applied rigidly but to be used as a broad construct to guide clinical decision-making (68) and engage people with type 1 and type 2 diabetes in shared decision-making. More aggressive targets may be

recommended if they can be achieved safely and with an acceptable burden of therapy and if life expectancy is sufficient to reap the benefits of stringent targets. Less stringent targets (A1C up to 8% [64 mmol/mol]) may be recommended if the patient’s life expectancy is such that the benefits of an intensive goal may not be realized, or if the risks and burdens outweigh the potential benefits. Severe or frequent hypoglycemia is an absolute indication for the modification of treatment regimens, including setting higher glycemic goals.

Diabetes is a chronic disease that progresses over decades. Thus, a goal that might be appropriate for an individual early in the course of their diabetes may change over time. Newly diagnosed patients and/or those without comorbidities that limit life expectancy may benefit from intensive control proven to prevent microvascular complications. Both DCCT/EDIC and UKPDS demonstrated metabolic memory, or a legacy effect, in which a finite period of intensive control yielded benefits that extended for decades after that control ended. Thus, a finite period of intensive control to near-normal A1C may yield enduring benefits even if control is subsequently deintensified as patient characteristics change. Over time, comorbidities may emerge, decreasing life expectancy and thereby decreasing the potential to reap benefits from intensive control. Also, with longer disease duration, diabetes may become more difficult to control, with increasing risks and burdens of therapy. Thus, A1C targets should be reevaluated over time to balance the risks and benefits as patient factors change.

Recommended glycemic targets for many nonpregnant adults are shown in **Table 6.3**. The recommendations include blood glucose levels that appear to correlate with achievement of an A1C of <7% (53 mmol/mol). Pregnancy recommendations are discussed in more detail in Section 15, “Management of Diabetes in Pregnancy” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S015>).

The issue of preprandial versus postprandial BGM targets is complex (69). Elevated postchallenge (2-h oral glucose tolerance test) glucose values have been associated with increased cardiovascular risk independent of fasting plasma glucose in some epidemiologic studies, whereas intervention trials have not



**Table 6.3—Summary of glycemic recommendations for many nonpregnant adults with diabetes**

A1C	<7.0% (53 mmol/mol)*#
Preprandial capillary plasma glucose	80–130 mg/dL* (4.4–7.2 mmol/L)
Peak postprandial capillary plasma glucose†	<180 mg/dL* (10.0 mmol/L)

\*More or less stringent glycemic goals may be appropriate for individual patients. #CGM may be used to assess glycemic target as noted in Recommendation 6.5b and Fig. 6.1. Goals should be individualized based on duration of diabetes, age/life expectancy, comorbid conditions, known CVD or advanced microvascular complications, hypoglycemia unawareness, and individual patient considerations (as per Fig. 6.2). †Postprandial glucose may be targeted if A1C goals are not met despite reaching preprandial glucose goals. Postprandial glucose measurements should be made 1–2 h after the beginning of the meal, generally peak levels in patients with diabetes.

shown postprandial glucose to be a cardiovascular risk factor independent of A1C. In people with diabetes, surrogate measures of vascular pathology, such as endothelial dysfunction, are negatively affected by postprandial hyperglycemia. It is clear that postprandial hyperglycemia, like preprandial hyperglycemia, contributes to elevated A1C levels, with its relative contribution being greater at A1C levels that are closer to 7% (53 mmol/mol). However, outcome studies have shown A1C to be the primary predictor of complications, and landmark trials of glycemic control such as the DCCT and UKPDS relied overwhelmingly on preprandial BGM. Additionally, a randomized controlled trial in patients with known CVD found no CVD benefit of insulin regimens targeting postprandial glucose compared with those targeting preprandial glucose (70). Therefore, it is reasonable to check postprandial glucose in individuals who have premeal glucose values within target but A1C values above target. In addition, when intensifying insulin therapy, measuring postprandial plasma glucose 1–2 h after the start of a meal (using BGM or CGM) and using treatments aimed at reducing postprandial plasma glucose values to <180 mg/dL (10.0 mmol/L) may help to lower A1C.

An analysis of data from 470 participants in the ADAG study (237 with type 1 diabetes and 147 with type 2 diabetes) found that the glucose ranges highlighted in Table 6.1 are adequate to meet targets and decrease hypoglycemia (13,71). These findings support that premeal glucose targets may be relaxed without undermining overall glycemic control as measured by A1C. These data prompted the revision in the ADA-recommended premeal glucose

target to 80–130 mg/dL (4.4–7.2 mmol/L) but did not affect the definition of hypoglycemia.

## HYPOGLYCEMIA

### Recommendations

- 6.9** Occurrence and risk for hypoglycemia should be reviewed at every encounter and investigated as indicated. **C**
- 6.10** Glucose (approximately 15–20 g) is the preferred treatment for the conscious individual with blood glucose <70 mg/dL (3.9 mmol/L), although any form of carbohydrate that contains glucose may be used. Fifteen minutes after treatment, if blood glucose monitoring (BGM) shows continued hypoglycemia, the treatment should be repeated. Once the BGM or glucose pattern is trending up, the individual should consume a meal or snack to prevent recurrence of hypoglycemia. **B**
- 6.11** Glucagon should be prescribed for all individuals at increased risk of level 2 or 3 hypoglycemia, so that it is available should it be needed. Caregivers, school personnel, or family members providing support to these individuals should know where it is and when and how to administer it. Glucagon administration is not limited to health care professionals. **E**
- 6.12** Hypoglycemia unawareness or one or more episodes of level 3 hypoglycemia should trigger hypoglycemia avoidance education and reevaluation and

adjustment of the treatment regimen to decrease hypoglycemia. **E**

- 6.13** Insulin-treated patients with hypoglycemia unawareness, one level 3 hypoglycemic event, or a pattern of unexplained level 2 hypoglycemia should be advised to raise their glycemic targets to strictly avoid hypoglycemia for at least several weeks in order to partially reverse hypoglycemia unawareness and reduce risk of future episodes. **A**
- 6.14** Ongoing assessment of cognitive function is suggested with increased vigilance for hypoglycemia by the clinician, patient, and caregivers if impaired or declining cognition is found. **B**

Hypoglycemia is the major limiting factor in the glycemic management of type 1 and type 2 diabetes. Recommendations regarding the classification of hypoglycemia are outlined in Table 6.4 (72–77). Level 1 hypoglycemia is defined as a measurable glucose concentration <70 mg/dL (3.9 mmol/L) but  $\geq$ 54 mg/dL (3.0 mmol/L). A blood glucose concentration of 70 mg/dL (3.9 mmol/L) has been recognized as a threshold for neuroendocrine responses to falling glucose in people without diabetes. Because many people with diabetes demonstrate impaired counterregulatory responses to hypoglycemia and/or experience hypoglycemia unawareness, a measured glucose level <70 mg/dL (3.9 mmol/L) is considered clinically important (independent of the severity of acute hypoglycemic symptoms). Level 2 hypoglycemia (defined as a blood glucose concentration <54 mg/dL [3.0 mmol/L]) is the threshold at which neuroglycopenic symptoms begin to occur and requires immediate action to resolve the hypoglycemic event. If a patient has level 2 hypoglycemia without adrenergic or neuroglycopenic symptoms, they likely have hypoglycemia unawareness (discussed further below). This clinical scenario warrants investigation and review of the medical regimen (78–82). Lastly, level 3 hypoglycemia is defined as a severe event characterized by altered mental and/or physical functioning that requires assistance from another person for recovery.



**Table 6.4—Classification of hypoglycemia**

	Glycemic criteria/description
Level 1	Glucose <70 mg/dL (3.9 mmol/L) and $\geq$ 54 mg/dL (3.0 mmol/L)
Level 2	Glucose <54 mg/dL (3.0 mmol/L)
Level 3	A severe event characterized by altered mental and/or physical status requiring assistance for treatment of hypoglycemia

Reprinted from Agiostratidou et al. (72).

Symptoms of hypoglycemia include, but are not limited to, shakiness, irritability, confusion, tachycardia, and hunger. Hypoglycemia may be inconvenient or frightening to patients with diabetes. Level 3 hypoglycemia may be recognized or unrecognized and can progress to loss of consciousness, seizure, coma, or death. Hypoglycemia is reversed by administration of rapid-acting glucose or glucagon. Hypoglycemia can cause acute harm to the person with diabetes or others, especially if it causes falls, motor vehicle accidents, or other injury. Recurrent level 2 hypoglycemia and/or level 3 hypoglycemia is an urgent medical issue and requires intervention with medical regimen adjustment, behavioral intervention, and, in some cases, use of technology to assist with hypoglycemia prevention and identification (73,82–85). A large cohort study suggested that among older adults with type 2 diabetes, a history of level 3 hypoglycemia was associated with greater risk of dementia (86). Conversely, in a substudy of the ACCORD trial, cognitive impairment at baseline or decline in cognitive function during the trial was significantly associated with subsequent episodes of level 3 hypoglycemia (87). Evidence from DCCT/EDIC, which involved adolescents and younger adults with type 1 diabetes, found no association between frequency of level 3 hypoglycemia and cognitive decline (88).

Studies of rates of level 3 hypoglycemia that rely on claims data for hospitalization, emergency department visits, and ambulance use substantially underestimate rates of level 3 hypoglycemia (89) yet reveal a high burden of hypoglycemia in adults over 60 years of age in the community (90). African Americans are at substantially increased risk of level 3 hypoglycemia (90,91). In addition to age and race, other important risk factors found in a community-based epidemiologic cohort of older Black and White adults with type 2 diabetes include

insulin use, poor or moderate versus good glycemic control, albuminuria, and poor cognitive function (90). Level 3 hypoglycemia was associated with mortality in participants in both the standard and the intensive glycemia arms of the ACCORD trial, but the relationships between hypoglycemia, achieved A1C, and treatment intensity were not straightforward. An association of level 3 hypoglycemia with mortality was also found in the ADVANCE trial (92). An association between self-reported level 3 hypoglycemia and 5-year mortality has also been reported in clinical practice (93). Glucose variability is also associated with an increased risk for hypoglycemia (94).

Young children with type 1 diabetes and the elderly, including those with type 1 and type 2 diabetes (86,95), are noted as particularly vulnerable to hypoglycemia because of their reduced ability to recognize hypoglycemic symptoms and effectively communicate their needs. Individualized glucose targets, patient education, dietary intervention (e.g., bedtime snack to prevent overnight hypoglycemia when specifically needed to treat low blood glucose), exercise management, medication adjustment, glucose monitoring, and routine clinical surveillance may improve patient outcomes (96). CGM with automated low glucose suspend and hybrid closed-loop systems have been shown to be effective in reducing hypoglycemia in type 1 diabetes (97). For patients with type 1 diabetes with level 3 hypoglycemia and hypoglycemia unawareness that persists despite medical treatment, human islet transplantation may be an option, but the approach remains experimental (98,99).

In 2015, the ADA changed its preprandial glycemic target from 70–130 mg/dL (3.9–7.2 mmol/L) to 80–130 mg/dL (4.4–7.2 mmol/L). This change reflects the results of the ADAG study, which demonstrated that higher

glycemic targets corresponded to A1C goals (13). An additional goal of raising the lower range of the glycemic target was to limit overtreatment and provide a safety margin in patients titrating glucose-lowering drugs such as insulin to glycemic targets.

### Hypoglycemia Treatment

Providers should continue to counsel patients to treat hypoglycemia with fast-acting carbohydrates at the hypoglycemia alert value of 70 mg/dL (3.9 mmol/L) or less. This should be reviewed at each patient visit. Hypoglycemia treatment requires ingestion of glucose- or carbohydrate-containing foods (100–102). The acute glycemic response correlates better with the glucose content of food than with the carbohydrate content of food. Pure glucose is the preferred treatment, but any form of carbohydrate that contains glucose will raise blood glucose. Added fat may retard and then prolong the acute glycemic response. In type 2 diabetes, ingested protein may increase insulin response without increasing plasma glucose concentrations (103). Therefore, carbohydrate sources high in protein should not be used to treat or prevent hypoglycemia. Ongoing insulin activity or insulin secretagogues may lead to recurrent hypoglycemia unless more food is ingested after recovery. Once the glucose returns to normal, the individual should be counseled to eat a meal or snack to prevent recurrent hypoglycemia.

### Glucagon

The use of glucagon is indicated for the treatment of hypoglycemia in people unable or unwilling to consume carbohydrates by mouth. Those in close contact with, or having custodial care of, people with hypoglycemia-prone diabetes (family members, roommates, school personnel, childcare providers, correctional institution staff, or coworkers) should be instructed on the use of glucagon, including where the glucagon product is kept and when and how to administer it. An individual does not need to be a health care professional to safely administer glucagon. In addition to traditional glucagon injection powder that requires reconstitution prior to injection, intranasal glucagon and ready-to-inject glucagon

preparations for subcutaneous injection are available. Care should be taken to ensure that glucagon products are not expired.

### Hypoglycemia Prevention

Hypoglycemia prevention is a critical component of diabetes management. BGM and, for some patients, CGM are essential tools to assess therapy and detect incipient hypoglycemia. Patients should understand situations that increase their risk of hypoglycemia, such as when fasting for laboratory tests or procedures, when meals are delayed, during and after the consumption of alcohol, during and after intense exercise, and during sleep. Hypoglycemia may increase the risk of harm to self or others, such as when driving. Teaching people with diabetes to balance insulin use and carbohydrate intake and exercise are necessary, but these strategies are not always sufficient for prevention (82,104–106). Formal training programs to increase awareness of hypoglycemia and to develop strategies to decrease hypoglycemia have been developed, including the Blood Glucose Awareness Training Programme, Dose Adjusted for Normal Eating (DAFNE), and DAFNEplus. Conversely, some individuals with type 1 diabetes and hypoglycemia who have a fear of hyperglycemia are resistant to relaxation of glycemic targets (78,80). Regardless of the factors contributing to hypoglycemia and hypoglycemia unawareness, this represents an urgent medical issue requiring intervention.

In type 1 diabetes and severely insulin-deficient type 2 diabetes, hypoglycemia unawareness (or hypoglycemia-associated autonomic failure) can severely compromise stringent diabetes control and quality of life. This syndrome is characterized by deficient counterregulatory hormone release, especially in older adults, and a diminished autonomic response, which are both risk factors for and caused by hypoglycemia. A corollary to this “vicious cycle” is that several weeks of avoidance of hypoglycemia has been demonstrated to improve counterregulation and hypoglycemia awareness in many patients (107). Hence, patients with one or more episodes of clinically significant hypoglycemia may benefit from at least short-term relaxation of glycemic targets and

availability of glucagon (108). Any person with recurrent hypoglycemia or hypoglycemia unawareness should have their glucose management regimen adjusted.

### Use of CGM Technology in Hypoglycemia Prevention

With the advent of CGM and CGM-assisted pump therapy, there has been a promise of alarm-based prevention of hypoglycemia (109,110). To date, there have been a number of randomized controlled trials in adults with type 1 diabetes and studies in adults and children with type 1 diabetes using real-time CGM (see Section 7, “Diabetes Technology,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>). These studies had differing A1C at entry and differing primary end points and thus must be interpreted carefully. Real-time CGM studies can be divided into studies with elevated A1C with the primary end point of A1C reduction and studies with A1C near target with the primary end point of reduction in hypoglycemia (100,110–125). In people with type 1 and type 2 diabetes with A1C above target, CGM improved A1C between 0.3% and 0.6%. For studies targeting hypoglycemia, most studies demonstrated a significant reduction in time spent between 54 and 70 mg/dL. A recent report in people with type 1 diabetes over the age of 60 years revealed a small but statistically significant decrease in hypoglycemia (126). No study to date has reported a decrease in level 3 hypoglycemia. In a single study using intermittently scanned CGM, adults with type 1 diabetes with A1C near goal and impaired awareness of hypoglycemia demonstrated no change in A1C and decreased level 2 hypoglycemia (116). For people with type 2 diabetes, studies examining the impact of CGM on hypoglycemic events are limited; a recent meta-analysis does not reflect a significant impact on hypoglycemic events in type 2 diabetes (127), whereas improvements in A1C were observed in most studies (127–133). Overall, real-time CGM appears to be a useful tool for decreasing time spent in a hypoglycemic range in people with impaired awareness. For type 2 diabetes, other strategies to assist patients with insulin dosing can improve A1C with minimal hypoglycemia (134,135).

### INTERCURRENT ILLNESS

For further information on management of patients with hyperglycemia in the hospital, see Section 16, “Diabetes Care in the Hospital” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S016>).

Stressful events (e.g., illness, trauma, surgery, etc.) may worsen glycemic control and precipitate diabetic ketoacidosis or nonketotic hyperglycemic hyperosmolar state, life-threatening conditions that require immediate medical care to prevent complications and death. Any condition leading to deterioration in glycemic control necessitates more frequent monitoring of blood glucose; ketosis-prone patients also require urine or blood ketone monitoring. If accompanied by ketosis, vomiting, or alteration in the level of consciousness, marked hyperglycemia requires temporary adjustment of the treatment regimen and immediate interaction with the diabetes care team. The patient treated with noninsulin therapies or medical nutrition therapy alone may require insulin. Adequate fluid and caloric intake must be ensured. Infection or dehydration are more likely to necessitate hospitalization of individuals with diabetes versus those without diabetes.

A physician with expertise in diabetes management should treat the hospitalized patient. For further information on the management of diabetic ketoacidosis and the nonketotic hyperglycemic hyperosmolar state, please refer to the ADA consensus report “Hyperglycemic Crises in Adult Patients With Diabetes” (135).

### References

1. 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
2. Laiteerapong N, Ham SA, Gao Y, et al. The legacy effect in type 2 diabetes: impact of early glycemic control on future complications (the Diabetes & Aging Study). *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:416–426
3. Stratton IM, Adler AI, Neil HAW, et al. Association of glycaemia with macrovascular and microvascular complications of type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 35): prospective observational study. *BMJ* 2000;321:405–412
4. Little RR, Rohlfing CL; National Glycohemoglobin Standardization Program (NGSP) Steering Committee. Status of hemoglobin A1c measurement and goals for improvement: from

- chaos to order for improving diabetes care. *Clin Chem* 2011;57:205–214
5. Valenzano M, Cibrario Bertolotti I, Valenzano A, Grassi G. Time in range-A1c hemoglobin relationship in continuous glucose monitoring of type 1 diabetes: a real-world study. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2021;9:e001045
  6. Fabris C, Heinemann L, Beck R, Cobelli C, Kovatchev B. Estimation of hemoglobin A1c from continuous glucose monitoring data in individuals with type 1 diabetes: is time in range all we need? *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:501–508
  7. Ranjan AG, Rosenlund SV, Hansen TW, Rossing P, Andersen S, Nørgaard K. Improved time in range over 1 year is associated with reduced albuminuria in individuals with sensor-augmented insulin pump-treated type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2882–2885
  8. Beck RW, Bergenstal RM, Cheng P, et al. The relationships between time in range, hyperglycemia metrics, and HbA<sub>1c</sub>. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2019;13:614–626
  9. Soupal J, Petruželková L, Grunberger G, et al. Glycemic outcomes in adults with T1D are impacted more by continuous glucose monitoring than by insulin delivery method: 3 years of follow-up from the COMISAIR study. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:37–43
  10. Jovanović L, Savas H, Mehta M, Trujillo A, Pettitt DJ. Frequent monitoring of A1C during pregnancy as a treatment tool to guide therapy. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:53–54
  11. Beck RW, Connor CG, Mullen DM, Wesley DM, Bergenstal RM. The fallacy of average: how using HbA<sub>1c</sub> alone to assess glycemic control can be misleading. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:994–999
  12. Nathan DM, Kuenen J, Borg R, Zheng H, Schoenfeld D; A1c-Derived Average Glucose Study Group. Translating the A1C assay into estimated average glucose values. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:1473–1478
  13. Wei N, Zheng H, Nathan DM. Empirically establishing blood glucose targets to achieve HbA<sub>1c</sub> goals. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:1048–1051
  14. Selvin E. Are there clinical implications of racial differences in HbA<sub>1c</sub>? A difference, to be a difference, must make a difference. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1462–1467
  15. Bergenstal RM, Gal RL, Connor CG, et al.; T1D Exchange Racial Differences Study Group. Racial differences in the relationship of glucose concentrations and hemoglobin A1c levels. *Ann Intern Med* 2017;167:95–102
  16. Khosla L, Bhat S, Fullington LA, Horlyck-Romanovsky MF. HbA<sub>1c</sub> performance in African descent populations in the United States with normal glucose tolerance, prediabetes, or diabetes: a scoping review. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2021;18:E22
  17. Lacy ME, Wellenius GA, Sumner AE, et al. Association of sickle cell trait with hemoglobin A1c in African Americans. *JAMA* 2017;317:507–515
  18. Rohlfing C, Hanson S, Little RR. Measurement of hemoglobin A1c in patients with sickle cell trait. *JAMA* 2017;317:2237
  19. Wheeler E, Leong A, Liu C-T, et al.; EPIC-CVD Consortium; EPIC-InterAct Consortium; Lifelines Cohort Study. Impact of common genetic determinants of hemoglobin A1c on type 2 diabetes risk and diagnosis in ancestrally diverse populations: a transethnic genome-wide meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* 2017;14:e1002383
  20. Diabetes Research in Children Network (DirecNet) Study Group. Relationship of A1C to glucose concentrations in children with type 1 diabetes: assessments by high-frequency glucose determinations by sensors. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:381–385
  21. Buse JB, Kaufman FR, Linder B, Hirst K, El Ghormli L; HEALTHY Study Group. Diabetes screening with hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> versus fasting plasma glucose in a multiethnic middle-school cohort. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:429–435
  22. Kamps JL, Hempe JM, Chalew SA. Racial disparity in A1C independent of mean blood glucose in children with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1025–1027
  23. Advani A. Positioning time in range in diabetes management. *Diabetologia* 2020;63:242–252
  24. Avari P, Uduku C, George D, Herrero P, Reddy M, Oliver N. Differences for percentage times in glycemic range between continuous glucose monitoring and capillary blood glucose monitoring in adults with type 1 diabetes: analysis of the REPLACE-BG dataset. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:222–227
  25. Vigersky RA, McMahon C. The relationship of hemoglobin A1C to time-in-range in patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:81–85
  26. Kröger J, Reichel A, Siegmund T, Ziegler R. Clinical recommendations for the use of the ambulatory glucose profile in diabetes care. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2020;14:586–594
  27. Livingstone R, Boyle JG, Petrie JR. How tightly controlled do fluctuations in blood glucose levels need to be to reduce the risk of developing complications in people with type 1 diabetes? *Diabet Med* 2020;37:513–521
  28. Messer LH, Berget C, Vigers T, et al. Real world hybrid closed-loop discontinuation: predictors and perceptions of youth discontinuing the 670G system in the first 6 months. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2020;21:319–327
  29. Mayeda L, Katz R, Ahmad I, et al. Glucose time in range and peripheral neuropathy in type 2 diabetes mellitus and chronic kidney disease. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2020;8:e000991
  30. Yoo JH, Choi MS, Ahn J, et al. Association between continuous glucose monitoring-derived time in range, other core metrics, and albuminuria in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:768–776
  31. Lu J, Ma X, Shen Y, et al. Time in range is associated with carotid intima-media thickness in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2020;22:72–78
  32. 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
  33. Holt RIG, DeVries JH, Hess-Fischl A, et al. The management of type 1 diabetes in adults. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:2589–2625
  34. 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
  35. Tchero H, Kangambega P, Briatte C, Brunet-Houdard S, Retali G-R, Rusch E. Clinical effectiveness of telemedicine in diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis of 42 randomized controlled trials. *Telemed J E Health* 2019;25:569–583
  36. Salabelle C, Ly Sall K, Eroukhanoff J, et al. COVID-19 pandemic lockdown in young people with type 1 diabetes: positive results of an unprecedented challenge for patients through telemedicine and change in use of continuous glucose monitoring. *Prim Care Diabetes* 2021;15:884–886
  37. Prabhu Navis J, Leelarathna L, Mubita W, et al. Impact of COVID-19 lockdown on flash and real-time glucose sensor users with type 1 diabetes in England. *Acta Diabetol* 2021;58:231–237
  38. Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT)/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) Research Group; Lachin JM, White NH, Hainsworth DP, et al. Effect of intensive diabetes therapy on the progression of diabetic retinopathy in patients with type 1 diabetes: 18 years of follow-up in the DCCT/EDIC. *Diabetes* 2015;64:631–642
  39. Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/ Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications Research Group; Lachin JM, Genuth S, Cleary P, Davis MD, Nathan DM. Retinopathy and nephropathy in patients with type 1 diabetes four years after a trial of intensive therapy. *N Engl J Med* 2000;342:381–389
  40. Ohkubo Y, Kishikawa H, Araki E, et al. Intensive insulin therapy prevents the progression of diabetic microvascular complications in Japanese patients with non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus: a randomized prospective 6-year study. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 1995;28:103–117
  41. UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Effect of intensive blood-glucose control with metformin on complications in overweight patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 34). *Lancet* 1998;352:854–865
  42. UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). *Lancet* 1998;352:837–853
  43. Holman RR, Paul SK, Bethel MA, Matthews DR, Neil HAW. 10-year follow-up of intensive glucose control in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;359:1577–1589
  44. Lind M, Pivodic A, Svensson A-M, Ólafsdóttir AF, Wedel H, Ludvigsson J. HbA<sub>1c</sub> level as a risk factor for retinopathy and nephropathy in children and adults with type 1 diabetes: Swedish population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4894
  45. Adler AI, Stratton IM, Neil HAW, et al. Association of systolic blood pressure with macrovascular and microvascular complications of type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 36): prospective observational study. *BMJ* 2000;321:412–419



46. Duckworth W, Abraira C, Moritz T, et al.; VADT Investigators. Glucose control and vascular complications in veterans with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:129–139
47. Patel A, MacMahon S, Chalmers J, et al.; ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Intensive blood glucose control and vascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:2560–2572
48. Ismail-Beigi F, Craven T, Banerji MA, et al.; ACCORD trial group. Effect of intensive treatment of hyperglycaemia on microvascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes: an analysis of the ACCORD randomised trial. *Lancet* 2010;376:419–430
49. Buse JB, Bain SC, Mann JFE, et al.; LEADER Trial Investigators. Cardiovascular risk reduction with liraglutide: an exploratory mediation analysis of the LEADER trial. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1546–1552
50. Nathan DM, Cleary PA, Backlund J-YC, et al.; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) Study Research Group. Intensive diabetes treatment and cardiovascular disease in patients with type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353:2643–2653
51. Nathan DM, Zinman B, Cleary PA, et al.; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) Research Group. Modern-day clinical course of type 1 diabetes mellitus after 30 years' duration: the diabetes control and complications trial/epidemiology of diabetes interventions and complications and Pittsburgh epidemiology of diabetes complications experience (1983-2005). *Arch Intern Med* 2009;169:1307–1316
52. Orchard TJ, Nathan DM, Zinman B, et al.; Writing Group for the DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Association between 7 years of intensive treatment of type 1 diabetes and long-term mortality. *JAMA* 2015;313:45–53
53. Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration; Di Angelantonio E, Kaptoge S, Wormser D, et al. Association of cardiometabolic multimorbidity with mortality. *JAMA* 2015;314:52–60
54. Yeung RO, Zhang Y, Luk A, et al. Metabolic profiles and treatment gaps in young-onset type 2 diabetes in Asia (the JADE programme): a cross-sectional study of a prospective cohort. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2:935–943
55. Sattar N, Rawshani A, Franzén S, et al. Age at diagnosis of type 2 diabetes mellitus and associations with cardiovascular and mortality risks. *Circulation* 2019;139:2228–2237
56. Zabala A, Darsalia V, Holzmann MJ, et al. Risk of first stroke in people with type 2 diabetes and its relation to glycaemic control: a nationwide observational study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2020;22:182–190
57. Zoungas S, Woodward M, Li Q, et al.; ADVANCE Collaborative group. Impact of age, age at diagnosis and duration of diabetes on the risk of macrovascular and microvascular complications and death in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2014;57:2465–2474
58. Skyler JS, Bergenstal R, Bonow RO, et al.; American Diabetes Association; American College of Cardiology Foundation; American Heart Association. Intensive glycemic control and the prevention of cardiovascular events: implications of the ACCORD, ADVANCE, and VA diabetes trials. A position statement of the American Diabetes Association and a scientific statement of the American College of Cardiology Foundation and the American Heart Association. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:187–192
59. Gerstein HC, Miller ME, Byington RP, et al.; Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Study Group. Effects of intensive glucose lowering in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:2545–2559
60. Zoungas S, Chalmers J, Neal B, et al.; ADVANCE-ON Collaborative Group. Follow-up of blood-pressure lowering and glucose control in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2014;371:1392–1406
61. Hayward RA, Reaven PD, Wiitala WL, et al.; VADT Investigators. Follow-up of glycemic control and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:2197–2206
62. Turnbull FM, Abraira C, Anderson RJ, et al. Intensive glucose control and macrovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2009;52:2288–2298
63. Duckworth WC, Abraira C, Moritz TE, et al.; Investigators of the VADT. The duration of diabetes affects the response to intensive glucose control in type 2 subjects: the VA Diabetes Trial. *J Diabetes Complications* 2011;25:355–361
64. Lipska KJ, Ross JS, Miao Y, Shah ND, Lee SJ, Steinman MA. Potential overtreatment of diabetes mellitus in older adults with tight glycemic control. *JAMA Intern Med* 2015;175:356–362
65. Vijan S, Sussman JB, Yudkin JS, Hayward RA. Effect of patients' risks and preferences on health gains with plasma glucose level lowering in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *JAMA Intern Med* 2014;174:1227–1234
66. Lee AK, Warren B, Lee CJ, et al. The association of severe hypoglycemia with incident cardiovascular events and mortality in adults with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:104–111
67. Davies MJ, D'Alessio DA, Fradkin J, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2018. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2669–2701
68. Inzucchi SE, Bergenstal RM, Buse JB, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2015: a patient-centered approach: update to a position statement of the American Diabetes Association and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:140–149
69. American Diabetes Association. Postprandial blood glucose. *Diabetes Care* 2001;24:775–778
70. Raz I, Wilson PWF, Strojek K, et al. Effects of prandial versus fasting glycemia on cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes: the HEART2D trial. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:381–386
71. Albers JW, Herman WH, Pop-Busui R, et al.; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications Research Group. Effect of prior intensive insulin treatment during the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) on peripheral neuropathy in type 1 diabetes during the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) Study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1090–1096
72. Agiostratidou G, Anhalt H, Ball D, et al. Standardizing clinically meaningful outcome measures beyond HbA<sub>1c</sub> for type 1 diabetes: a consensus report of the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, the American Association of Diabetes Educators, the American Diabetes Association, the Endocrine Society, JDRF International, The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust, the Pediatric Endocrine Society, and the T1D Exchange. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1622–1630
73. Lamounier RN, Geloneze B, Leite SO, et al.; HAT Brazil study group. Hypoglycemia incidence and awareness among insulin-treated patients with diabetes: the HAT study in Brazil. *Diabetol Metab Syndr* 2018;10:83
74. Li P, Geng Z, Ladage VP, Wu J, Lorincz I, Doshi JA. Early hypoglycaemia and adherence after basal insulin initiation in a nationally representative sample of Medicare beneficiaries with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2019;21:2486–2495
75. Shivaprasad C, Aiswarya Y, Kejal S, et al. Comparison of CGM-derived measures of glycemic variability between pancreatogenic diabetes and type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2021;15:134–140
76. Hendrieckx C, Ivory N, Singh H, Frier BM, Speight J. Impact of severe hypoglycaemia on psychological outcomes in adults with Type 2 diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabet Med* 2019;36:1082–1091
77. Yang W, Ma J, Yuan G, et al. Determining the optimal fasting glucose target for patients with type 2 diabetes: Results of the multicentre, open-label, randomized-controlled FPG GOAL trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2019;21:1973–1977
78. Polonsky WH, Fortmann AL, Price D, Fisher L. "Hyperglycemia aversiveness": investigating an overlooked problem among adults with type 1 diabetes. *J Diabetes Complications* 2021;35:107925
79. Al Hayek A, Robert AA, Al Dawish M. Impact of the FreeStyle Libre flash glucose monitoring system on diabetes self-management practices and glycemic control among patients with type 2 diabetes in Saudi Arabia: A prospective study. *Diabetes Metab Syndr* 2021;15:557–563
80. Brennan MC, Albrecht MA, Brown JA, Leslie GD, Ntoumanis N. Self-management group education to reduce fear of hypoglycemia as a barrier to physical activity in adults living with type 1 diabetes: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Can J Diabetes* 2021;45:619–628
81. Mannucci E, Naletto L, Vaccaro G, et al. Efficacy and safety of glucose-lowering agents in patients with type 2 diabetes: a network meta-analysis of randomized, active comparator-controlled trials. *Nutr Metab Cardiovasc Dis* 2021;31:1027–1034
82. Amiel SA, Choudhary P, Jacob P, et al. Hypoglycaemia Awareness Restoration Programme for People with Type 1 Diabetes and Problematic Hypoglycaemia Persisting Despite Optimised Self-care (HARPOdoc): protocol for a group randomised controlled trial of a novel intervention addressing cognitions. *BMJ Open* 2019;9:e030356
83. Harris SM, Joyce H, Miller A, Connor C, Amiel SA, Mulnier H. The attitude of healthcare



- professionals plays an important role in the uptake of diabetes self-management education: analysis of the Barriers to Uptake of Type 1 Diabetes Education (BUD1E) study survey. *Diabet Med* 2018;35:1189–1196
84. Choudhary P, Amiel SA. Hypoglycaemia in type 1 diabetes: technological treatments, their limitations and the place of psychology. *Diabetologia* 2018;61:761–769
85. Hopkins D, Lawrence I, Mansell P, et al. Improved biomedical and psychological outcomes 1 year after structured education in flexible insulin therapy for people with type 1 diabetes: the U.K. DAFNE experience. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:1638–1642
86. Whitmer RA, Karter AJ, Yaffe K, Quesenberry CP Jr, Selby JV. Hypoglycemic episodes and risk of dementia in older patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *JAMA* 2009;301:1565–1572
87. Punthakee Z, Miller ME, Launer LJ, et al.; ACCORD Group of Investigators; ACCORD-MIND Investigators. Poor cognitive function and risk of severe hypoglycemia in type 2 diabetes: post hoc epidemiologic analysis of the ACCORD trial. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:787–793
88. Jacobson AM, Musen G, Ryan CM, et al.; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/ Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications Study Research Group. Long-term effect of diabetes and its treatment on cognitive function. *N Engl J Med* 2007;356:1842–1852
89. Karter AJ, Moffet HH, Liu JY, Lipska KJ. Surveillance of hypoglycemia-limitations of emergency department and hospital utilization data. *JAMA Intern Med* 2018;178:987–988
90. Lee AK, Lee CJ, Huang ES, Sharrett AR, Coresh J, Selvin E. Risk factors for severe hypoglycemia in black and white adults with diabetes: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) Study. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1661–1667
91. Karter AJ, Lipska KJ, O'Connor PJ, et al.; SUPREME-DM Study Group. High rates of severe hypoglycemia among African American patients with diabetes: the surveillance, prevention, and Management of Diabetes Mellitus (SUPREME-DM) network. *J Diabetes Complications* 2017;31:869–873
92. Zoungas S, Patel A, Chalmers J, et al.; ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Severe hypoglycemia and risks of vascular events and death. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:1410–1418
93. McCoy RG, Van Houten HK, Ziegenfuss JY, Shah ND, Wermers RA, Smith SA. Increased mortality of patients with diabetes reporting severe hypoglycemia. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:1897–1901
94. Cahn A, Zuker I, Eilenberg R, et al. Machine learning based study of longitudinal HbA1c trends and their association with all-cause mortality: analyses from a National Diabetes Registry. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev*. 7 July 2021 [Epub ahead of print]. DOI: 10.1002/dmrr.3485
95. DuBose SN, Weinstock RS, Beck RW, et al. Hypoglycemia in older adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2016;18:765–771
96. Seaquist ER, Anderson J, Childs B, et al. Hypoglycemia and diabetes: a report of a workgroup of the American Diabetes Association and the Endocrine Society. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1384–1395
97. Bergenstal RM, Klonoff DC, Garg SK, et al.; ASPIRE In-Home Study Group. Threshold-based insulin-pump interruption for reduction of hypoglycemia. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:224–232
98. Hering BJ, Clarke WR, Bridges ND, et al.; Clinical Islet Transplantation Consortium. Phase 3 trial of transplantation of human islets in type 1 diabetes complicated by severe hypoglycemia. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1230–1240
99. Harlan DM. Islet transplantation for hypoglycemia unawareness/severe hypoglycemia: caveat emptor. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1072–1074
100. McTavish L, Wiltshire E. Effective treatment of hypoglycemia in children with type 1 diabetes: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2011;12:381–387
101. McTavish L, Corley B, Weatherall M, Wiltshire E, Krebs JD. Weight-based carbohydrate treatment of hypoglycaemia in people with type 1 diabetes using insulin pump therapy: a randomized crossover clinical trial. *Diabet Med* 2018;35:339–346
102. Georgakopoulos K, Katsilambros N, Fragaki M, et al. Recovery from insulin-induced hypoglycemia after saccharose or glucose administration. *Clin Physiol Biochem* 1990;8:267–272
103. Layman DK, Clifton P, Gannon MC, Krauss RM, Nuttall FQ. Protein in optimal health: heart disease and type 2 diabetes. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2008;87:1571S–1575S
104. Stanton-Fay SH, Hamilton K, Chadwick PM, et al.; DAFNEplus study group. The DAFNEplus programme for sustained type 1 diabetes self management: intervention development using the Behaviour Change Wheel. *Diabet Med* 2021;38:e14548
105. Farrell CM, McCrimmon RJ. Clinical approaches to treat impaired awareness of hypoglycaemia. *Ther Adv Endocrinol Metab* 2021;12:20420188211000248
106. Cox DJ, Gonder-Frederick L, Julian DM, Clarke W. Long-term follow-up evaluation of blood glucose awareness training. *Diabetes Care* 1994;17:1–5
107. Cryer PE. Diverse causes of hypoglycemia-associated autonomic failure in diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:2272–2279
108. Mitchell BD, He X, Sturdy IM, Cagle AP, Settles JA. Glucagon prescription patterns in patients with either type 1 or 2 diabetes with newly prescribed insulin. *Endocr Pract* 2016;22:123–135
109. Hermanns N, Heinemann L, Freckmann G, Waldenmaier D, Ehrmann D. Impact of CGM on the management of hypoglycemia problems: overview and secondary analysis of the HypoDE study. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2019;13:636–644
110. 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
111. 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
112. 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
113. 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
114. 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
115. 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
116. 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
117. 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
118. 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
119. 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
120. 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
121. 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
122. 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
123. Beck RW, Hirsch IB, Laffel L, et al.; Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation Continuous Glucose Monitoring Study Group. The effect of continuous glucose monitoring in well-controlled type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1378–1383
124. 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
125. Ludvigsson J, Hanas R. Continuous subcutaneous glucose monitoring improved metabolic control in pediatric patients with type 1 diabetes: a controlled crossover study. *Pediatrics* 2003;111:933–938
126. 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
127. Dicembrini I, Mannucci E, Monami M, Pala L. Impact of technology on glycemic control in type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis of randomized trials on continuous glucose monitoring and continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2019;21:2619–2625
128. 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
129. 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
130. 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
131. 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
132. 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
133. 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
134. 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
135. Kitabchi AE, Umpierrez GE, Miles JM, Fisher JN. Hyperglycemic crises in adult patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1335–1343



## 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. Hohendorf 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/cfpd/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 IJ, 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, Zammit 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, Radovnická 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 RA, 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-Alvernia 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, Traylor 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. Luijckx JM, 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, Niemeier 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, Joksck 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, McLarney 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, Bläsigg 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. Ekhlaspour 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, Bonnemaïson-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, Ekhlaspour 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-Víbora 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, Raghinaru 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, Plasoza V, et al. Excellent glycemic control maintained by open-source hybrid closed-loop androidaps 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, Volkening 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



## 8. Obesity and Weight Management for the Prevention and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S113–S124 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S008>

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).

There is strong and consistent evidence that obesity management can delay the progression from prediabetes to type 2 diabetes (1–5) and is highly beneficial in the treatment of type 2 diabetes (6–17). In patients with type 2 diabetes and overweight or obesity, modest weight loss improves glycemic control and reduces the need for glucose-lowering medications (6–8), and more intensive dietary energy restriction can substantially reduce A1C and fasting glucose and promote sustained diabetes remission through at least 2 years (10,18–22). Metabolic surgery strongly improves glycemic control and often leads to remission of diabetes, improved quality of life, improved cardiovascular outcomes, and reduced mortality. The importance of addressing obesity is further heightened by numerous studies showing that both obesity and diabetes increase risk for more severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infections (23–26). The goal of this section is to provide evidence-based recommendations for obesity management, including behavioral, pharmacologic, and surgical interventions, in patients with type 2 diabetes. This section focuses on obesity management in adults; further discussion on obesity in older individuals and children can be found in Section 13, “Older Adults” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>), and Section 14, “Children and Adolescents” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>), respectively.

### ASSESSMENT

#### Recommendations

- 8.1** Use person-centered, nonjudgmental language that fosters collaboration between patients and providers, including people-first language (e.g., “person with obesity” rather than “obese person”). **E**

\*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. 8. Obesity and weight management for the prevention and treatment of type 2 diabetes: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S113–S124

© 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>.

**8.2** Measure height and weight and calculate BMI at annual visits or more frequently. Assess weight trajectory to inform treatment considerations. **E**

**8.3** Based on clinical considerations, such as the presence of comorbid heart failure or significant unexplained weight gain or loss, weight may need to be monitored and evaluated more frequently. **B** If deterioration of medical status is associated with significant weight gain or loss, inpatient evaluation should be considered, especially focused on associations between medication use, food intake, and glycemic status. **E**

**8.4** Accommodations should be made to provide privacy during weighing. **E**

A person-centered communication style that uses inclusive and nonjudgmental language and active listening, elicits patient preferences and beliefs, and assesses potential barriers to care should be used to optimize patient health outcomes and health-related quality of life. Use people-first language (e.g., “person with obesity” rather than “obese person”) to avoid defining patients by their condition (27–29).

Height and weight should be measured and used to calculate BMI annually or more frequently when appropriate (19). BMI, calculated as weight in kilograms divided by the square of height in meters ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ), is calculated automatically by most electronic medical records. Use BMI to document weight status (overweight: BMI 25–29.9  $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ; obesity class I: BMI 30–34.9  $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ; obesity class II: BMI 35–39.9  $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ; obesity class III: BMI  $\geq 40$   $\text{kg}/\text{m}^2$ ), but note that misclassification can occur, particularly in very muscular or frail individuals. In some groups, notably Asian and Asian American populations, the BMI cut points to define overweight and obesity are lower than in other populations due to differences in body composition and cardiometabolic risk (Table 8.1) (30,31). Clinical considerations, such as the presence of comorbid heart failure or unexplained weight change, may warrant more frequent

weight measurement and evaluation (32,33). If weighing is questioned or refused, the practitioner should be mindful of possible prior stigmatizing experiences and query for concerns, and the value of weight monitoring should be explained as a part of the medical evaluation process that helps to inform treatment decisions (34,35). Accommodations should be made to ensure privacy during weighing, particularly for those patients who report or exhibit a high level of weight-related distress or dissatisfaction. Scales should be situated in a private area or room. Weight should be measured and reported nonjudgmentally. Care should be taken to regard a patient’s weight (and weight changes) and BMI as sensitive health information. In addition to weight and BMI, assessment of weight distribution (including propensity for central/visceral adipose deposition) and weight gain pattern and trajectory can further inform risk stratification and treatment options (36). Providers should advise patients with overweight or obesity and those with increasing weight trajectories that, in general, higher BMIs increase the risk of diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and all-cause mortality, as well as other adverse health and quality of life outcomes. Providers should assess readiness to engage in behavioral changes for weight loss and jointly determine behavioral and weight loss goals and patient-appropriate intervention strategies (37). Strategies may include dietary changes, physical activity, behavioral counseling, pharmacologic therapy, medical devices, and metabolic surgery (Table 8.1). The latter three strategies may be considered for carefully selected patients as adjuncts to dietary changes, physical activity, and behavioral counseling.

## DIET, PHYSICAL ACTIVITY, AND BEHAVIORAL THERAPY

### Recommendations

**8.5** Diet, physical activity, and behavioral therapy to achieve and maintain  $\geq 5\%$  weight loss is recommended for most people with type 2 diabetes and overweight or obesity. Additional weight loss usually results in further improvements in control

of diabetes and cardiovascular risk. **B**

**8.6** Such interventions should include a high frequency of counseling ( $\geq 16$  sessions in 6 months) and focus on dietary changes, physical activity, and behavioral strategies to achieve a 500–750 kcal/day energy deficit. **A**

**8.7** An individual’s preferences, motivation, and life circumstances should be considered, along with medical status, when weight loss interventions are recommended. **C**

**8.8** Behavioral changes that create an energy deficit, regardless of macronutrient composition, will result in weight loss. Dietary recommendations should be individualized to the patient’s preferences and nutritional needs. **A**

**8.9** Evaluate systemic, structural, and socioeconomic factors that may impact dietary patterns and food choices, such as food insecurity and hunger, access to healthful food options, cultural circumstances, and social determinants of health. **C**

**8.10** For those who achieve weight loss goals, long-term ( $\geq 1$  year) weight maintenance programs are recommended when available. Such programs should, at minimum, provide monthly contact and support, recommend ongoing monitoring of body weight (weekly or more frequently) and other self-monitoring strategies, and encourage regular physical activity (200–300 min/week). **A**

**8.11** Short-term dietary intervention using structured, very-low-calorie diets (800–1,000 kcal/day) may be prescribed for carefully selected individuals by trained practitioners in medical settings with close monitoring. Long-term, comprehensive weight maintenance strategies and counseling should be integrated to maintain weight loss. **B**

**8.12** There is no clear evidence that dietary supplements are effective for weight loss. **A**



**Table 8.1—Treatment options for overweight and obesity in type 2 diabetes**

Treatment	BMI category (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )		
	25.0–26.9 (or 23.0–24.9*)	27.0–29.9 (or 25.0–27.4*)	≥30.0 (or ≥27.5*)
Diet, physical activity, and behavioral counseling	†	†	†
Pharmacotherapy		†	†
Metabolic surgery			†

\*Recommended cutpoints for Asian American individuals (expert opinion). †Treatment may be indicated for select motivated patients.

Among patients with both type 2 diabetes and overweight or obesity who have inadequate glycemic, blood pressure, and lipid control and/or other obesity-related medical conditions, modest and sustained weight loss improves glycemic control, blood pressure, and lipids and may reduce the need for medications to control these risk factors (6–8,38). Greater weight loss may produce even greater benefits (20,21). For a more detailed discussion of lifestyle management approaches and recommendations see Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-5005>). For a detailed discussion of nutrition interventions, please also refer to “Nutrition Therapy for Adults With Diabetes or Prediabetes: A Consensus Report” (39).

#### Look AHEAD Trial

Although the Action for Health in Diabetes (Look AHEAD) trial did not show that the intensive lifestyle intervention reduced cardiovascular events in adults with type 2 diabetes and overweight or obesity (40), it did confirm the feasibility of achieving and maintaining long-term weight loss in patients with type 2 diabetes. In the intensive lifestyle intervention group, mean weight loss was 4.7% at 8 years (41). Approximately 50% of intensive lifestyle intervention participants lost and maintained ≥5% of their initial body weight, and 27% lost and maintained ≥10% of their initial body weight at 8 years (41). Participants assigned to the intensive lifestyle group required fewer glucose-, blood pressure-, and lipid-lowering medications than those randomly assigned to standard care. Secondary analyses of the Look AHEAD trial and other large cardiovascular outcome studies document additional benefits of weight loss in patients with type 2 diabetes, including improvements in mobility,

physical and sexual function, and health-related quality of life (32). Moreover, several subgroups had improved cardiovascular outcomes, including those who achieved >10% weight loss (42) and those with moderately or poorly controlled diabetes (A1C >6.8%) at baseline (43).

#### Behavioral Interventions

Significant weight loss can be attained with lifestyle programs that achieve a 500–750 kcal/day energy deficit, which in most cases is approximately 1,200–1,500 kcal/day for women and 1,500–1,800 kcal/day for men, adjusted for the individual’s baseline body weight. Clinical benefits typically begin upon achieving 3–5% weight loss (19,44), and the benefits of weight loss are progressive; more intensive weight loss goals (>5%, >7%, >15%, etc.) may be pursued if needed to achieve further health improvements and/or if the patient is more motivated and more intensive goals can be feasibly and safely attained.

Dietary interventions may differ by macronutrient goals and food choices as long as they create the necessary energy deficit to promote weight loss (19,45–47). Use of meal replacement plans prescribed by trained practitioners, with close patient monitoring, can be beneficial. Within the intensive lifestyle intervention group of the Look AHEAD trial, for example, use of a partial meal replacement plan was associated with improvements in diet quality and weight loss (44). The diet choice should be based on the patient’s health status and preferences, including a determination of food availability and other cultural circumstances that could affect dietary patterns (48).

Intensive behavioral interventions should include ≥16 sessions during the initial 6 months and focus on dietary changes, physical activity, and behavioral

strategies to achieve an ~500–750 kcal/day energy deficit. Interventions should be provided by trained interventionists in either individual or group sessions (44). Assessing an individual’s motivation level, life circumstances, and willingness to implement behavioral changes to achieve weight loss should be considered along with medical status when weight loss interventions are recommended and initiated (37,49).

Patients with type 2 diabetes and overweight or obesity who have lost weight should be offered long-term (≥1 year) comprehensive weight loss maintenance programs that provide at least monthly contact with trained interventionists and focus on ongoing monitoring of body weight (weekly or more frequently) and/or other self-monitoring strategies such as tracking intake, steps, etc.; continued focus on dietary and behavioral changes; and participation in high levels of physical activity (200–300 min/week) (50). Some commercial and proprietary weight loss programs have shown promising weight loss results, though most lack evidence of effectiveness, many do not satisfy guideline recommendations, and some promote unscientific and possibly dangerous practices (51,52).

When provided by trained practitioners in medical settings with ongoing monitoring, short-term (generally up to 3 months) intensive dietary intervention may be prescribed for carefully selected patients, such as those requiring weight loss prior to surgery and those needing greater weight loss and glycemic improvements. When integrated with behavioral support and counseling, structured very-low-calorie diets, typically 800–1,000 kcal/day utilizing high-protein foods and meal replacement products, may increase the pace and/or magnitude of initial weight loss and glycemic improvements compared with standard behavioral interventions (20,21). As weight regain is common,

such interventions should include long-term, comprehensive weight maintenance strategies and counseling to maintain weight loss and behavioral changes (53,54).

Despite widespread marketing and exorbitant claims, there is no clear evidence that dietary supplements (such as herbs and botanicals, high-dose vitamins and minerals, amino acids, enzymes, antioxidants, etc.) are effective for obesity management or weight loss (55–57). Several large systematic reviews show that most trials evaluating dietary supplements for weight loss are of low quality and at high risk for bias. High-quality published studies show little or no weight loss benefits. In contrast, vitamin/mineral (e.g., iron, vitamin B12, vitamin D) supplementation may be indicated in cases of documented deficiency, and protein supplements may be indicated as adjuncts to medically supervised weight loss regimens.

Health disparities adversely affect people who have systematically experienced greater obstacles to health based on their race or ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, disability, or other factors. Overwhelming research shows that these disparities may significantly affect health outcomes, including increasing the risk for obesity, diabetes, and diabetes-related complications. Health care providers should evaluate systemic, structural, and socioeconomic factors that may impact food choices, access to healthful foods, and dietary patterns; behavioral patterns, such as neighborhood safety and availability of safe outdoor spaces for physical activity; environmental exposures; access to health care; social contexts; and, ultimately, diabetes risk and outcomes. For a detailed discussion of social determinants of health, refer to “Social Determinants of Health: A Scientific Review” (58).

## PHARMACOTHERAPY

### Recommendations

- 8.13** When choosing glucose-lowering medications for people with type 2 diabetes and overweight or obesity, consider the medication’s effect on weight. **B**
- 8.14** Whenever possible, minimize medications for comorbid conditions that are associated with weight gain. **E**

**8.15** Weight loss medications are effective as adjuncts to diet, physical activity, and behavioral counseling for selected people with type 2 diabetes and BMI  $\geq 27$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>. Potential benefits and risks must be considered. **A**

**8.16** If a patient’s response to weight loss medication is effective (typically defined as  $>5\%$  weight loss after 3 months’ use), further weight loss is likely with continued use. When early response is insufficient (typically  $<5\%$  weight loss after 3 months’ use) or if there are significant safety or tolerability issues, consider discontinuation of the medication and evaluate alternative medications or treatment approaches. **A**

### Glucose-Lowering Therapy

A meta-analysis of 227 randomized controlled trials of glucose-lowering treatments in type 2 diabetes found that A1C changes were not associated with baseline BMI, indicating that people with obesity can benefit from the same types of treatments for diabetes as normal-weight patients (59). As numerous effective medications are available, when considering medication regimens health care providers should consider each medication’s effect on weight. Agents associated with varying degrees of weight loss include metformin,  $\alpha$ -glucosidase inhibitors, sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors, glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists, and amylin mimetics. Dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitors are weight neutral. In contrast, insulin secretagogues, thiazolidinediones, and insulin are often associated with weight gain (see Section 9, “Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>).

### Concomitant Medications

Providers should carefully review the patient’s concomitant medications and, whenever possible, minimize or provide alternatives for medications that promote weight gain. Examples of medications associated with weight gain include antipsychotics (e.g., clozapine, olanzapine, risperidone, etc.), some antidepressants

(e.g., tricyclic antidepressants, some selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, and monoamine oxidase inhibitors), glucocorticoids, injectable progestins, some anticonvulsants (e.g., gabapentin, pregabalin), and possibly sedating antihistamines and anticholinergics (60).

### Approved Weight Loss Medications

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved medications for both short-term and long-term weight management as adjuncts to diet, exercise, and behavioral therapy. Nearly all FDA-approved medications for weight loss have been shown to improve glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes and delay progression to type 2 diabetes in patients at risk (22). Phentermine and other older adrenergic agents are indicated for short-term ( $\leq 12$  weeks) treatment (61). Five weight loss medications are FDA approved for long-term use ( $>12$  weeks) in adult patients with BMI  $\geq 27$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> with one or more obesity-associated comorbid condition (e.g., type 2 diabetes, hypertension, and/or dyslipidemia) who are motivated to lose weight (22). Medications approved by the FDA for the treatment of obesity, summarized in **Table 8.2**, include orlistat, phentermine/topiramate ER, naltrexone/bupropion ER, liraglutide 3 mg, and semaglutide 2.4 mg. (In addition, setmelanotide, a melanocortin-4 receptor agonist, is approved for use in cases of rare genetic mutations resulting in severe hyperphagia and extreme obesity, such as leptin receptor deficiency and proopiomelanocortin deficiency.) In principle, medications help improve adherence to dietary recommendations, in most cases by modulating appetite or satiety. Providers should be knowledgeable about the product label and balance the potential benefits of successful weight loss against the potential risks of the medication for each patient. These medications are contraindicated in women who are pregnant or actively trying to conceive and not recommended for use in women who are nursing. Women of reproductive potential should receive counseling regarding the use of reliable methods of contraception. Of note, while weight loss medications are often used in patients with type 1 diabetes, clinical trial data in this population are limited.

**Table 8.2—Medications approved by the FDA for the treatment of obesity in adults**

Medication name	Typical adult maintenance dose	Average wholesale price (30-day supply) (130)	National Average Drug Acquisition Cost (30-day supply) (131)	1-Year (52- or 56-week) mean weight loss (% loss from baseline)		Common side effects (132–136)	Possible safety concerns/considerations (132–136)
				Treatment arms	Weight loss (% loss from baseline)		
<b>Short-term treatment (≤12 weeks)</b>							
<b>Sympathomimetic amine anorectic</b>							
<u>Phentermine (137)</u>	8–37.5 mg q.d.*	\$5–\$44 (37.5 mg dose)	\$3 (37.5 mg dose)	15 mg q.d.† 7.5 mg q.d.† PBO	6.1 5.5 1.2	Dry mouth, insomnia, dizziness, irritability, increased blood pressure, elevated heart rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contraindicated for use in combination with monoamine oxidase inhibitors</li> </ul>
<b>Long-term treatment (&gt;12 weeks)</b>							
<b>Lipase inhibitor</b>							
<u>Orlistat (3)</u>	60 mg t.i.d. (OTC) 120 mg t.i.d. (Rx)	\$41–\$82 \$823	\$41 \$659	120 mg t.i.d.‡ PBO	9.6 5.6	Abdominal pain, flatulence, fecal urgency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential malabsorption of fat-soluble vitamins (A, D, E, K) and of certain medications (e.g., cyclosporine, thyroid hormone, anticonvulsants, etc.)</li> <li>Rare cases of severe liver injury reported</li> <li>Cholelithiasis</li> <li>Nephrolithiasis</li> </ul>
<b>Sympathomimetic amine anorectic/antiepileptic combination</b>							
<u>Phentermine/topiramate ER (138)</u>	7.5 mg/46 mg q.d.§ 15 mg/92 mg q.d.   7.5 mg/46 mg q.d.   PBO	\$223 (7.5 mg/46 mg dose) \$179 (7.5 mg/46 mg dose)		15 mg/92 mg q.d.   7.5 mg/46 mg q.d.   PBO	9.8 7.8 1.2	Constipation, paresthesia, insomnia, nasopharyngitis, xerostomia, increased blood pressure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contraindicated for use in combination with monoamine oxidase inhibitors</li> <li>Birth defects</li> <li>Cognitive impairment</li> <li>Acute angle-closure glaucoma</li> </ul>
<b>Opioid antagonist/antidepressant combination</b>							
<u>Naltrexone/bupropion ER (15)</u>	16 mg/180 mg b.i.d.	\$364	\$291	16 mg/180 mg b.i.d. PBO	5.0 1.8	Constipation, nausea, headache, xerostomia, insomnia, elevated heart rate and blood pressure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contraindicated in patients with uncontrolled hypertension and/or seizure disorders</li> <li>Contraindicated for use with chronic opioid therapy</li> <li>Acute angle-closure glaucoma</li> </ul> <p><b>Black box warning:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk of suicidal behavior/ideation in people younger than 24 years old who have depression</li> </ul>

Continued on p. S118

**Table 8.2—Continued**

Medication name	Typical adult maintenance dose	Average wholesale price (30-day supply) (130)	National Average Drug Acquisition Cost (30-day supply) (131)	1-Year (52- or 56-week) mean weight loss (% loss from baseline)		Common side effects (132–136)	Possible safety concerns/considerations (132–136)
				Treatment arms	Weight loss (% loss from baseline)		
<b>Glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist</b>							
Liraglutide (16)**	3 mg q.d.	\$1,619	\$1,296	3.0 mg q.d. 1.8 mg q.d. PBO	6.0 4.7 2.0	Gastrointestinal side effects (nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, esophageal reflux), injection site reactions, elevated heart rate, hypoglycemia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pancreatitis has been reported in clinical trials but causality has not been established. Discontinue if pancreatitis is suspected.</li> <li>Use caution in patients with kidney disease when initiating or increasing dose due to potential risk of acute kidney injury</li> </ul> <p><b>Black box warning:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk of thyroid C-cell tumors in rodents; human relevance not determined</li> </ul>
Semaglutide (139)	2.4 mg once weekly	\$1,619	\$1,302	2.4 mg weekly PBO	9.6 3.4	Gastrointestinal side effects (nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, esophageal reflux), injection site reactions, elevated heart rate, hypoglycemia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pancreatitis has been reported in clinical trials, but causality has not been established. Discontinue if pancreatitis is suspected.</li> </ul> <p><b>Black box warning:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk of thyroid C-cell tumors in rodents; human relevance not determined</li> </ul>

All medications are contraindicated in women who are or may become pregnant. Women of reproductive potential must be counseled regarding the use of reliable methods of contraception. Select safety and side effect information is provided; for a comprehensive discussion of safety considerations, please refer to the prescribing information for each agent. b.i.d., twice daily; ER, extended release; N/A, not applicable; OTC, over the counter; PBO, placebo; q.d., daily; Rx, prescription; t.i.d., three times daily. \*Use lowest effective dose; maximum appropriate dose is 37.5 mg. †Duration of treatment was 28 weeks in a general adult population with obesity. \*\*Agent has demonstrated cardiovascular safety in a dedicated cardiovascular outcome trial (140). ‡Enrolled participants had normal (79%) or impaired (21%) glucose tolerance. §Maximum dose, depending on response, is 15 mg/92 mg q.d. ||Approximately 68% of enrolled participants had type 2 diabetes or impaired glucose tolerance.



### Assessing Efficacy and Safety

Upon initiating weight loss medication, assess efficacy and safety at least monthly for the first 3 months and at least quarterly thereafter. Modeling from published clinical trials consistently shows that early responders have improved long-term outcomes (62–64). Unless clinical circumstances (such as poor tolerability) or other considerations (such as financial expense or patient preference) suggest otherwise, those who achieve sufficient early weight loss upon starting a chronic weight loss medication (typically defined as >5% weight loss after 3 months' use) should continue the medication. When early use appears ineffective (typically <5% weight loss after 3 months' use), it is unlikely that continued use will improve weight outcomes; as such, it should be recommended to discontinue the medication and consider other treatment options.

### MEDICAL DEVICES FOR WEIGHT LOSS

While gastric banding devices have fallen out of favor in recent years, since 2015 several minimally invasive medical devices have been approved by the FDA for short-term weight loss, including implanted gastric balloons, a vagus nerve stimulator, and gastric aspiration therapy (65). Given the current high cost, limited insurance coverage, and paucity of data in people with diabetes, medical devices for weight loss are rarely utilized at this time, and it remains to be seen how they may be used in the future (66).

Recently, an oral hydrogel (Plenity) has been approved for long-term use in those with BMI >25 kg/m<sup>2</sup> to simulate the space-occupying effect of implantable gastric balloons. Taken with water 30 min before meals, the hydrogel expands to fill a portion of the stomach volume to help decrease food intake during meals. Though average weight loss is relatively small (2–3% greater than placebo), the subgroup of participants with prediabetes or diabetes at baseline had improved weight loss outcomes (8.1% weight loss) compared with the overall treatment (6.4% weight loss) and placebo (4.4% weight loss) groups (67).

### METABOLIC SURGERY

#### Recommendations

- 8.17** Metabolic surgery should be a recommended option to treat type 2 diabetes in screened surgical candidates with BMI  $\geq 40$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> (BMI  $\geq 37.5$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> in Asian Americans) and in adults with BMI 35.0–39.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (32.5–37.4 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in Asian Americans) who do not achieve durable weight loss and improvement in comorbidities (including hyperglycemia) with nonsurgical methods. **A**
- 8.18** Metabolic surgery may be considered as an option to treat type 2 diabetes in adults with BMI 30.0–34.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (27.5–32.4 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in Asian Americans) who do not achieve durable weight loss and improvement in comorbidities (including hyperglycemia) with nonsurgical methods. **A**
- 8.19** Metabolic surgery should be performed in high-volume centers with multidisciplinary teams knowledgeable about and experienced in the management of obesity, diabetes, and gastrointestinal surgery. **E**
- 8.20** People being considered for metabolic surgery should be evaluated for comorbid psychological conditions and social and situational circumstances that have the potential to interfere with surgery outcomes. **B**
- 8.21** People who undergo metabolic surgery should receive long-term medical and behavioral support and routine monitoring of micronutrient, nutritional, and metabolic status. **B**
- 8.22** If postbariatric hypoglycemia is suspected, clinical evaluation should exclude other potential disorders contributing to hypoglycemia, and management includes education, medical nutrition therapy with a dietitian experienced in postbariatric hypoglycemia, and medication treatment, as needed. **A** Continuous glucose monitoring should be considered as an important adjunct to improve safety by


alerting patients to hypoglycemia, especially for those with severe hypoglycemia or hypoglycemia unawareness. **E**

- 8.23** People who undergo metabolic surgery should routinely be evaluated to assess the need for ongoing mental health services to help with the adjustment to medical and psychosocial changes after surgery. **C**

Surgical procedures for obesity treatment—often referred to interchangeably as bariatric surgery, weight loss surgery, metabolic surgery, or metabolic/bariatric surgery—can promote significant and durable weight loss and improve type 2 diabetes. Given the magnitude and rapidity of improvement of hyperglycemia and glucose homeostasis, these procedures have been suggested as treatments for type 2 diabetes even in the absence of severe obesity and will be referred to here as “metabolic surgery.”

A substantial body of evidence, including data from numerous large cohort studies and randomized controlled (non-blinded) clinical trials, demonstrates that metabolic surgery achieves superior glycemic control and reduction of cardiovascular risk in patients with type 2 diabetes and obesity compared with nonsurgical intervention (17). In addition to improving glycemia, metabolic surgery reduces the incidence of microvascular disease (68), improves quality of life (69–71), decreases cancer risk, and improves cardiovascular disease risk factors and long-term cardiovascular events (72–83). Cohort studies that match surgical and nonsurgical subjects strongly suggest that metabolic surgery reduces all-cause mortality (84,85).

The overwhelming majority of procedures in the U.S. are vertical sleeve gastrectomy (VSG) and Roux-en-Y gastric bypass (RYGB). Both procedures result in an anatomically smaller stomach pouch and often robust changes in enteroendocrine hormones. In VSG, ~80% of the stomach is removed, leaving behind a long, thin sleeve-shaped pouch. RYGB creates a much smaller stomach pouch (roughly the size of a “walnut”), which is then attached to the



**Figure 8.1**—A: Vertical sleeve gastrectomy. B: Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. Images reprinted from National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (141).

distal small intestine, thereby bypassing the duodenum and jejunum. (Fig. 8.1.)

Several organizations recommend lowering the BMI criteria for metabolic surgery to 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (27.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup> for Asian Americans) for people with type 2 diabetes who have not achieved sufficient weight loss and improved comorbidities (including hyperglycemia) with reasonable nonsurgical treatments (86–93). Studies have documented diabetes remission after 1–5 years in 30–63% of patients with RYGB (17,94). Most notably, the Surgical Treatment and Medications Potentially Eradicate Diabetes Efficiently (STAMPEDE) trial, which randomized 150 participants with uncontrolled diabetes to receive either metabolic surgery or medical treatment, found that 29% of those treated with RYGB and 23% treated with VSG achieved A1C of 6.0% or lower after 5 years (95). Available data suggest an erosion of diabetes remission over time (96); at least 35–50% of patients who initially achieve remission of diabetes eventually experience recurrence. Still, the median disease-free period among such individuals following RYGB is 8.3 years (97,98), and the majority of those who undergo surgery maintain substantial improvement of glycemic control from baseline for at least 5–15 years (69,73,74,95,98–101).

Exceedingly few presurgical predictors of success have been identified, but younger age, shorter duration of diabetes (e.g., <8 years) (70), and lesser severity of diabetes (better glycemic control, nonuse of insulin) are associated with higher rates of

diabetes remission (70,73,100,102). Greater baseline visceral fat area may also predict improved postoperative outcomes, especially among Asian American patients with type 2 diabetes, who typically have greater visceral fat compared with Caucasians (103).

Although surgery has been shown to improve the metabolic profiles of patients with type 1 diabetes, larger and longer-term studies are needed to determine the role of metabolic surgery in such patients (104).

Whereas metabolic surgery has greater initial costs than nonsurgical obesity treatments, retrospective analyses and modeling studies suggest that surgery may be cost-effective or even cost-saving for individuals with type 2 diabetes. However, these results are largely dependent on assumptions about the long-term effectiveness and safety of the procedures (105,106).

#### Potential Risks and Complications

The safety of metabolic surgery has improved significantly with continued refinement of minimally invasive (laparoscopic) approaches, enhanced training and credentialing, and involvement of multidisciplinary teams. Perioperative mortality rates are typically 0.1–0.5%, similar to those of common abdominal procedures such as cholecystectomy or hysterectomy (107–111). Major complications occur in 2–6% of those undergoing metabolic surgery, which compares favorably with the rates for other commonly performed elective operations (111). Postsurgical recovery times and morbidity have also dramatically declined. Minor complications and need

for operative reintervention occur in up to 15% (107–116). Empirical data suggest that proficiency of the operating surgeon and surgical team is an important factor for determining mortality, complications, reoperations, and readmissions (117). Accordingly, metabolic surgery should be performed in high-volume centers with multidisciplinary teams experienced in the management of diabetes, obesity, and gastrointestinal surgery.

Beyond the perioperative period, longer-term risks include vitamin and mineral deficiencies, anemia, osteoporosis, dumping syndrome, and severe hypoglycemia (118). Nutritional and micronutrient deficiencies and related complications occur with variable frequency depending on the type of procedure and require routine monitoring of micronutrient and nutritional status and lifelong vitamin/nutritional supplementation (118). Dumping syndrome usually occurs shortly (10–30 min) after a meal and may present with diarrhea, nausea, vomiting, palpitations, and fatigue; hypoglycemia is usually not present at the time of symptoms but in some cases may develop several hours later.

Postbariatric hypoglycemia (PBH) can occur with RYGB, VSG, and other gastrointestinal procedures and may severely impact quality of life (119–121). PBH is driven in part by altered gastric emptying of ingested nutrients, leading to rapid intestinal glucose absorption and excessive postprandial secretion of glucagon-like peptide 1 and other gastrointestinal peptides. As a result, overstimulation of insulin release and a sharp drop in plasma glucose occurs, most commonly 1–3 h after a high-carbohydrate meal. Symptoms range from sweating, tremor, tachycardia, and increased hunger to impaired cognition, loss of consciousness, and seizures. In contrast to dumping syndrome, which often occurs soon after surgery and improves over time, PBH typically presents >1 year postsurgery. Diagnosis is primarily made by a thorough history; detailed records of food intake, physical activity, and symptom patterns; and exclusion of other potential causes (e.g., malnutrition, side effects of medications or supplements, dumping syndrome, insulinoma). Initial management includes patient education to facilitate reduced intake of rapidly digested carbohydrates while ensuring adequate intake of protein and healthy

fats and vitamin/nutrient supplements. When available, patients should be offered medical nutrition therapy with a dietitian experienced in PBH and use of continuous glucose monitoring (ideally real-time continuous glucose monitoring, which can detect dropping glucose levels before severe hypoglycemia occurs), especially for those with hypoglycemia unawareness. Medication treatment, if needed, is primarily aimed at slowing carbohydrate absorption (e.g., acarbose) or reducing glucagon-like peptide 1 and insulin secretion (e.g., diazoxide, octreotide) (122).

People who undergo metabolic surgery may also be at increased risk for substance abuse, worsening or new-onset depression and/or anxiety disorders, and suicidal ideation (118,123–128). Candidates for metabolic surgery should be assessed by a mental health professional with expertise in obesity management prior to consideration for surgery (129). Surgery should be postponed in patients with alcohol or substance use disorders, severe depression, suicidal ideation, or other significant mental health conditions until these conditions have been sufficiently addressed. Individuals with preoperative or new-onset psychopathology should be assessed regularly following surgery to optimize mental health and postsurgical outcomes.

## References

- Knowler WC, Barrett-Connor E, Fowler SE, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Reduction in the incidence of type 2 diabetes with lifestyle intervention or metformin. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:393–403
- Garvey WT, Ryan DH, Henry R, et al. Prevention of type 2 diabetes in subjects with prediabetes and metabolic syndrome treated with phentermine and topiramate extended release. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:912–921
- Torgerson JS, Hauptman J, Boldrin MN, Sjöström L. XENical in the prevention of diabetes in obese subjects (XENDOS) study: a randomized study of orlistat as an adjunct to lifestyle changes for the prevention of type 2 diabetes in obese patients. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:155–161
- le Roux CW, Astrup A, Fujioka K, et al.; SCALE Obesity Prediabetes NN8022-1839 Study Group. 3 years of liraglutide versus placebo for type 2 diabetes risk reduction and weight management in individuals with prediabetes: a randomised, double-blind trial. *Lancet* 2017;389:1399–1409
- Booth H, Khan O, Prevost T, et al. Incidence of type 2 diabetes after bariatric surgery: population-based matched cohort study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2:963–968
- UKPDS Group. UK Prospective Diabetes Study 7: response of fasting plasma glucose to diet therapy in newly presenting type II diabetic patients. *Metabolism* 1990;39:905–912
- Goldstein DJ. Beneficial health effects of modest weight loss. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord* 1992;16:397–415
- Pastors JG, Warshaw H, Daly A, Franz M, Kulkarni K. The evidence for the effectiveness of medical nutrition therapy in diabetes management. *Diabetes Care* 2002;25:608–613
- Lim EL, Hollingsworth KG, Aribisala BS, Chen MJ, Mathers JC, Taylor R. Reversal of type 2 diabetes: normalisation of beta cell function in association with decreased pancreas and liver triacylglycerol. *Diabetologia* 2011;54:2506–2514
- Jackness C, Karmally W, Febres G, et al. Very low-calorie diet mimics the early beneficial effect of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass on insulin sensitivity and  $\beta$ -cell function in type 2 diabetic patients. *Diabetes* 2013;62:3027–3032
- Rothberg AE, McEwen LN, Kraftson AT, Fowler CE, Herman WH. Very-low-energy diet for type 2 diabetes: an underutilized therapy? *J Diabetes Complications* 2014;28:506–510
- Hollander PA, Elbein SC, Hirsch IB, et al. Role of orlistat in the treatment of obese patients with type 2 diabetes. A 1-year randomized double-blind study. *Diabetes Care* 1998;21:1288–1294
- Garvey WT, Ryan DH, Bohannon NJV, et al. Weight-loss therapy in type 2 diabetes: effects of phentermine and topiramate extended release. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:3309–3316
- O'Neil PM, Smith SR, Weissman NJ, et al. Randomized placebo-controlled clinical trial of lorcaserin for weight loss in type 2 diabetes mellitus: the BLOOM-DM study. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2012;20:1426–1436
- Hollander P, Gupta AK, Plodkowski R, et al.; COR-Diabetes Study Group. Effects of naltrexone sustained-release/bupropion sustained-release combination therapy on body weight and glycemic parameters in overweight and obese patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:4022–4029
- Davies MJ, Bergenstal R, Bode B, et al.; NN8022-1922 Study Group. Efficacy of liraglutide for weight loss among patients with type 2 diabetes: the SCALE diabetes randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2015;314:687–699
- Rubino F, Nathan DM, Eckel RH, et al.; Delegates of the 2nd Diabetes Surgery Summit. Metabolic surgery in the treatment algorithm for type 2 diabetes: a joint statement by international diabetes organizations. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:861–877
- Steven S, Hollingsworth KG, Al-Mrabeh A, et al. Very low-calorie diet and 6 months of weight stability in type 2 diabetes: pathophysiological changes in responders and nonresponders. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:808–815
- Jensen MD, Ryan DH, Apovian CM, et al.; American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines; Obesity Society. 2013 AHA/ACC/TOS guideline for the management of overweight and obesity in adults: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and The Obesity Society. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2014;63(25 Pt B):2985–3023
- Lean ME, Leslie WS, Barnes AC, et al. Primary care-led weight management for remission of type 2 diabetes (DIRECT): an open-label, cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet* 2018;391:541–551
- Lean MEJ, Leslie WS, Barnes AC, et al. Durability of a primary care-led weight-management intervention for remission of type 2 diabetes: 2-year results of the DIRECT open-label, cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2019;7:344–355
- Kahan S, Fujioka K. Obesity pharmacotherapy in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Spectr* 2017;30:250–257
- Cao P, Song Y, Zhuang Z, et al. Obesity and COVID-19 in adult patients with diabetes. *Diabetes* 2021;70:1061–1069
- Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al.; the Northwell COVID-19 Research Consortium. Presenting characteristics, comorbidities, and outcomes among 5700 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 in the New York City area. *JAMA* 2020;323:2052–2059
- Chu Y, Yang J, Shi J, Zhang P, Wang X. Obesity is associated with increased severity of disease in COVID-19 pneumonia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Med Res* 2020;25:64
- Popkin BM, Du S, Green WD, et al. Individuals with obesity and COVID-19: a global perspective on the epidemiology and biological relationships. *Obes Rev* 2020;21:e13128
- AMA Manual of Style Committee. *AMA Manual of Style: A Guide for Authors and Editors*. 11th ed. New York, Oxford University Press, 2020
- American Medical Association. *Person-First Language for Obesity H-440.821*. Accessed 12 October 2021. Available from <https://policy-search.ama-assn.org/policyfinder/detail/obesity?uri=%2FAMADoc%2FHOD.xml#H-440.821.xml>
- Rubino F, Puhl RM, Cummings DE, et al. Joint international consensus statement for ending stigma of obesity. *Nat Med* 2020;26:485–497
- WHO Expert Consultation. *Appropriate body-mass index for Asian populations and its implications for policy and intervention strategies*. *Lancet* 2004;363:157–163
- Araneta MRG, Kanaya A, Hsu WC, et al. Optimum BMI cutpoints to screen Asian Americans for type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:814–820
- Yancy CW, Jessup M, Bozkurt B, et al.; American College of Cardiology Foundation; American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of heart failure: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;62:e147–e239
- Bosch X, Monclús E, Escoda O, et al. Unintentional weight loss: Clinical characteristics and outcomes in a prospective cohort of 2677 patients. *PLoS One* 2017;12:e0175125
- Wilding JPH. The importance of weight management in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Int J Clin Pract* 2014;68:682–691
- Van Gaal L, Scheen A. Weight management in type 2 diabetes: current and emerging approaches to treatment. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1161–1172
- Kushner RF, Batsis JA, Butsch WS, et al. Weight history in clinical practice: the state of the science and future directions. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2020;28:9–17



37. Warren J, Smalley B, Barefoot N. Higher motivation for weight loss in African American than Caucasian rural patients with hypertension and/or diabetes. *Ethn Dis* 2016;26:77–84
38. Rothberg AE, McEwen LN, Kraftson AT, et al. Impact of weight loss on waist circumference and the components of the metabolic syndrome. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2017;5:e000341
39. Evert AB, Dennison M, Gardner CD, et al. Nutrition therapy for adults with diabetes or prediabetes: a consensus report. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:731–754
40. Wing RR, Bolin P, Brancati FL, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Cardiovascular effects of intensive lifestyle intervention in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:145–154
41. Look AHEAD Research Group. Eight-year weight losses with an intensive lifestyle intervention: the Look AHEAD study. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2014;22:5–13
42. Gregg EW, Jakicic JM, Blackburn G, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Association of the magnitude of weight loss and changes in physical fitness with long-term cardiovascular disease outcomes in overweight or obese people with type 2 diabetes: a post-hoc analysis of the Look AHEAD randomised clinical trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2016;4:913–921
43. Baum A, Scarpa J, Bruzelius E, Tamler R, Basu S, Faghmous J. Targeting weight loss interventions to reduce cardiovascular complications of type 2 diabetes: a machine learning-based post-hoc analysis of heterogeneous treatment effects in the Look AHEAD trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;5:808–815
44. Franz MJ, Boucher JL, Rutten-Ramos S, VanWormer JJ. Lifestyle weight-loss intervention outcomes in overweight and obese adults with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2015;115:1447–1463
45. Sacks FM, Bray GA, Carey VJ, et al. Comparison of weight-loss diets with different compositions of fat, protein, and carbohydrates. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:859–873
46. de Souza RJ, Bray GA, Carey VJ, et al. Effects of 4 weight-loss diets differing in fat, protein, and carbohydrate on fat mass, lean mass, visceral adipose tissue, and hepatic fat: results from the POUNDS LOST trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2012;95:614–625
47. Johnston BC, Kanters S, Bandayrel K, et al. Comparison of weight loss among named diet programs in overweight and obese adults: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2014;312:923–933
48. Leung CW, Epel ES, Ritchie LD, Crawford PB, Laraia BA. Food insecurity is inversely associated with diet quality of lower-income adults. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2014;114:1943–53.e2
49. Kahan S, Manson JE. Obesity treatment, beyond the guidelines: practical suggestions for clinical practice. *JAMA* 2019;321:1349–1350
50. Donnelly JE, Blair SN, Jakicic JM, Manore MM, Rankin JW; American College of Sports Medicine. American College of Sports Medicine Position Stand. Appropriate physical activity intervention strategies for weight loss and prevention of weight regain for adults. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2009;41:459–471
51. Gudzone KA, Doshi RS, Mehta AK, et al. Efficacy of commercial weight-loss programs: an updated systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;162:501–512
52. Bloom B, Mehta AK, Clark JM, Gudzone KA. Guideline-concordant weight-loss programs in an urban area are uncommon and difficult to identify through the internet. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2016;24:583–588
53. Tsai AG, Wadden TA. The evolution of very-low-calorie diets: an update and meta-analysis. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2006;14:1283–1293
54. Johansson K, Neovius M, Hemmingsson E. Effects of anti-obesity drugs, diet, and exercise on weight-loss maintenance after a very-low-calorie diet or low-calorie diet: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2014;99:14–23
55. Batsis JA, Apolzan JW, Bagley PJ, et al. A systematic review of dietary supplements and alternative therapies for weight loss. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2021;29:1102–1113
56. Bessell E, Maunder A, Lauche R, Adams J, Sainsbury A, Fuller NR. Efficacy of dietary supplements containing isolated organic compounds for weight loss: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised placebo-controlled trials. *Int J Obes* 2021;45:1631–1643
57. Maunder A, Bessell E, Lauche R, Adams J, Sainsbury A, Fuller NR. Effectiveness of herbal medicines for weight loss: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2020;22:891–903
58. Hill-Briggs F, Adler NE, Berkowitz SA, et al. Social determinants of health and diabetes: a scientific review. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:258–279
59. Cai X, Yang W, Gao X, Zhou L, Han X, Ji L. Baseline body mass index and the efficacy of hypoglycemic treatment in type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2016;11:e0166625
60. Domecq JP, Prutsky G, Leppin A, et al. Clinical review: drugs commonly associated with weight change: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2015;100:363–370
61. Drugs.com. Phentermine [FDA prescribing information]. Accessed 12 October 2021. Available from <https://www.drugs.com/pro/phentermine.html>
62. Apovian CM, Aronne LJ, Bessesen DH, et al.; Endocrine Society. Pharmacological management of obesity: an Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2015;100:342–362
63. Fujioka K, O'Neil PM, Davies M, et al. Early weight loss with liraglutide 3.0 mg predicts 1-year weight loss and is associated with improvements in clinical markers. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2016;24:2278–2288
64. Fujioka K, Plodkowski R, O'Neil PM, Gilder K, Walsh B, Greenway FL. The relationship between early weight loss and weight loss at 1 year with naltrexone ER/bupropion ER combination therapy. *Int J Obes* 2016;40:1369–1375
65. Sullivan S. Endoscopic medical devices for primary obesity treatment in patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Spectr* 2017;30:258–264
66. Kahan S, Saunders KH, Kaplan LM. Combining obesity pharmacotherapy with endoscopic bariatric and metabolic therapies. *Techniques nnov Gastrointest Endosc* 2020;22:154–158
67. Greenway FL, Aronne LJ, Raben A, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of Gelesis100: a novel nonsystemic oral hydrogel for weight loss. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2019;27:205–216
68. O'Brien R, Johnson E, Haneuse S, et al. Microvascular outcomes in patients with diabetes after bariatric surgery versus usual care: a matched cohort study. *Ann Intern Med* 2018;169:300–310
69. Mingrone G, Panunzi S, De Gaetano A, et al. Bariatric-metabolic surgery versus conventional medical treatment in obese patients with type 2 diabetes: 5 year follow-up of an open-label, single-centre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2015;386:964–973
70. Schauer PR, Bhatt DL, Kirwan JP, et al.; STAMPEDE Investigators. Bariatric surgery versus intensive medical therapy for diabetes—3-year outcomes. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370:2002–2013
71. Halperin F, Ding S-A, Simonson DC, et al. Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery or lifestyle with intensive medical management in patients with type 2 diabetes: feasibility and 1-year results of a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Surg* 2014;149:716–726
72. Sjöström L, Lindroos A-K, Peltonen M, et al.; Swedish Obese Subjects Study Scientific Group. Lifestyle, diabetes, and cardiovascular risk factors 10 years after bariatric surgery. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:2683–2693
73. Sjöström L, Peltonen M, Jacobson P, et al. Association of bariatric surgery with long-term remission of type 2 diabetes and with microvascular and macrovascular complications. *JAMA* 2014;311:2297–2304
74. Adams TD, Davidson LE, Litwin SE, et al. Health benefits of gastric bypass surgery after 6 years. *JAMA* 2012;308:1122–1131
75. Sjöström L, Narbro K, Sjöström CD, et al.; Swedish Obese Subjects Study. Effects of bariatric surgery on mortality in Swedish obese subjects. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357:741–752
76. Sjöström L, Gummesson A, Sjöström CD, et al.; Swedish Obese Subjects Study. Effects of bariatric surgery on cancer incidence in obese patients in Sweden (Swedish Obese Subjects Study): a prospective, controlled intervention trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2009;10:653–662
77. Sjöström L, Peltonen M, Jacobson P, et al. Bariatric surgery and long-term cardiovascular events. *JAMA* 2012;307:56–65
78. Adams TD, Gress RE, Smith SC, et al. Long-term mortality after gastric bypass surgery. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357:753–761
79. Arterburn DE, Olsen MK, Smith VA, et al. Association between bariatric surgery and long-term survival. *JAMA* 2015;313:62–70
80. Adams TD, Arterburn DE, Nathan DM, Eckel RH. Clinical outcomes of metabolic surgery: microvascular and macrovascular complications. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:912–923
81. Sheng B, Truong K, Spittler H, Zhang L, Tong X, Chen L. The long-term effects of bariatric surgery on type 2 diabetes remission, microvascular and macrovascular complications, and mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Obes Surg* 2017;27:2724–2732
82. Fisher DP, Johnson E, Haneuse S, et al. Association between bariatric surgery and macrovascular disease outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes and severe obesity. *JAMA* 2018;320:1570–1582
83. Billeter AT, Scheurlen KM, Probst P, et al. Meta-analysis of metabolic surgery versus



- medical treatment for microvascular complications in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Br J Surg* 2018;105:168–181
84. Aminian A, Zajichek A, Arterburn DE, et al. Association of metabolic surgery with major adverse cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes and obesity. *JAMA* 2019;322:1271–1282
85. Syn NL, Cummings DE, Wang LZ, et al. Association of metabolic-bariatric surgery with long-term survival in adults with and without diabetes: a one-stage meta-analysis of matched cohort and prospective controlled studies with 174 772 participants. *Lancet* 2021;397:1830–1841
86. Rubino F, Kaplan LM, Schauer PR, Cummings DE; Diabetes Surgery Summit Delegates. The Diabetes Surgery Summit consensus conference: recommendations for the evaluation and use of gastrointestinal surgery to treat type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Ann Surg* 2010;251:399–405
87. Cummings DE, Cohen RV. Beyond BMI: the need for new guidelines governing the use of bariatric and metabolic surgery. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2:175–181
88. Zimmet P, Alberti KGMM, Rubino F, Dixon JB. IDF's view of bariatric surgery in type 2 diabetes. *Lancet* 2011;378:108–110
89. Kasama K, Mui W, Lee WJ, et al. IFSO-APC consensus statements 2011. *Obes Surg* 2012;22:677–684
90. Wentworth JM, Burton P, Laurie C, Brown WA, O'Brien PE. Five-year outcomes of a randomized trial of gastric band surgery in overweight but not obese people with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:e44–e45
91. Cummings DE, Arterburn DE, Westbrook EO, et al. Gastric bypass surgery vs intensive lifestyle and medical intervention for type 2 diabetes: the CROSSROADS randomised controlled trial. *Diabetologia* 2016;59:945–953
92. Liang Z, Wu Q, Chen B, Yu P, Zhao H, Ouyang X. Effect of laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery on type 2 diabetes mellitus with hypertension: a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2013;101:50–56
93. Aminian A, Chang J, Brethauer SA; American Society for Metabolic and Bariatric Surgery Clinical Issues Committee. ASBMS updated position statement on bariatric surgery in class I obesity (BMI 30–35 kg/m<sup>2</sup>). *Surg Obes Relat Dis* 2018;14:1071–1087
94. Isaman DJM, Rothberg AE, Herman WH. Reconciliation of type 2 diabetes remission rates in studies of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2247–2253
95. Schauer PR, Bhatt DL, Kirwan JP, et al.; STAMPEDE Investigators. Bariatric surgery versus intensive medical therapy for diabetes—5-year outcomes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:641–651
96. Ikramuddin S, Korner J, Lee W-J, et al. Durability of addition of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass to lifestyle intervention and medical management in achieving primary treatment goals for uncontrolled type 2 diabetes in mild to moderate obesity: a randomized control trial. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1510–1518
97. Sjöholm K, Pajunen P, Jacobson P, et al. Incidence and remission of type 2 diabetes in relation to degree of obesity at baseline and 2 year weight change: the Swedish Obese Subjects (SOS) study. *Diabetologia* 2015;58:1448–1453
98. Arterburn DE, Bogart A, Sherwood NE, et al. A multisite study of long-term remission and relapse of type 2 diabetes mellitus following gastric bypass. *Obes Surg* 2013;23:93–102
99. Cohen RV, Pinheiro JC, Schiavon CA, Salles JE, Wajchenberg BL, Cummings DE. Effects of gastric bypass surgery in patients with type 2 diabetes and only mild obesity. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:1420–1428
100. Brethauer SA, Aminian A, Romero-Talamás H, et al. Can diabetes be surgically cured? Long-term metabolic effects of bariatric surgery in obese patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Ann Surg* 2013;258:628–636; discussion 636–637
101. Hsu C-C, Almulaifi A, Chen J-C, et al. Effect of bariatric surgery vs medical treatment on type 2 diabetes in patients with body mass index lower than 35: five-year outcomes. *JAMA Surg* 2015;150:1117–1124
102. Hariri K, Guevara D, Jayaram A, Kini SU, Herron DM, Fernandez-Ranvier G. Preoperative insulin therapy as a marker for type 2 diabetes remission in obese patients after bariatric surgery. *Surg Obes Relat Dis* 2018;14:332–337
103. Yu H, Di J, Bao Y, et al. Visceral fat area as a new predictor of short-term diabetes remission after Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery in Chinese patients with a body mass index less than 35 kg/m<sup>2</sup>. *Surg Obes Relat Dis* 2015;11:6–11
104. Kirwan JP, Aminian A, Kashyap SR, Burguera B, Brethauer SA, Schauer PR. Bariatric surgery in obese patients with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:941–948
105. Rubin JK, Hinrichs-Krapels S, Hesketh R, Martin A, Herman WH, Rubino F. Identifying barriers to appropriate use of metabolic/bariatric surgery for type 2 diabetes treatment: Policy Lab results. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:954–963
106. Fouse T, Schauer P. The socioeconomic impact of morbid obesity and factors affecting access to obesity surgery. *Surg Clin North Am* 2016;96:669–679
107. Flum DR, Belle SH, King WC, et al.; Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery (LABS) Consortium. Perioperative safety in the longitudinal assessment of bariatric surgery. *N Engl J Med* 2009;361:445–454
108. Courcoulas AP, Christian NJ, Belle SH, et al.; Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery (LABS) Consortium. Weight change and health outcomes at 3 years after bariatric surgery among individuals with severe obesity. *JAMA* 2013;310:2416–2425
109. Arterburn DE, Courcoulas AP. Bariatric surgery for obesity and metabolic conditions in adults. *BMJ* 2014;349:g3961
110. Young MT, Gebhart A, Phelan MJ, Nguyen NT. Use and outcomes of laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy vs laparoscopic gastric bypass: analysis of the American College of Surgeons NSQIP. *J Am Coll Surg* 2015;220:880–885
111. Aminian A, Brethauer SA, Kirwan JP, Kashyap SR, Burguera B, Schauer PR. How safe is metabolic/diabetes surgery? *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:198–201
112. Birkmeyer NJO, Dimick JB, Share D, et al.; Michigan Bariatric Surgery Collaborative. Hospital complication rates with bariatric surgery in Michigan. *JAMA* 2010;304:435–442
113. Altieri MS, Yang J, Telem DA, et al. Lap band outcomes from 19,221 patients across centers and over a decade within the state of New York. *Surg Endosc* 2016;30:1725–1732
114. Hutter MM, Schirmer BD, Jones DB, et al. First report from the American College of Surgeons Bariatric Surgery Center Network: laparoscopic sleeve gastrectomy has morbidity and effectiveness positioned between the band and the bypass. *Ann Surg* 2011;254:410–420; discussion 420–422
115. Nguyen NT, Slone JA, Nguyen X-MT, Hartman JS, Hoyt DB. A prospective randomized trial of laparoscopic gastric bypass versus laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding for the treatment of morbid obesity: outcomes, quality of life, and costs. *Ann Surg* 2009;250:631–641
116. Courcoulas AP, King WC, Belle SH, et al. Seven-year weight trajectories and health outcomes in the Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery (LABS) study. *JAMA Surg* 2018;153:427–434
117. Birkmeyer JD, Finks JF, O'Reilly A, et al.; Michigan Bariatric Surgery Collaborative. Surgical skill and complication rates after bariatric surgery. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1434–1442
118. Mechanick JI, Apovian C, Brethauer S, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for the perioperative nutrition, metabolic, and nonsurgical support of patients undergoing bariatric procedures – 2019 update: cosponsored by American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists/American College of Endocrinology, The Obesity Society, American Society for Metabolic & Bariatric Surgery, Obesity Medicine Association, and American Society of Anesthesiologists – executive summary. *Endocr Pract* 2019;25:1346–1359
119. Service FJ, Thompson GB, Service FJ, Andrews JC, Gollazo-Clavell ML, Lloyd RV. Hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemia with nesidioblastosis after gastric-bypass surgery. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353:249–254
120. Sheehan A, Patti ME. Hypoglycemia after upper gastrointestinal surgery: clinical approach to assessment, diagnosis, and treatment. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes* 2020;13:4469–4482
121. Lee D, Dreyfuss JM, Sheehan A, Puleio A, Mulla CM, Patti ME. Glycemic patterns are distinct in post-bariatric hypoglycemia after gastric bypass (PBH-RYGB). *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2021;106:2291–2303
122. Salehi M, Vella A, McLaughlin T, Patti M-E. Hypoglycemia after gastric bypass surgery: current concepts and controversies. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2018;103:2815–2826
123. Conason A, Teixeira J, Hsu C-H, Puma L, Knafo D, Geliebter A. Substance use following bariatric weight loss surgery. *JAMA Surg* 2013;148:145–150
124. Bhatti JA, Nathens AB, Thiruchelvam D, Grantcharov T, Goldstein BI, Redelmeier DA. Self-harm emergencies after bariatric surgery: a population-based cohort study. *JAMA Surg* 2016;151:226–232
125. Peterhänsel C, Petroff D, Klinitzke G, Kersting A, Wagner B. Risk of completed suicide after bariatric surgery: a systematic review. *Obes Rev* 2013;14:369–382
126. Jakobsen GS, Småstuen MC, Sandbu R, et al. Association of bariatric surgery vs medical obesity treatment with long-term medical

- complications and obesity-related comorbidities. *JAMA* 2018;319:291–301
127. King WC, Chen J-Y, Mitchell JE, et al. Prevalence of alcohol use disorders before and after bariatric surgery. *JAMA* 2012;307:2516–2525
128. Young-Hyman D, Peyrot M. *Psychosocial Care for People with Diabetes*. 1st ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2012
129. Greenberg I, Sogg S, M Perna F. Behavioral and psychological care in weight loss surgery: best practice update. *Obesity* (Silver Spring) 2009;17:880–884
130. Truven Health Analytics. *Micromedex 2.0. Introduction to RED BOOK Online*. Accessed 15 October 2021. Available from [https://www.micromedexsolutions.com/micromedex2/4.34.0/WebHelp/RED\\_BOOK/Introduction\\_to\\_REDB\\_BOOK\\_Online.htm](https://www.micromedexsolutions.com/micromedex2/4.34.0/WebHelp/RED_BOOK/Introduction_to_REDB_BOOK_Online.htm)
131. Data.Medicare.gov. NADAC (National Average Drug Acquisition Cost) 2021. U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Accessed 15 October 2021. Available from <https://data.medicare.gov/dataset/d5eaf378-dcef-5779-83de-acdd8347d68e>
132. U.S. National Library of Medicine. Phen-termine - phentermine hydrochloride capsule. Accessed 13 October 2021. Available from <https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/drugInfo.cfm?setid=737eef3b-9a6b-4ab3-a25c-49d84d2a0197>
133. Nalpropion Pharmaceuticals. *Contrave* (naltrexone HCl/bupropion HCl) extended-release tablets. Accessed 13 October 2021. Available at <https://contrave.com>
134. CHEPLAPHARM and H2-Pharma. *Xenical* (orlistat). Accessed 13 October 2021. Available from <https://xenical.com>
135. Vivus. *Qsymia* (phentermine and topiramate extended-release) capsules. Accessed 13 October 2021. Available from <https://qsymia.com>
136. Novo Nordisk. *Saxenda* (liraglutide injection 3 mg). Accessed 13 October 2021. Available from <https://www.saxenda.com>
137. Aronne LJ, Wadden TA, Peterson C, Winslow D, Odeh S, Gadde KM. Evaluation of phentermine and topiramate versus phen-termine/topiramate extended-release in obese adults. *Obesity* (Silver Spring) 2013;21:2163–2171
138. Gadde KM, Allison DB, Ryan DH, et al. Effects of low-dose, controlled-release, phentermine plus topiramate combination on weight and associated comorbidities in overweight and obese adults (CONQUER): a randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2011; 377:1341–1352
139. Davies M, Færch L, Jeppesen OK, et al.; STEP 2 Study Group. Semaglutide 2.4 mg once a week in adults with overweight or obesity, and type 2 diabetes (STEP 2): a randomised, double-blind, double-dummy, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2021;397:971–984
140. Marso SP, Daniels GH, Brown-Frandsen K, et al.; LEADER Steering Committee; LEADER Trial Investigators. Liraglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:311–322
141. National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases. *Types of Weight-loss Surgery*. Accessed 31 August 2021. Available from <https://www.niddk.nih.gov/health-information/weight-management/bariatric-surgery/types>



## 9. Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S125–S143 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>

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://www.diabetes.org/SOC).

### PHARMACOLOGIC THERAPY FOR ADULTS WITH TYPE 1 DIABETES

#### Recommendations

- 9.1 Most individuals with type 1 diabetes should be treated with multiple daily injections of prandial and basal insulin, or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion. **A**
- 9.2 Most individuals with type 1 diabetes should use rapid-acting insulin analogs to reduce hypoglycemia risk. **A**
- 9.3 Individuals with type 1 diabetes should receive education on how to match mealtime insulin doses to carbohydrate intake, fat and protein content, and anticipated physical activity. **B**

#### Insulin Therapy

Because the hallmark of type 1 diabetes is absent or near-absent  $\beta$ -cell function, insulin treatment is essential for individuals with type 1 diabetes. In addition to hyperglycemia, insulinopenia can contribute to other metabolic disturbances like hypertriglyceridemia and ketoacidosis as well as tissue catabolism that can be life threatening. Severe metabolic decompensation can be, and was, mostly prevented with once or twice daily injections for the six or seven decades after the discovery of insulin. However, over the past three decades, evidence has accumulated supporting more intensive insulin replacement, using multiple daily injections of insulin or continuous subcutaneous administration through an insulin pump, as providing the best combination of effectiveness and safety for people with type 1 diabetes. The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) demonstrated that intensive

\*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. 9. Pharmacologic approaches to glycemic treatment: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S125–S143

© 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>.

therapy with multiple daily injections or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (CSII) reduced A1C and was associated with improved long-term outcomes (1–3). The study was carried out with short-acting (regular) and intermediate-acting (NPH) human insulins. In this landmark trial, lower A1C with intensive control (7%) led to ~50% reductions in microvascular complications over 6 years of treatment. However, intensive therapy was associated with a higher rate of severe hypoglycemia than conventional treatment (62 compared with 19 episodes per 100 patient-years of therapy). Follow-up of subjects from the DCCT more than 10 years after the active treatment component of the study demonstrated fewer macrovascular as well as fewer microvascular complications in the group that received intensive treatment (2,4).

Insulin replacement regimens typically consist of basal insulin, mealtime insulin, and correction insulin (5). Basal insulin includes NPH insulin, long-acting insulin analogs, and continuous delivery of rapid-acting insulin via an insulin pump. Basal insulin analogs have longer duration of action with flatter, more constant plasma concentrations and activity profiles than NPH insulin; rapid-acting analogs (RAA) have a quicker onset and peak and shorter duration of action than regular human insulin. In people with type 1 diabetes, treatment with analog insulins is associated with less hypoglycemia and weight gain as well as lower A1C compared with human insulins (6–8). More recently, two new injectable insulin formulations with enhanced rapid action profiles have been introduced. Inhaled human insulin has a rapid peak and shortened duration of action compared with RAA and may cause less hypoglycemia and weight gain (9) (see also subsection “Inhaled Insulin” in PHARMACOLOGIC THERAPY FOR ADULTS WITH TYPE 2 DIABETES), and faster-acting insulin aspart and insulin lispro-aabc may reduce prandial excursions better than RAA (10–12). In addition, new longer-acting basal analogs (U-300 glargine or degludec) may confer a lower hypoglycemia risk compared with U-100 glargine in individuals with type 1 diabetes (13,14). Despite the advantages of insulin analogs in individuals with type 1 diabetes, for some individuals the expense and/or intensity of

treatment required for their use is prohibitive. There are multiple approaches to insulin treatment, and the central precept in the management of type 1 diabetes is that some form of insulin be given in a planned regimen tailored to the individual to keep them safe and out of diabetic ketoacidosis and to avoid significant hypoglycemia, with every effort made to reach the individual’s glycemic targets.

Most studies comparing multiple daily injections with CSII have been relatively small and of short duration. However, a recent systematic review and meta-analysis concluded that CSII via 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 (15). However, there is no consensus to guide the choice of injection or pump therapy in a given individual, and research to guide this decision-making is needed (16). The arrival of continuous glucose monitors (CGM) to clinical practice has proven beneficial in people using insulin therapy. Its use is now considered standard of care for most people with type 1 diabetes (5) (see Section 7, “Diabetes Technology,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>). Reduction of nocturnal hypoglycemia in individuals with type 1 diabetes using insulin pumps with CGM is improved by automatic suspension of insulin delivery at a preset glucose level (16–18). When choosing among insulin delivery systems, patient preferences, cost, insulin type and dosing regimen, and self-management capabilities should be considered (see Section 7, “Diabetes Technology,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>).

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has now approved two hybrid closed-loop pump systems (also called automated insulin delivery [AID] systems). The safety and efficacy of hybrid closed-loop systems has been supported in the literature in adolescents and adults with type 1 diabetes (19,20), and recent evidence suggests that a closed-loop system is superior to sensor-augmented pump therapy for glycemic control and reduction of hypoglycemia over 3 months of comparison in children and adults with type 1 diabetes (21). In the International Diabetes Closed Loop (iDCL) trial, a 6-month trial in people with type 1 diabetes at least

14 years of age, the use of a closed-loop system was associated with a greater percentage of time spent in the target glycemic range, reduced mean glucose and A1C levels, and a lower percentage of time spent in hypoglycemia compared with use of a sensor-augmented pump (22).

Intensive insulin management using a version of CSII and continuous glucose monitoring should be considered in most individuals with type 1 diabetes. AID systems may be considered in individuals with type 1 diabetes who are capable of using the device safely (either by themselves or with a caregiver) in order to improve time in range and reduce A1C and hypoglycemia (22). See Section 7, “Diabetes Technology” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>), for a full discussion of insulin delivery devices.

In general, individuals with type 1 diabetes require 50% of their daily insulin as basal and 50% as prandial, but this is dependent on a number of factors, including whether the individual consumes lower or higher carbohydrate meals. Total daily insulin requirements can be estimated based on weight, with typical doses ranging from 0.4 to 1.0 units/kg/day. Higher amounts are required during puberty, pregnancy, and medical illness. The *American Diabetes Association/JDRF Type 1 Diabetes Sourcebook* notes 0.5 units/kg/day as a typical starting dose in individuals with type 1 diabetes who are metabolically stable, with half administered as prandial insulin given to control blood glucose after meals and the other half as basal insulin to control glycemia in the periods between meal absorption (23); this guideline provides detailed information on intensification of therapy to meet individualized needs. In addition, the American Diabetes Association (ADA) position statement “Type 1 Diabetes Management Through the Life Span” provides a thorough overview of type 1 diabetes treatment (24).

Typical multidose regimens for individuals with type 1 diabetes combine premeal use of shorter-acting insulins with a longer-acting formulation. The long-acting basal dose is titrated to regulate overnight, fasting glucose. Postprandial glucose excursions are best controlled by a well-timed injection of



prandial insulin. The optimal time to administer prandial insulin varies, based on the pharmacokinetics of the formulation (regular, RAA, inhaled), the premeal blood glucose level, and carbohydrate consumption. Recommendations for prandial insulin dose administration should therefore be individualized. Physiologic insulin secretion varies with glycemia, meal size, meal composition, and tissue demands for glucose. To approach this variability in people using insulin treatment, strategies have evolved to adjust prandial doses based on predicted needs. Thus, education of patients on how to adjust prandial insulin to account for carbohydrate intake, premeal glucose levels, and anticipated activity can be effective and should be offered to most patients (25,26). For individuals in whom carbohydrate counting is effective, estimates of the fat and protein content of meals can be incorporated into their prandial dosing for added

benefit (27) (see Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>).

The 2021 ADA/European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD) consensus report on the management of type 1 diabetes in adults summarizes different insulin regimens and glucose monitoring strategies in individuals with type 1 diabetes (Fig. 9.1 and Table 9.1) (5).

**Insulin Injection Technique**

Ensuring that patients and/or caregivers understand correct insulin injection technique is important to optimize glucose control and insulin use safety. Thus, it is important that insulin be delivered into the proper tissue in the correct way. Recommendations have been published elsewhere outlining best practices for insulin injection (28). Proper insulin injection technique includes injecting into appropriate body areas, injection site rotation, appropriate care of injection sites to avoid infection or other

complications, and avoidance of intramuscular (IM) insulin delivery.

Exogenously delivered insulin should be injected into subcutaneous tissue, not intramuscularly. Recommended sites for insulin injection include the abdomen, thigh, buttock, and upper arm. Because insulin absorption from IM sites differs according to the activity of the muscle, inadvertent IM injection can lead to unpredictable insulin absorption and variable effects on glucose, with IM injection being associated with frequent and unexplained hypoglycemia in several reports. Risk for IM insulin delivery is increased in younger, leaner patients when injecting into the limbs rather than truncal sites (abdomen and buttocks) and when using longer needles. Recent evidence supports the use of short needles (e.g., 4-mm pen needles) as effective and well tolerated when compared with longer needles, including a study performed in adults with obesity (29).

Injection site rotation is additionally necessary to avoid lipohypertrophy, an accumulation of subcutaneous fat in response to the adipogenic actions of insulin at a site of multiple injections. Lipohypertrophy appears as soft, smooth raised areas several centimeters in breadth and can contribute to erratic insulin absorption, increased glycemic variability, and unexplained hypoglycemic episodes. Patients and/or caregivers should receive education about proper injection site rotation and how to recognize and avoid areas of lipohypertrophy. As noted in Table 4.1, examination of insulin injection sites for the presence of lipohypertrophy, as well as assessment of injection device use and injection technique, are key components of a comprehensive diabetes medical evaluation and treatment plan. Proper insulin injection technique may lead to more effective use of this therapy and, as such, holds the potential for improved clinical outcomes.

**Noninsulin Treatments for Type 1 Diabetes**

Injectable and oral glucose-lowering drugs have been studied for their efficacy as adjuncts to insulin treatment of type 1 diabetes. Pramlintide is based on the naturally occurring  $\beta$ -cell peptide amylin and is approved for use in adults

**Representative relative attributes of insulin delivery approaches in people with type 1 diabetes<sup>1</sup>**

Injected insulin regimens	Flexibility	Lower risk of hypoglycemia	Higher costs
MDI with LAA + RAA or URAA	+++	+++	+++
Less-preferred, alternative injected insulin regimens			
MDI with NPH + RAA or URAA	++	++	++
MDI with NPH + short-acting (regular) insulin	++	+	+
Two daily injections with NPH + short-acting (regular) insulin or premixed	+	+	+
Continuous insulin infusion regimens	Flexibility	Lower risk of hypoglycemia	Higher costs
Hybrid closed-loop technology	+++++	+++++	+++++
Insulin pump with threshold/predictive low-glucose suspend	++++	++++	++++
Insulin pump therapy without automation	+++	+++	+++

**Figure 9.1**—Choices of insulin regimens in people with type 1 diabetes. Continuous glucose monitoring improves outcomes with injected or infused insulin and is superior to blood glucose monitoring. Inhaled insulin may be used in place of injectable prandial insulin in the U.S. <sup>1</sup>The number of plus signs (+) is an estimate of relative association of the regimen with increased flexibility, lower risk of hypoglycemia, and higher costs between the considered regimens. LAA, long-acting insulin analog; MDI, multiple daily injections; RAA, rapid-acting insulin analog; URAA, ultra-rapid-acting insulin analog. Reprinted from Holt et al. (5).

**Table 9.1—Examples of subcutaneous insulin regimens**

Regimen	Timing and distribution	Advantages	Disadvantages	Adjusting doses
Regimens that more closely mimic normal insulin secretion				
Insulin pump therapy (hybrid closed-loop, low-glucose suspend, CGM-augmented open-loop, BGM-augmented open-loop)	<p>Basal delivery of URAA or RAA; generally 40–60% of TDD.</p> <p>Mealtime and correction: URAA or RAA by bolus based on ICR and/or ISF and target glucose, with pre-meal insulin ~15 min before eating.</p>	<p>Can adjust basal rates for varying insulin sensitivity by time of day, for exercise and for sick days.</p> <p>Flexibility in meal timing and content.</p> <p>Pump can deliver insulin in increments of fractions of units.</p> <p>Potential for integration with CGM for low-glucose suspend or hybrid closed-loop.</p> <p>TIR % highest and TBR % lowest with: hybrid closed-loop &gt; low-glucose suspend &gt; CGM-augmented open-loop &gt; BGM-augmented open-loop.</p>	<p>Most expensive regimen.</p> <p>Must continuously wear one or more devices.</p> <p>Risk of rapid development of ketosis or DKA with interruption of insulin delivery.</p> <p>Potential reactions to adhesives and site infections.</p> <p>Most technically complex approach (harder for people with lower numeracy or literacy skills).</p>	<p>Mealtime insulin: if carbohydrate counting is accurate, change ICR if glucose after meal consistently out of target.</p> <p>Correction insulin: adjust ISF and/or target glucose if correction does not consistently bring glucose into range.</p> <p>Basal rates: adjust based on overnight, fasting, or daytime glucose outside of activity of URAA/RAA bolus.</p>
MDI: LAA + flexible doses of URAA or RAA at meals	<p>LAA once daily (insulin detemir or insulin glargine may require twice-daily dosing); generally 50% of TDD.</p> <p>Mealtime and correction: URAA or RAA based on ICR and/or ISF and target glucose.</p>	<p>Can use pens for all components.</p> <p>Flexibility in meal timing and content.</p> <p>Insulin analogs cause less hypoglycemia than human insulins.</p>	<p>At least four daily injections.</p> <p>Most costly insulins.</p> <p>Smallest increment of insulin is 1 unit (0.5 unit with some pens).</p> <p>LAAAs may not cover strong dawn phenomenon (rise in glucose in early morning hours) as well as pump therapy.</p>	<p>Mealtime insulin: if carbohydrate counting is accurate, change ICR if glucose after meal consistently out of target.</p> <p>Correction insulin: adjust ISF and/or target glucose if correction does not consistently bring glucose into range.</p> <p>LAA: based on overnight or fasting glucose or daytime glucose outside of activity time course, or URAA or RAA injections.</p>

Continued on p. S129

**Table 9.1—Continued**

Regimen	Timing and distribution	Advantages	Disadvantages	Adjusting doses
<b>MDI regimens with less flexibility</b>				
Four injections daily with fixed doses of N and RAA	Pre-breakfast: RAA ~20% of TDD.	May be feasible if unable to carbohydrate count. All meals have RAA coverage.	Shorter duration RAA may lead to basal deficit during day; may need twice-daily N.	Pre-breakfast RAA: based on BGM after breakfast or before lunch.
	Pre-lunch: RAA ~10% of TDD. Pre-dinner: RAA ~10% of TDD. Bedtime: N ~50% of TDD.	N less expensive than LAAs.	Greater risk of nocturnal hypoglycemia with N. Requires relatively consistent mealtimes and carbohydrate intake.	Pre-lunch RAA: based on BGM after lunch or before dinner. Pre-dinner RAA: based on BGM after dinner or at bedtime. Evening N: based on fasting or overnight BGM.
Four injections daily with fixed doses of N and R	Pre-breakfast: R ~20% of TDD.	May be feasible if unable to carbohydrate count. R can be dosed based on ICR and correction.	Greater risk of nocturnal hypoglycemia with N. Greater risk of delayed post-meal hypoglycemia with R.	Pre-breakfast R: based on BGM after breakfast or before lunch.
	Pre-lunch: R ~10% of TDD. Pre-dinner: R ~10% of TDD. Bedtime: N ~50% of TDD.	All meals have R coverage. Least expensive insulins.	Requires relatively consistent mealtimes and carbohydrate intake. R must be injected at least 30 min before meal for better effect.	Pre-lunch R: based on BGM after lunch or before dinner. Pre-dinner R: based on BGM after dinner or at bedtime. Evening N: based on fasting or overnight BGM.
<b>Regimens with fewer daily injections</b>				
Three injections daily: N + R or N + RAA	Pre-breakfast: ~40% N + ~15% R or RAA.	Morning insulins can be mixed in one syringe. May be appropriate for those who cannot take injections in middle of day.	Greater risk of nocturnal hypoglycemia with N than LAAs.	Morning N: based on pre-dinner BGM.
	Pre-dinner: ~15% R or RAA. Bedtime: 30% N.	Morning N covers lunch to some extent. Same advantages of RAAs over R. Least (N + R) or less expensive insulins than MDI with analogs.	Greater risk of delayed post-meal hypoglycemia with R than RAAs. Requires relatively consistent mealtimes and carbohydrate intake. Coverage of post-lunch glucose often suboptimal. R must be injected at least 30 min before meal for better effect.	Morning R: based on pre-lunch BGM. Morning RAA: based on post-breakfast or pre-lunch BGM. Pre-dinner R: based on bedtime BGM. Pre-dinner RAA: based on post-dinner or bedtime BGM. Evening N: based on fasting BGM.

Continued on p. S130

**Table 9.1—Continued**

Regimen	Timing and distribution	Advantages	Disadvantages	Adjusting doses
Twice-daily “split-mixed”: N + R or N + RAA	Pre-breakfast: ~40% N + ~15% R or RAA. Pre-dinner: ~30% N + ~15% R or RAA.	Least number of injections for people with strong preference for this. Insulins can be mixed in one syringe. Least (N + R) or less (N + RAA) expensive insulins vs analogs. Eliminates need for doses during the day.	Risk of hypoglycemia in afternoon or middle of night from N. Fixed mealtimes and meal content. Coverage of post-lunch glucose often suboptimal. Difficult to reach targets for blood glucose without hypoglycemia.	Morning N: based on pre-dinner BGM. Morning R: based on pre-lunch BGM. Morning RAA: based on post-breakfast or pre- lunch BGM. Evening R: based on bedtime BGM. Evening RAA: based on post-dinner or bedtime BGM. Evening N: based on fasting BGM.

BGM, blood glucose monitoring; CGM, continuous glucose monitoring; ICR, insulin:carbohydrate ratio; ISF, insulin sensitivity factor; LAA, long-acting analog; MDI, multiple daily injections; N, NPH insulin; R, short-acting (regular) insulin; RAA, rapid-acting analog; TDD, total daily insulin dose; URAA, ultra-rapid-acting analog. Reprinted from Holt et al. (5).

with type 1 diabetes. Clinical trials have demonstrated a modest reduction in A1C (0.3–0.4%) and modest weight loss (~1 kg) with pramlintide (30–33). Similarly, results have been reported for several agents currently approved only for the treatment of type 2 diabetes. The addition of metformin in adults with type 1 diabetes caused small reductions in body weight and lipid levels but did not improve A1C (34,35). The largest clinical trials of glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists (GLP-1 RAs) in type 1 diabetes have been conducted with liraglutide 1.8 mg daily, showing modest A1C reductions (~0.4%), decreases in weight (~5 kg), and reductions in insulin doses (36,37). Similarly, sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors have been studied in clinical trials in people with type 1 diabetes, showing improvements in A1C, reduced body weight, and improved blood pressure (38–40); however, SGLT2 inhibitor use in type 1 diabetes is associated with an increased rate of diabetic ketoacidosis. The risks and benefits of adjunctive agents continue to be evaluated, with consensus statements providing guidance on patient selection and precautions (41); only pramlintide is approved for treatment of type 1 diabetes.

**SURGICAL TREATMENT FOR TYPE 1 DIABETES**


**Pancreas and Islet Transplantation**

Successful pancreas and islet transplantation can normalize glucose levels and mitigate microvascular complications of type 1 diabetes. However, patients receiving these treatments require life-long immunosuppression to prevent graft rejection and/or recurrence of autoimmune islet destruction. Given the potential adverse effects of immunosuppressive therapy, pancreas transplantation should be reserved for patients with type 1 diabetes undergoing simultaneous renal transplantation, following renal transplantation, or for those with recurrent ketoacidosis or severe hypoglycemia despite intensive glycemic management (42).

The 2021 ADA/EASD consensus report on the management of type 1 diabetes in adults offers a simplified overview of indications for β-cell replacement therapy in people with type 1 diabetes (Fig. 9.2) (5).



**Simplified overview of indications for  $\beta$ -cell replacement therapy in people with type 1 diabetes**



**Figure 9.2**—Simplified overview of indications for  $\beta$ -cell replacement therapy in people with type 1 diabetes. The two main forms of  $\beta$ -cell replacement therapy are whole-pancreas transplantation or islet cell transplantation.  $\beta$ -Cell replacement therapy can be combined with kidney transplantation if the individual has end-stage renal disease, which may be performed simultaneously or after kidney transplantation. All decisions about transplantation must balance the surgical risk, metabolic need, and the choice of the individual with diabetes. GFR, glomerular filtration rate. Reprinted from Holt et al. (5).

**PHARMACOLOGIC THERAPY FOR ADULTS WITH TYPE 2 DIABETES**

**Recommendations**

**9.4a** First-line therapy depends on comorbidities, patient-centered treatment factors, and management needs and generally includes metformin and comprehensive lifestyle modification. **A**

**9.4b** Other medications (glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists, sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors), with or without metformin based on glycemic needs, are appropriate initial therapy for individuals with type 2 diabetes with or at high risk for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, heart failure, and/or chronic kidney disease (Fig. 9.3). **A**

**9.5** Metformin should be continued upon initiation of insulin therapy (unless contraindicated or not tolerated) for ongoing glycemic and metabolic benefits. **A**

**9.6** Early combination therapy can be considered in some patients at treatment initiation to extend the time to treatment failure. **A**

**9.7** The early introduction of insulin should be considered if there is evidence of ongoing catabolism (weight loss), if symptoms of hyperglycemia are present, or when A1C levels ( $>10\%$  [86 mmol/mol]) or blood glucose levels ( $\geq 300$  mg/dL [16.7 mmol/L]) are very high. **E**

**9.8** A patient-centered approach should guide the choice of pharmacologic agents. Consider the effects on cardiovascular and renal comorbidities, efficacy, hypoglycemia risk, impact on weight, cost and access, risk for side effects, and patient preferences (Table 9.2 and Fig. 9.3). **E**

**9.9** Among individuals with type 2 diabetes who have established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease or indicators of high car-

diovascular risk, established kidney disease, or heart failure, a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor and/or glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist with demonstrated cardiovascular disease benefit (Fig. 9.3, Table 9.2, Table 10.3B, and Table 10.3C) is recommended as part of the glucose-lowering regimen and comprehensive cardiovascular risk reduction, independent of A1C and in consideration of patient-specific factors (Fig. 9.3) (see Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>, for details on cardiovascular risk reduction recommendations). **A**

**9.10** In patients with type 2 diabetes, a glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist is preferred to insulin when possible. **A**

**9.11** If insulin is used, combination therapy with a glucagon-like

peptide 1 receptor agonist is recommended for greater efficacy and durability of treatment effect. **A**

**9.12** Recommendation for treatment intensification for patients not meeting treatment goals should not be delayed. **A**

**9.13** Medication regimen and medication-taking behavior should be reevaluated at regular intervals (every 3–6 months) and adjusted as needed to incorporate specific factors that impact choice of treatment (**Fig. 4.1** and **Table 9.2**). **E**

**9.14** Clinicians should be aware of the potential for overbasalization with insulin therapy. Clinical signals that may prompt evaluation of overbasalization include basal dose more than  $\sim 0.5$  IU/kg/day, high bedtime-morning or post-prandial glucose differential, hypoglycemia (aware or unaware), and high glycemic variability. Indication of overbasalization should prompt reevaluation to further individualize therapy. **E**

The ADA/EASD consensus report “Management of Hyperglycemia in Type 2 Diabetes, 2018” and the 2019 update (43,44) recommend a patient-centered approach to choosing appropriate pharmacologic treatment of blood glucose. This includes consideration of efficacy and key patient factors: 1) important comorbidities such as atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) and indicators of high ASCVD risk, chronic kidney disease (CKD), and heart failure (HF) (see Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>, and Section 11 “Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>), 2) hypoglycemia risk, 3) effects on body weight, 4) side effects, 5) cost, and 6) patient preferences. Lifestyle modifications that improve health (see Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>) should be emphasized along with any pharmacologic therapy. Section 13, “Older Adults” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>),

and Section 14, “Children and Adolescents” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>), have recommendations specific for older adults and for children and adolescents with type 2 diabetes, respectively. Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>), and Section 11, “Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>), have recommendations for the use of glucose-lowering drugs in the management of cardiovascular and renal disease, respectively.

#### Initial Therapy

First-line therapy depends on comorbidities, patient-centered treatment factors, and management needs but will generally include metformin and comprehensive lifestyle modification. Pharmacotherapy should be started at the time type 2 diabetes is diagnosed unless there are contraindications; for many patients this will be metformin monotherapy in combination with lifestyle modifications. Additional and/or alternative agents may be considered in special circumstances, such as in individuals with established or increased risk of cardiovascular or renal complications (see Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>, and **Fig. 9.3**). Metformin is effective and safe, is inexpensive, and may reduce risk of cardiovascular events and death (45). Metformin is available in an immediate-release form for twice-daily dosing or as an extended-release form that can be given once daily. Compared with sulfonylureas, metformin as first-line therapy has beneficial effects on A1C, weight, and cardiovascular mortality (46); there is little systematic data available for other oral agents as initial therapy of type 2 diabetes.

The principal side effects of metformin are gastrointestinal intolerance due to bloating, abdominal discomfort, and diarrhea; these can be mitigated by gradual dose titration. The drug is cleared by renal filtration, and very high circulating levels (e.g., as a result of overdose or acute renal failure) have been associated with lactic acidosis. However, the occurrence of this complication is now known to be very rare, and metformin may be safely used in patients with reduced

estimated glomerular filtration rates (eGFR); the FDA has revised the label for metformin to reflect its safety in patients with eGFR  $\geq 30$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (47). A randomized trial confirmed previous observations that metformin use is associated with vitamin B12 deficiency and worsening of symptoms of neuropathy (48). This is compatible with a report from the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study (DPPOS) suggesting periodic testing of vitamin B12 (49).

In patients with contraindications or intolerance to metformin, initial therapy should be based on patient factors; consider a drug from another class depicted in **Fig. 9.3**. When A1C is  $\geq 1.5\%$  (12.5 mmol/mol) above the glycemic target (see Section 6, “Glycemic Targets,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>, for appropriate targets), many patients will require dual combination therapy to achieve their target A1C level (50). Insulin has the advantage of being effective where other agents are not and should be considered as part of any combination regimen when hyperglycemia is severe, especially if catabolic features (weight loss, hypertriglyceridemia, ketosis) are present. It is common practice to initiate insulin therapy for patients who present with blood glucose levels  $\geq 300$  mg/dL (16.7 mmol/L) or A1C  $>10\%$  (86 mmol/mol) or if the patient has symptoms of hyperglycemia (i.e., polyuria or polydipsia) or evidence of catabolism (weight loss) (**Fig. 9.4**). As glucose toxicity resolves, simplifying the regimen and/or changing to noninsulin agents is often possible. However, there is evidence that patients with uncontrolled hyperglycemia associated with type 2 diabetes can also be effectively treated with a sulfonylurea (51).


#### Combination Therapy

Because type 2 diabetes is a progressive disease in many patients, maintenance of glycemic targets with monotherapy is often possible for only a few years, after which combination therapy is necessary. Traditional recommendations have been to use stepwise addition of medications to metformin to maintain A1C at target. The advantage of this is to provide a clear assessment of the positive and negative effects of new drugs and

Table 9.2—Drug-specific and patient factors to consider when selecting antihyperglycemic treatment in adults with type 2 diabetes

	Efficacy (60)	Hypoglycemia	Weight change (109)	CV effects		Cost	Oral/SQ	Renal effects		Additional considerations
				ASCVD	HF			Progression of DKD	Dosing/use considerations*	
<b>Metformin</b>	High	No	Neutral (potential for modest loss)	Potential benefit	Neutral	Low	Oral	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contraindicated with eGFR &lt;30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gastrointestinal side effects common (diarrhea, nausea)</li> <li>Potential for B12 deficiency</li> </ul>
<b>SGLT2 inhibitors</b>	Intermediate	No	Loss	Benefit: empagliflozin <sup>†</sup> , canagliflozin <sup>†</sup> , ertugliflozin <sup>†</sup>	Benefit: empagliflozin <sup>‡</sup> , dapagliflozin <sup>‡</sup>	High	Oral	Benefit: canagliflozin <sup>§</sup> , dapagliflozin <sup>§</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See labels for renal dose considerations of individual agents</li> <li>Glucose-lowering effect is lower for SGLT2 inhibitors at lower eGFR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be discontinued before any scheduled surgery to avoid potential risk for DKA</li> <li>DKA risk (all agents, rare in T2D)</li> <li>Risk of bone fractures (canagliflozin)</li> <li>Genitourinary infections</li> <li>Risk of volume depletion, hypotension</li> <li>↑LDL cholesterol</li> <li>Risk of Fournier's gangrene</li> </ul>
<b>GLP-1 RAs</b>	High	No	Loss	Benefit: dulaglutide <sup>†</sup> , liraglutide <sup>†</sup> , semaglutide (SQ) <sup>†</sup>  Neutral: exenatide once weekly, lixisenatide	Benefit on renal end points in CVOTs driven by albuminuria outcomes: liraglutide, semaglutide (SQ), dulaglutide	High	SQ, oral (semaglutide)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See labels for renal dose considerations of individual agents</li> <li>No dose adjustment for dulaglutide, liraglutide, semaglutide</li> <li>Caution when initiating or increasing dose due to potential risk of nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, or dehydration. Monitor renal function in patients reporting severe adverse GI reactions when initiating or increasing dose of therapy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>FDA Black Box:</b> Risk of thyroid C-cell tumors in rodents; human relevance not determined (liraglutide, dulaglutide, exenatide extended release, semaglutide)</li> <li>GI side effects common (nausea, vomiting, diarrhea)</li> <li>Injection site reactions</li> <li>Pancreatitis has been reported in clinical trials but causality has not been established. Discontinue if pancreatitis is suspected.</li> </ul>	
<b>DPP-4 inhibitors</b>	Intermediate	No	Neutral	Neutral	Potential risk: saxagliptin	High	Oral	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Renal dose adjustment required (sitagliptin, saxagliptin, alogliptin); can be used in renal impairment</li> <li>No dose adjustment required for linagliptin</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pancreatitis has been reported in clinical trials but causality has not been established. Discontinue if pancreatitis is suspected.</li> <li>Joint pain</li> </ul>
<b>Thiazolidinediones</b>	High	No	Gain	Potential benefit: pioglitazone	Increased risk	Low	Oral	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No dose adjustment required</li> <li>Generally not recommended in renal impairment due to potential for fluid retention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>FDA Black Box:</b> Congestive heart failure (pioglitazone, rosiglitazone)</li> <li>Fluid retention (edema; heart failure)</li> <li>Benefit in NASH</li> <li>Risk of bone fractures</li> <li>Bladder cancer (pioglitazone)</li> <li>↑LDL cholesterol (rosiglitazone)</li> </ul>
<b>Sulfonylureas (2nd generation)</b>	High	Yes	Gain	Neutral	Neutral	Low	Oral	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glyburide: generally not recommended in chronic kidney disease</li> <li>Glipizide and glimepiride: initiate conservatively to avoid hypoglycemia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FDA Special Warning on increased risk of cardiovascular mortality based on studies of an older sulfonylurea (tolbutamide)</li> </ul>
<b>Insulin</b>	High	Yes	Gain	Neutral	Neutral	Low (SQ)	SQ; inhaled	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower insulin doses required with a decrease in eGFR; titrate per clinical response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injection site reactions</li> <li>Higher risk of hypoglycemia with human insulin (NPH or premixed formulations) vs. analogs</li> </ul>
<b>Analog</b>	High	Yes	Gain	Neutral	Neutral	High	SQ	Neutral		

ASCVD, atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; CV, cardiovascular; CVOT, cardiovascular outcomes trial; DPP-4, dipeptidyl peptidase 4; DKA, diabetic ketoacidosis; DKD, diabetic kidney disease; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; GI, gastrointestinal; GLP-1 RAs, glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists; HF, heart failure; NASH, nonalcoholic steatohepatitis; SGLT2, sodium-glucose cotransporter 2; SQ, subcutaneous; T2D, type 2 diabetes. \*For agent-specific dosing recommendations, please refer to the manufacturers' prescribing information. †FDA-approved for cardiovascular disease benefit. ‡FDA-approved for heart failure indication. §FDA-approved for chronic kidney disease indication.



**Figure 9.3**—Pharmacologic treatment of hyperglycemia in adults with type 2 diabetes. 2022 ADA Professional Practice Committee (PPC) adaptation of Davies et al. (43) and Buse et al. (44). For appropriate context, see Fig. 4.1. The 2022 ADA PPC adaptation emphasizes incorporation of therapy rather than sequential add-on, which may require adjustment of current therapies. Therapeutic regimen should be tailored to comorbidities, patient-centered treatment factors, and management needs. ASCVD, atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CVD, cardiovascular disease; CVDts, cardiovascular outcomes trials; DPP-4i, dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitor; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; GLP-1 RA, glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist; HF, heart failure; SGLT2i, sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor; SU, sulfonylurea; TZD, type 2 diabetes; TZD, thiazolidinedione.



reduce potential side effects and expense (52). However, there are data to support initial combination therapy for more rapid attainment of glycemic goals (53,54) and later combination therapy for longer durability of glycemic effect (55). The VERIFY (Vildagliptin Efficacy in combination with metformin For early treatment of type 2 diabetes) trial demonstrated that initial combination therapy is superior to sequential addition of medications for extending primary and secondary failure (56). In the VERIFY trial, participants receiving the initial combination of metformin and the dipeptidyl peptidase 4 (DPP-4) inhibitor vildagliptin had a slower decline of glycemic control compared with metformin alone and with vildagliptin added sequentially to metformin. These results have not been generalized to oral agents other than vildagliptin, but they suggest that more intensive early treatment has some benefits and should be considered through a shared decision-making process with patients, as appropriate. Initial combination therapy should be considered in patients presenting with A1C levels 1.5–2.0% above target. Finally, incorporation of high glycemic efficacy therapies or therapies for cardiovascular/renal risk reduction (e.g., GLP-1 RAs, SGLT2 inhibitors) may allow for weaning of the current regimen, particularly of agents that may increase the risk of hypoglycemia. Thus, treatment intensification may not necessarily follow a pure sequential addition of therapy but instead reflect a tailoring of the regimen in alignment with patient-centered treatment goals (Fig. 9.3).

Recommendations for treatment intensification for patients not meeting treatment goals should not be delayed. Shared decision-making is important in discussions regarding treatment intensification. The choice of medication added to initial therapy is based on the clinical characteristics of the patient and their preferences. Important clinical characteristics include the presence of established ASCVD or indicators of high ASCVD risk, HF, CKD, other comorbidities, and risk for specific adverse drug effects, as well as safety, tolerability, and cost. A comparative effectiveness meta-analysis suggests that each new class of noninsulin agents added to initial therapy with

metformin generally lowers A1C approximately 0.7–1.0% (57,58). (Fig. 9.3 and Table 9.2).

For patients with established ASCVD or indicators of high ASCVD risk (such as patients  $\geq 55$  years of age with coronary, carotid, or lower-extremity artery stenosis  $>50\%$  or left ventricular hypertrophy), HF, or CKD, an SGLT2 inhibitor or GLP-1 RA with demonstrated CVD benefit (Table 9.2, Table 10.3B, Table 10.3C, and Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>) is recommended as part of the glucose-lowering regimen independent of A1C, independent of metformin use, and in consideration of patient-specific factors (Fig. 9.3). For patients without established ASCVD, indicators of high ASCVD risk, HF, or CKD, the choice of a second agent to add to metformin is not yet guided by empiric evidence comparing across multiple classes. Rather, drug choice is based on efficacy, avoidance of side effects (particularly hypoglycemia and weight gain), cost, and patient preferences (59). Similar considerations are applied in patients who require a third agent to achieve glycemic goals. A recent systematic review and network meta-analysis suggests greatest reductions in A1C level with insulin regimens and specific GLP-1 RAs added to metformin-based background therapy (60). In all cases, treatment regimens need to be continuously reviewed for efficacy, side effects, and patient burden (Table 9.2). In some instances, patients will require medication reduction or discontinuation. Common reasons for this include ineffectiveness, intolerable side effects, expense, or a change in glycemic goals (e.g., in response to development of comorbidities or changes in treatment goals). Section 13, “Older Adults” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>), has a full discussion of treatment considerations in older adults, in whom changes of glycemic goals and de-escalation of therapy are common.


The need for the greater potency of injectable medications is common, particularly in people with a longer duration of diabetes. The addition of basal insulin, either human NPH or one of the long-acting insulin analogs, to oral agent regimens is a well-established approach that is effective for many patients. In addition, recent evidence supports the utility of GLP-1 RAs in patients not at

glycemic goal. While most GLP-1 RAs are injectable, an oral formulation of semaglutide is now commercially available (61). In trials comparing the addition of an injectable GLP-1 RA or insulin in patients needing further glucose lowering, glycemic efficacy of injectable GLP-1 RA was similar or greater than that of basal insulin (62–68). GLP-1 RAs in these trials had a lower risk of hypoglycemia and beneficial effects on body weight compared with insulin, albeit with greater gastrointestinal side effects. Thus, trial results support GLP-1 RAs as the preferred option for patients requiring the potency of an injectable therapy for glucose control (Fig. 9.4). In patients who are intensified to insulin therapy, combination therapy with a GLP-1 RA has been shown to have greater efficacy and durability of glycemic treatment effect than treatment intensification with insulin alone. However, cost and tolerability issues are important considerations in GLP-1 RA use.

Costs for diabetes medications has increased dramatically over the past two decades, and an increasing proportion is now passed on to patients and their families (69). Table 9.3 provides cost information for currently approved noninsulin therapies. Of note, prices listed are average wholesale prices (AWP) (70) and National Average Drug Acquisition Costs (NADAC) (71), separate measures to allow for a comparison of drug prices, but do not account for discounts, rebates, or other price adjustments often involved in prescription sales that affect the actual cost incurred by the patient. Medication costs can be a major source of stress for patients with diabetes and contribute to worse adherence to medications (72); cost-reducing strategies may improve adherence in some cases (73).

### Cardiovascular Outcomes Trials

There are now multiple large randomized controlled trials reporting statistically significant reductions in cardiovascular events in patients with type 2 diabetes treated with an SGLT2 inhibitor or GLP-1 RA; see Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>) for details. Subjects enrolled in many of the cardiovascular outcomes trials had A1C  $\geq 6.5\%$ , with



1. Consider insulin as the first injectable if evidence of ongoing catabolism, symptoms of hyperglycemia are present, when A1C levels (>10% [86 mmol/mol]) or blood glucose levels (≥300 mg/dL [16.7 mmol/L]) are very high, or a diagnosis of type 1 diabetes is a possibility.
2. When selecting GLP-1 RA, consider: patient preference, A1C lowering, weight-lowering effect, or frequency of injection. If CVD, consider GLP-1 RA with proven CVD benefit. Oral or injectable GLP-1 RA are appropriate.
3. For patients on GLP-1 RA and basal insulin combination, consider use of a fixed-ratio combination product (IDegLira or iGlarLixi).
4. Consider switching from evening NPH to a basal analog if the patient develops hypoglycemia and/or frequently forgets to administer NPH in the evening and would be better managed with an AM dose of a long-acting basal insulin.
5. If adding prandial insulin to NPH, consider initiation of a self-mixed or premixed insulin regimen to decrease the number of injections required.

**Figure 9.4**—Intensifying to injectable therapies in type 2 diabetes. DSMES, diabetes self-management education and support; FPG, fasting plasma glucose; GLP-1 RA, glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist; max, maximum; PPG, postprandial glucose. Adapted from Davies et al. (43).

**Table 9.3—Median monthly (30-day) AWP and NADAC of maximum approved daily dose of noninsulin glucose-lowering agents in the U.S.**

Class	Compound(s)	Dosage strength/ product (if applicable)	Median AWP (min, max) <sup>†</sup>	Median NADAC (min, max) <sup>†</sup>	Maximum approved daily dose*
Biguanides	• Metformin	850 mg (IR)	\$108 (\$5, \$109)	\$3	2,550 mg
		1,000 mg (IR)	\$87 (\$5, \$88)	\$2	2,000 mg
		1,000 mg (ER)	\$242 (\$242, \$7,214)	\$102 (\$102, \$430)	2,000 mg
Sulfonylureas (2nd generation)	• Glimepiride	4 mg	\$74 (\$71, \$198)	\$3	8 mg
		10 mg (IR)	\$68 (\$67, \$70)	\$3	40 mg
	• Glipizide	10 mg (XL/ER)	\$48	\$12	20 mg
		• Glyburide	6 mg (micronized)	\$52 (\$48, \$71)	\$11
		5 mg	\$82 (\$63, \$93)	\$12	20 mg
Thiazolidinediones	• Pioglitazone	45 mg	\$348 (\$7, \$349)	\$5	45 mg
	• Rosiglitazone	4 mg	N/A	\$324	8 mg
α-Glucosidase inhibitors	• Acarbose	100 mg	\$106 (\$104, \$106)	\$26	300 mg
	• Miglitol	100 mg	\$284 (\$241, \$346)	N/A	300 mg
Meglitinides (glinides)	• Nateglinide	120 mg	\$155	\$28	360 mg
	• Repaglinide	2 mg	\$878 (\$58, \$897)	\$34	16 mg
DPP-4 inhibitors	• Alogliptin	25 mg	\$234	\$166	25 mg
	• Saxagliptin	5 mg	\$549	\$438	5 mg
	• Linagliptin	5 mg	\$583	\$466	5 mg
	• Sitagliptin	100 mg	\$596	\$477	100 mg
SGLT2 inhibitors	• Ertugliflozin	15 mg	\$372	\$297	15 mg
	• Dapagliflozin	10 mg	\$639	\$511	10 mg
	• Canagliflozin	300 mg	\$652	\$521	300 mg
	• Empagliflozin	25 mg	\$658	\$526	25 mg
GLP-1 RAs	• Exenatide (extended release)	2 mg powder for suspension or pen	\$909	\$727	2 mg**
		10 µg pen	\$933	\$746	20 µg
	• Exenatide	10 µg pen	\$933	\$746	20 µg
	• Dulaglutide	4.5 mg mL pen	\$1,013	\$811	4.5 mg**
	• Semaglutide	1 mg pen	\$1,022	\$822	1 mg**
		14 mg (tablet)	\$1,022	\$819	14 mg
• Liraglutide	1.8 mg pen	\$1,220	\$975	1.8 mg	
• Lixisenatide	20 µg pen	\$814	N/A	20 µg	
Bile acid sequestrant	• Colesevelam	625 mg tabs	\$710 (\$674, \$712)	\$75	3.75 g
		3.75 g suspension	\$674	\$222	3.75 g
Dopamine-2 agonist	• Bromocriptine	0.8 mg	\$1,036	\$833	4.8 mg
Amylin mimetic	• Pramlintide	120 µg pen	\$2,702	N/A	120 µg/injection††

AWP, average wholesale price; DPP-4, dipeptidyl peptidase 4; ER and XL, extended release; GLP-1 RA, glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist; IR, immediate release; max, maximum; min, minimum; N/A, data not available; NADAC, National Average Drug Acquisition Cost; SGLT2, sodium–glucose cotransporter 2. <sup>†</sup>Calculated for 30-day supply (AWP [70] or NADAC [71] unit price × number of doses required to provide maximum approved daily dose × 30 days); median AWP or NADAC listed alone when only one product and/or price. \*Utilized to calculate median AWP and NADAC (min, max); generic prices used, if available commercially. \*\*Administered once weekly. ††AWP and NADAC calculated based on 120 µg three times daily.

more than 70% taking metformin at baseline. Thus, a practical extension of these results to clinical practice is to use these drugs preferentially in patients with type 2 diabetes and established ASCVD or indicators of high ASCVD risk. For these patients, incorporating one of the SGLT2 inhibitors and/or GLP-1 RAs that have been demonstrated to have cardiovascular disease benefit is recom-

mended (Table 9.2, Fig. 9.3, and Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>). Emerging data suggest that use of both classes of drugs will provide additional cardiovascular and kidney outcomes benefit; thus, combination therapy with an SGLT2 inhibitor and a GLP-1 RA may be considered to provide the complementary outcomes benefits asso-

ciated with these classes of medication (74). In cardiovascular outcomes trials, empagliflozin, canagliflozin, dapagliflozin, liraglutide, semaglutide, and dulaglutide all had beneficial effects on indices of CKD, while dedicated renal outcomes studies have demonstrated benefit of specific SGLT2 inhibitors. See Section 11, “Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/>

**Table 9.4—Median cost of insulin products in the U.S. calculated as AWP (70) and NADAC (71) per 1,000 units of specified dosage form/product**

Insulins	Compounds	Dosage form/product	Median AWP (min, max)*	Median NADAC*
Rapid-acting	• Lispro follow-on product	U-100 vial	\$157	\$125
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$202	\$161
	• Lispro	U-100 vial	\$165†	\$132†
		U-100 cartridge	\$408	\$325
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$212†	\$170†
		U-200 prefilled pen	\$424	\$339
	• Lispro-aabc	U-100 vial	\$330	N/A
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$424	N/A
		U-200 prefilled pen	\$424	N/A
	• Glulisine	U-100 vial	\$341	\$272
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$439	\$352
	• Aspart	U-100 vial	\$174†	\$139†
		U-100 cartridge	\$215	\$172
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$223†	\$179†
	• Aspart (“faster acting product”)	U-100 vial	\$347	\$278
U-100 cartridge		\$430	N/A	
U-100 prefilled pen		\$447	\$356	
• Inhaled insulin	Inhalation cartridges	\$1,325	\$606	
Short-acting	• human regular	U-100 vial	\$165††	\$132††
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$208	\$167
Intermediate-acting	• human NPH	U-100 vial	\$165††	\$132††
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$208	\$167
Concentrated human regular insulin	• U-500 human regular insulin	U-500 vial	\$178	\$143
		U-500 prefilled pen	\$230	\$184
Long-acting	• Glargine follow-on products	U-100 prefilled pen	\$118	\$96
		U-100 vial	\$190 (118, 261)	\$95
	• Glargine	U-100 vial; U-100 prefilled pen	\$340	\$277
		U-300 prefilled pen	\$340	\$272
	• Detemir	U-100 vial; U-100 prefilled pen	\$370	\$296
	• Degludec	U-100 vial; U-100 prefilled pen; U-200 prefilled pen	\$407	\$325
Premixed insulin products	• NPH/regular 70/30	U-100 vial	\$165††	\$133††
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$208	\$167
	• Lispro 50/50	U-100 vial	\$342	\$274
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$424	\$338
	• Lispro 75/25	U-100 vial	\$152	\$273
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$212	\$170
	• Aspart 70/30	U-100 vial	\$180	\$144
		U-100 prefilled pen	\$224	\$179
Premixed insulin/GLP-1 RA products	• Glargine/Lixisenatide	100/33 µg prefilled pen	\$619	\$495
	• Degludec/Liraglutide	100/3.6 µg prefilled pen	\$917	\$732

AWP, average wholesale price; GLP-1 RA, glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist; N/A, not available; NADAC, National Average Drug Acquisition Cost. \*AWP or NADAC calculated as in **Table 9.3**. †Generic prices used when available. ††AWP and NADAC data presented do not include vials of regular human insulin and NPH available at Walmart for approximately \$25/vial; median listed alone when only one product and/or price.

dc22-S011) for discussion of how CKD may impact treatment choices. Additional large randomized trials of other agents in these classes are ongoing.

**Insulin Therapy**

Many patients with type 2 diabetes eventually require and benefit from insulin therapy (**Fig. 9.4**). See the section INSULIN INJECTION TECHNIQUE, above, for

guidance on how to administer insulin safely and effectively. The progressive nature of type 2 diabetes should be regularly and objectively explained to patients, and clinicians should avoid using insulin as a threat or describing it as a sign of personal failure or punishment. Rather, the utility and importance of insulin to maintain glycemic control once progression of the disease overcomes the

effect of other agents should be emphasized. Educating and involving patients in insulin management is beneficial. For example, instruction of patients in self-titration of insulin doses based on glucose monitoring improves glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes initiating insulin (75). Comprehensive education regarding self-monitoring of blood glucose, diet, and the avoidance and



appropriate treatment of hypoglycemia are critically important in any patient using insulin.

#### **Basal Insulin**

Basal insulin alone is the most convenient initial insulin regimen and can be added to metformin and other oral agents. Starting doses can be estimated based on body weight (0.1–0.2 units/kg/day) and the degree of hyperglycemia, with individualized titration over days to weeks as needed. The principal action of basal insulin is to restrain hepatic glucose production and limit hyperglycemia overnight and between meals (76,77). Control of fasting glucose can be achieved with human NPH insulin or a long-acting insulin analog. In clinical trials, long-acting basal analogs (U-100 glargine or detemir) have been demonstrated to reduce the risk of symptomatic and nocturnal hypoglycemia compared with NPH insulin (78–83), although these advantages are modest and may not persist (84). Longer-acting basal analogs (U-300 glargine or degludec) may convey a lower hypoglycemia risk compared with U-100 glargine when used in combination with oral agents (85–91). Clinicians should be aware of the potential for overbasalization with insulin therapy. Clinical signals that may prompt evaluation of overbasalization include basal dose greater than ~0.5 units/kg, high bedtime-morning or post-preprandial glucose differential (e.g., bedtime-morning glucose differential  $\geq 50$  mg/dL), hypoglycemia (aware or unaware), and high variability. Indication of overbasalization should prompt reevaluation to further individualize therapy (92).

The cost of insulin has been rising steadily over the past two decades, at a pace several fold that of other medical expenditures (93). This expense contributes significant burden to patients as insulin has become a growing “out-of-pocket” cost for people with diabetes, and direct patient costs contribute to treatment nonadherence (93). Therefore, consideration of cost is an important component of effective management. For many individuals with type 2 diabetes (e.g., individuals with relaxed A1C goals, low rates of hypoglycemia, and prominent insulin resistance, as well as those with cost concerns), human insulin (NPH and regular) may be the appropriate choice of therapy, and clinicians should

be familiar with its use (94). Human regular insulin, NPH, and 70/30 NPH/regular products can be purchased for considerably less than the AWP and NADAC prices listed in **Table 9.4** at select pharmacies. Additionally, approval of follow-on biologics for insulin glargine, the first interchangeable insulin glargine product, and generic versions of analog insulins may expand cost-effective options.

#### **Prandial Insulin**

Many individuals with type 2 diabetes require doses of insulin before meals, in addition to basal insulin, to reach glycaemic targets. A dose of 4 units or 10% of the amount of basal insulin at the largest meal or the meal with the greatest postprandial excursion is a safe estimate for initiating therapy. The prandial insulin regimen can then be intensified based on individual needs (see **Fig. 9.4**). Individuals with type 2 diabetes are generally more insulin resistant than those with type 1 diabetes, require higher daily doses (~1 unit/kg), and have lower rates of hypoglycemia (95). Titration can be based on home glucose monitoring or A1C. With significant additions to the prandial insulin dose, particularly with the evening meal, consideration should be given to decreasing basal insulin. Meta-analyses of trials comparing rapid-acting insulin analogs with human regular insulin in with type 2 diabetes have not reported important differences in A1C or hypoglycemia (96,97).

#### **Concentrated Insulins**

Several concentrated insulin preparations are currently available. U-500 regular insulin is, by definition, five times more concentrated than U-100 regular insulin. U-500 regular insulin has distinct pharmacokinetics with delayed onset and longer duration of action, has characteristics more like an intermediate-acting (NPH) insulin, and can be used as two or three daily injections (98). U-300 glargine and U-200 degludec are three and two times as concentrated as their U-100 formulations, respectively, and allow higher doses of basal insulin administration per volume used. U-300 glargine has a longer duration of action than U-100 glargine but modestly lower efficacy per unit administered (99,100). The FDA has also approved a concentrated formulation of rapid-acting

insulin lispro, U-200 (200 units/mL) and insulin lispro-aabc (U-200). These concentrated preparations may be more convenient and comfortable for individuals to inject and may improve adherence in those with insulin resistance who require large doses of insulin. While U-500 regular insulin is available in both prefilled pens and vials, other concentrated insulins are available only in prefilled pens to minimize the risk of dosing errors.

#### **Inhaled Insulin**

Inhaled insulin is available as a rapid-acting insulin; studies in individuals with type 1 diabetes suggest rapid pharmacokinetics (8). A pilot study found evidence that compared with injectable rapid-acting insulin, supplemental doses of inhaled insulin taken based on postprandial glucose levels may improve blood glucose management without additional hypoglycemia or weight gain (101), although results from a larger study are needed for confirmation. Use of inhaled insulin may result in a decline in lung function (reduced forced expiratory volume in 1 s [FEV<sub>1</sub>]). Inhaled insulin is contraindicated in individuals with chronic lung disease, such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and is not recommended in individuals who smoke or who recently stopped smoking. All individuals require spirometry (FEV<sub>1</sub>) testing to identify potential lung disease prior to and after starting inhaled insulin therapy.

#### **Combination Injectable Therapy**

If basal insulin has been titrated to an acceptable fasting blood glucose level (or if the dose is  $>0.5$  units/kg/day with indications of need for other therapy) and A1C remains above target, consider advancing to combination injectable therapy (**Fig. 9.4**). This approach can use a GLP-1 RA added to basal insulin or multiple doses of insulin. The combination of basal insulin and GLP-1 RA has potent glucose-lowering actions and less weight gain and hypoglycemia compared with intensified insulin regimens (102–106). The DUAL VIII randomized controlled trial demonstrated greater durability of glycaemic treatment effect with the combination GLP-1 RA–insulin therapy compared with addition of basal insulin alone (55). In select

individuals, complex insulin regimens can also be simplified with combination GLP-1 RA–insulin therapy in type 2 diabetes (107). Two different once-daily, fixed dual-combination products containing basal insulin plus a GLP-1 RA are available: insulin glargine plus lixisenatide (iGlarLixi) and insulin degludec plus liraglutide (IDegLira).

Intensification of insulin treatment can be done by adding doses of prandial insulin to basal insulin. Starting with a single prandial dose with the largest meal of the day is simple and effective, and it can be advanced to a regimen with multiple prandial doses if necessary (108). Alternatively, in an individual on basal insulin in whom additional prandial coverage is desired, the regimen can be converted to two doses of a premixed insulin. Each approach has advantages and disadvantages. For example, basal/prandial regimens offer greater flexibility for individuals who eat on irregular schedules. On the other hand, two doses of premixed insulin is a simple, convenient means of spreading insulin across the day. Moreover, human insulins, separately, self-mixed, or as premixed NPH/regular (70/30) formulations, are less costly alternatives to insulin analogs. **Figure 9.4** outlines these options as well as recommendations for further intensification, if needed, to achieve glycemic goals. When initiating combination injectable therapy, metformin therapy should be maintained, while sulfonylureas and DPP-4 inhibitors are typically weaned or discontinued. In individuals with suboptimal blood glucose control, especially those requiring large insulin doses, adjunctive use of a thiazolidinedione or an SGLT2 inhibitor may help to improve control and reduce the amount of insulin needed, though potential side effects should be considered. Once a basal/bolus insulin regimen is initiated, dose titration is important, with adjustments made in both mealtime and basal insulins based on the blood glucose levels and an understanding of the pharmacodynamic profile of each formulation (also known as pattern control or pattern management). As people with type 2 diabetes get older, it may become necessary to simplify complex insulin regimens because of a decline in self-management ability (see Section 13, “Older Adults,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>).

## 2022 ADA Professional Practice Committee Updates to Fig. 9.3

The 2022 ADA Professional Practice Committee focused on several key areas in **Fig. 9.3** to reconcile emerging evidence and support harmonization of guidelines. Areas of discussion and updated changes are outlined below.

1. *Title and Purpose of Algorithm.* Given the significant impact the cardiovascular outcomes trials have had on understanding the management of type 2 diabetes and the different guidelines and algorithms being proposed by different societies, it was important to identify the purpose of **Fig. 9.3**, recognizing that no single algorithm covers all circumstances or goals. The purpose of this guidance is to support achievement of glycemic goals to reduce long-term complications, highlighting aspects of therapy that support patient-centered goals. Thus, the scope of this algorithm is defined as the “Pharmacologic Treatment of Hyperglycemia in Adults with Type 2 Diabetes.” Toward this goal, glycemic status should be assessed, with treatment modified regularly (e.g., at least twice yearly if stable and more often if not to goal) to achieve patient-centered treatment goals and to avoid therapeutic inertia.
2. *Initial Therapy.* First-line therapy for the treatment of hyperglycemia has traditionally been metformin and comprehensive lifestyle. Recognizing the multiple treatment goals and comorbidities for individuals with type 2 diabetes, alternative initial treatment approaches to metformin are acceptable, depending on comorbidities, patient-centered treatment factors, and glycemic and comorbidity management needs.
3. *+ASCVD/Indicators of High Cardiovascular Risk.* Please see Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>), for comprehensive review of evidence. This pathway has been streamlined to highlight therapies that have evidence to support cardiovascular risk reduction and glycemic management, prioritizing GLP-1 RAs and SGLT2 inhibitors for this population.
4. *+HF.* This pathway highlights the emerging evidence of improvement in cardiovascular outcomes with SGLT2 inhibitors in individuals with type 2 diabetes and existing HF.
5. *+CKD.* This pathway has been updated based on populations studied in renal and cardiovascular outcomes studies and to specify recommendations when further intensification is required (e.g., for patients on an SGLT2 inhibitor, consider incorporating GLP-1 RA and vice versa).
6. *Principle of Incorporation.* Prior algorithms have conveyed sequential addition of therapy. Recognizing the importance of tailoring the therapeutic regimen to the individual’s needs and comorbidities, the principle of incorporation is emphasized throughout **Fig. 9.3**. Not all treatment intensification results in sequential add-on therapy, but in some cases it may involve switching therapy or weaning current therapy to accommodate therapeutic changes. For example, discontinuation of the DPP-4 inhibitor is recommended when intensifying from a DPP-4 inhibitor to a GLP-1 RA, given overlapping mechanisms. In addition, when cardioprotective agents (e.g., SGLT2 inhibitors, GLP-1 RAs) are introduced in the regimen, this may require weaning current therapy to minimize hypoglycemia, dependent on baseline A1C status.
7. *Treatment Intensification.* For the individual with high risk or established ASCVD, CKD, or HF whose A1C remains above target, further treatment intensification should be based on comorbidities, patient-centered treatment factors, and management needs as highlighted on the right side of **Fig. 9.3**.
8. *Efficacy.* Agents should be considered that provide adequate efficacy to achieve and maintain glycemic goals (**Table 9.2**) (60) while considering additional patient-centered factors (e.g., focus on minimizing hypoglycemia, focus on minimizing weight gain and promoting weight loss, and access/cost considerations).
9. *Minimize Hypoglycemia.* Agents with no/low inherent risk of hypoglycemia are preferred, with incorporation of additional agents as indicated.

10. *Minimize Weight Gain/Promote Weight Loss.* Agents with good efficacy for weight loss are preferred (109), with incorporation of additional agents as indicated.
11. *Access/Cost Considerations.* Access and cost are universal considerations. Classes with medications currently available in generic form are listed.

## References

1. Cleary PA, Orchard TJ, Genuth S, et al.; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. The effect of intensive glycemic treatment on coronary artery calcification in type 1 diabetic participants of the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) Study. *Diabetes* 2006;55:3556–3565
2. Nathan DM, Cleary PA, Backlund J-YC, et al.; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) Study Research Group. Intensive diabetes treatment and cardiovascular disease in patients with type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353:2643–2653
3. Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT)/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) Study Research Group. Mortality in type 1 diabetes in the DCCT/EDIC versus the general population. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1378–1383
4. Writing Team for the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications Research Group. Effect of intensive therapy on the microvascular complications of type 1 diabetes mellitus. *JAMA* 2002;287:2563–2569
5. Holt RIG, DeVries JH, Hess-Fischl A, et al. The management of type 1 diabetes in adults. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:2589–2625
6. Tricco AC, Ashoor HM, Antony J, et al. Safety, effectiveness, and cost effectiveness of long acting versus intermediate acting insulin for patients with type 1 diabetes: systematic review and network meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2014;349:g5459
7. Bartley PC, Bogoev M, Larsen J, Philotheou A. Long-term efficacy and safety of insulin detemir compared to Neutral Protamine Hagedorn insulin in patients with Type 1 diabetes using a treat-to-target basal-bolus regimen with insulin aspart at meals: a 2-year, randomized, controlled trial. *Diabet Med* 2008;25:442–449
8. DeWitt DE, Hirsch IB. Outpatient insulin therapy in type 1 and type 2 diabetes mellitus: scientific review. *JAMA* 2003;289:2254–2264
9. Bode BW, McGill JB, Lorber DL, Gross JL, Chang PC, Bregman DB; Affinity 1 Study Group. Inhaled technosphere insulin compared with injected prandial insulin in type 1 diabetes: a randomized 24-week trial. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:2266–2273
10. Russell-Jones D, Bode BW, De Block C, et al. Fast-acting insulin aspart improves glycemic control in basal-bolus treatment for type 1 diabetes: results of a 26-week multicenter, active-controlled, treat-to-target, randomized, parallel-group trial (onset 1). *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:943–950
11. Klaff L, Cao D, Dellva MA, et al. Ultra rapid lispro improves postprandial glucose control compared with lispro in patients with type 1 diabetes: results from the 26-week PRONTO-T1D study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2020;22:1799–1807
12. Blevins T, Zhang Q, Frias JP, Jinnouchi H; PRONTO-T2D Investigators. Randomized double-blind clinical trial comparing ultra rapid lispro with lispro in a basal-bolus regimen in patients with type 2 diabetes: PRONTO-T2D. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2991–2998
13. Lane W, Bailey TS, Gerety G, et al.; Group Information; SWITCH 1. Effect of insulin degludec vs insulin glargine U100 on hypoglycemia in patients with type 1 diabetes: the SWITCH 1 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2017;318:33–44
14. Home PD, Bergenstal RM, Bolli GB, et al. New insulin glargine 300 units/mL versus glargine 100 units/mL in people with type 1 diabetes: a randomized, phase 3a, open-label clinical trial (EDITION 4). *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:2217–2225
15. 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
16. Pickup JC. The evidence base for diabetes technology: appropriate and inappropriate meta-analysis. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2013;7:1567–1574
17. Bergenstal RM, Klonoff DC, Garg SK, et al.; ASPIRE In-Home Study Group. Threshold-based insulin-pump interruption for reduction of hypoglycemia. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:224–232
18. Buckingham BA, Raghinaru D, Cameron F, et al.; In Home Closed Loop Study Group. Predictive low-glucose insulin suspension reduces duration of nocturnal hypoglycemia in children without increasing ketosis. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1197–1204
19. 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
20. 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
21. 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
22. 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
23. Peters AL, Laffel L (Eds.). *American Diabetes Association/JDRF Type 1 Diabetes Sourcebook*. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2013
24. Chiang JL, Kirkman MS, Laffel LMB; Type 1 Diabetes Sourcebook Authors. Type 1 diabetes through the life span: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2034–2054
25. Bell KJ, Barclay AW, Petocz P, Colagiuri S, Brand-Miller JC. Efficacy of carbohydrate counting in type 1 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2:133–140
26. Vaz EC, Porfírio GJM, Nunes HRC, Nunes-Nogueira VDS. Effectiveness and safety of carbohydrate counting in the management of adult patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Endocrinol Metab* 2018;62:337–345
27. Bell KJ, Smart CE, Steil GM, Brand-Miller JC, King B, Wolpert HA. Impact of fat, protein, and glycemic index on postprandial glucose control in type 1 diabetes: implications for intensive diabetes management in the continuous glucose monitoring era. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1008–1015
28. Frid AH, Kreugel G, Grassi G, et al. New insulin delivery recommendations. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2016;91:1231–1255
29. Bergenstal RM, Strock ES, Peremislov D, Gibney MA, Parvu V, Hirsch LJ. Safety and efficacy of insulin therapy delivered via a 4mm pen needle in obese patients with diabetes. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2015;90:329–338
30. Whitehouse F, Kruger DF, Fineman M, et al. A randomized study and open-label extension evaluating the long-term efficacy of pramlintide as an adjunct to insulin therapy in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2002;25:724–730
31. Ratner RE, Want LL, Fineman MS, et al. Adjunctive therapy with the amylin analogue pramlintide leads to a combined improvement in glycemic and weight control in insulin-treated subjects with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2002;4:51–61
32. Hollander PA, Levy P, Fineman MS, et al. Pramlintide as an adjunct to insulin therapy improves long-term glycemic and weight control in patients with type 2 diabetes: a 1-year randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:784–790
33. Ratner RE, Dickey R, Fineman M, et al. Amylin replacement with pramlintide as an adjunct to insulin therapy improves long-term glycaemic and weight control in type 1 diabetes mellitus: a 1-year, randomized controlled trial. *Diabet Med* 2004;21:1204–1212
34. Meng H, Zhang A, Liang Y, Hao J, Zhang X, Lu J. Effect of metformin on glycaemic control in patients with type 1 diabetes: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2018;34:e2983
35. Petrie JR, Chaturvedi N, Ford I, et al.; REMOVAL Study Group. Cardiovascular and metabolic effects of metformin in patients with type 1 diabetes (REMOVAL): a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;5:597–609
36. Mathieu C, Zinman B, Hemmingsson JU, et al.; ADJUNCT ONE Investigators. Efficacy and safety of liraglutide added to insulin treatment in type 1 diabetes: the ADJUNCT ONE treat-to-target randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1702–1710
37. Ahrén B, Hirsch IB, Pieber TR, et al.; ADJUNCT TWO Investigators. Efficacy and safety of liraglutide added to capped insulin treatment in subjects with type 1 diabetes: the ADJUNCT TWO randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1693–1701



38. Dandona P, Mathieu C, Phillip M, et al.; DEPICT-1 Investigators. Efficacy and safety of dapagliflozin in patients with inadequately controlled type 1 diabetes (DEPICT-1): 24 week results from a multicentre, double-blind, phase 3, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;5:864–876
39. Rosenstock J, Marquard J, Laffel LM, et al. Empagliflozin as adjunctive to insulin therapy in type 1 diabetes: the EASE trials. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2560–2569
40. Snaith JR, Holmes-Walker DJ, Greenfield JR. Reducing type 1 diabetes mortality: role for adjunctive therapies? *Trends Endocrinol Metab* 2020;31:150–164
41. Danne T, Garg S, Peters AL, et al. International consensus on risk management of diabetic ketoacidosis in patients with type 1 diabetes treated with sodium-glucose cotransporter (SGLT) inhibitors. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:1147–1154
42. Dean PG, Kukla A, Stegall MD, Kudva YC. Pancreas transplantation. *BMJ* 2017;357:j1321
43. Davies MJ, D'Alessio DA, Fradkin J, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2018. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2669–2701
44. Buse JB, Wexler DJ, Tsapas A, et al. 2019 update to: management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2018. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:487–493
45. Holman RR, Paul SK, Bethel MA, Matthews DR, Neil HAW. 10-year follow-up of intensive glucose control in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;359:1577–1589
46. Maruthur NM, Tseng E, Hutfless S, et al. Diabetes medications as monotherapy or metformin-based combination therapy for type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2016;164:740–751
47. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA Drug Safety Communication: FDA revises warnings regarding use of the diabetes medicine metformin in certain patients with reduced kidney function. Accessed 20 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-drug-safety-communication-fda-revises-warnings-regarding-use-diabetes-medicine-metformin-certain>
48. Out M, Kooy A, Leher P, Schalkwijk CA, Stehouwer CDA. Long-term treatment with metformin in type 2 diabetes and methylmalonic acid: post hoc analysis of a randomized controlled 4.3-year trial. *J Diabetes Complications* 2018;32:171–178
49. Aroda VR, Edelstein SL, Goldberg RB, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Long-term metformin use and vitamin B12 deficiency in the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2016;101:1754–1761
50. Henry RR, Murray AV, Marmolejo MH, Hennicken D, Ptaszynska A, List JF. Dapagliflozin, metformin XR, or both: initial pharmacotherapy for type 2 diabetes, a randomised controlled trial. *Int J Clin Pract* 2012;66:446–456
51. Babu A, Mehta A, Guerrero P, et al. Safe and simple emergency department discharge therapy for patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and severe hyperglycemia. *Endocr Pract* 2009;15:696–704
52. Cahn A, Cefalu WT. Clinical considerations for use of initial combination therapy in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39(Suppl. 2):S137–S145
53. Abdul-Ghani MA, Puckett C, Triplitt C, et al. Initial combination therapy with metformin, pioglitazone and exenatide is more effective than sequential add-on therapy in subjects with new-onset diabetes. Results from the Efficacy and Durability of Initial Combination Therapy for Type 2 Diabetes (EDICT): a randomized trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:268–275
54. Phung OJ, Sobieraj DM, Engel SS, Rajpathak SN. Early combination therapy for the treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2014;16:410–417
55. Aroda VR, González-Galvez G, Grøn R, et al. Durability of insulin degludec plus liraglutide versus insulin glargine U100 as initial injectable therapy in type 2 diabetes (DUAL VIII): a multicentre, open-label, phase 3b, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2019;7:596–605
56. Matthews DR, Paldanius PM, Proot P, Chiang Y, Stumvoll M; VERIFY study group. Glycaemic durability of an early combination therapy with vildagliptin and metformin versus sequential metformin monotherapy in newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes (VERIFY): a 5-year, multicentre, randomised, double-blind trial. *Lancet* 2019;394:1519–1529
57. Bennett WL, Maruthur NM, Singh S, et al. Comparative effectiveness and safety of medications for type 2 diabetes: an update including new drugs and 2-drug combinations. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;154:602–613
58. Maloney A, Rosenstock J, Fonseca V. A model-based meta-analysis of 24 antihyperglycemic drugs for type 2 diabetes: comparison of treatment effects at therapeutic doses. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2019;105:1213–1223
59. Vijan S, Sussman JB, Yudkin JS, Hayward RA. Effect of patients' risks and preferences on health gains with plasma glucose level lowering in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *JAMA Intern Med* 2014;174:1227–1234
60. Tsapas A, Avgerinos I, Karagiannis T, et al. Comparative effectiveness of glucose-lowering drugs for type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2020;173:278–286
61. Pratley R, Amod A, Hoff ST, et al.; PIONEER 4 investigators. Oral semaglutide versus subcutaneous liraglutide and placebo in type 2 diabetes (PIONEER 4): a randomised, double-blind, phase 3a trial. *Lancet* 2019;394:39–50
62. Singh S, Wright EE Jr, Kwan AYM, et al. Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists compared with basal insulins for the treatment of type 2 diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2017;19:228–238
63. Levin PA, Nguyen H, Wittbrodt ET, Kim SC. Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonists: a systematic review of comparative effectiveness research. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes* 2017;10:123–139
64. Abd El Aziz MS, Kahle M, Meier JJ, Nauck MA. A meta-analysis comparing clinical effects of short- or long-acting GLP-1 receptor agonists versus insulin treatment from head-to-head studies in type 2 diabetic patients. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2017;19:216–227
65. Giorgino F, Benroubi M, Sun J-H, Zimmermann AG, Pechtner V. Efficacy and safety of once-weekly dulaglutide versus insulin glargine in patients with type 2 diabetes on metformin and glimepiride (AWARD-2). *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:2241–2249
66. Aroda VR, Bain SC, Cariou B, et al. Efficacy and safety of once-weekly semaglutide versus once-daily insulin glargine as add-on to metformin (with or without sulfonylureas) in insulin-naïve patients with type 2 diabetes (SUSTAIN 4): a randomised, open-label, parallel-group, multicentre, multinational, phase 3a trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;5:355–366
67. Davies M, Heller S, Sreenan S, et al. Once-weekly exenatide versus once- or twice-daily insulin detemir: randomized, open-label, clinical trial of efficacy and safety in patients with type 2 diabetes treated with metformin alone or in combination with sulfonylureas. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1368–1376
68. Diamant M, Van Gaal L, Stranks S, et al. Once weekly exenatide compared with insulin glargine titrated to target in patients with type 2 diabetes (DURATION-3): an open-label randomised trial. *Lancet* 2010;375:2234–2243
69. Riddle MC, Herman WH. The cost of diabetes care—an elephant in the room. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:929–932
70. Truven Health Analytics. Micromedex 2.0: Introduction to RED BOOK Online. Accessed 20 October 2021. Available from [https://www.micromedexolutions.com/micromedex2/4.34.0/WebHelp/RED\\_BOOK/Introduction\\_to\\_REDB\\_BOOK\\_Online.htm](https://www.micromedexolutions.com/micromedex2/4.34.0/WebHelp/RED_BOOK/Introduction_to_REDB_BOOK_Online.htm)
71. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. NADAC (National Average Drug Acquisition Cost) 2021. Accessed 15 October 2021. Available from <https://data.medicare.gov/dataset/d5eaf378-dcef-5779-83de-acdd8347d68e>
72. Kang H, Lobo JM, Kim S, Sohn M-W. Cost-related medication non-adherence among U.S. adults with diabetes. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2018;143:24–33
73. Patel MR, Piette JD, Resnicow K, Kowalski-Dobson T, Heisler M. Social determinants of health, cost-related nonadherence, and cost-reducing behaviors among adults with diabetes: findings from the National Health Interview Survey. *Med Care* 2016;54:796–803
74. Gerstein HC, Sattar N, Rosenstock J, et al.; AMPLITUDE-O Trial Investigators. Cardiovascular and renal outcomes with efglenatide in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2021;385:896–907
75. Blonde L, Merilainen M, Karwe V; TITRATE Study Group. Patient-directed titration for achieving glycaemic goals using a once-daily basal insulin analogue: an assessment of two different fasting plasma glucose targets - the TITRATE study. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2009;11:623–631
76. Porcellati F, Lucidi P, Cioli P, et al. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of insulin glargine given in the evening as compared with in the morning in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:503–512



77. Wang Z, Hedrington MS, Gogitidze Joy N, et al. Dose-response effects of insulin glargine in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1555–1560
78. Singh SR, Ahmad F, Lal A, Yu C, Bai Z, Bennett H. Efficacy and safety of insulin analogues for the management of diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis. *CMAJ* 2009;180:385–397
79. Horvath K, Jeitler K, Berghold A, et al. Long-acting insulin analogues versus NPH insulin (human isophane insulin) for type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007;2:CD005613
80. Monami M, Marchionni N, Mannucci E. Long-acting insulin analogues versus NPH human insulin in type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2008;81:184–189
81. Owens DR, Traylor L, Mullins P, Landgraf W. Patient-level meta-analysis of efficacy and hypoglycaemia in people with type 2 diabetes initiating insulin glargine 100U/mL or neutral protamine Hagedorn insulin analysed according to concomitant oral antidiabetes therapy. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2017;124(Suppl. C):57–65
82. Riddle MC, Rosenstock J; Insulin Glargine 4002 Study Investigators. The treat-to-target trial: randomized addition of glargine or human NPH insulin to oral therapy of type 2 diabetic patients. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:3080–3086
83. Hermansen K, Davies M, Derezinski T, Martinez Ravn G, Clauson P, Home P. A 26-week, randomized, parallel, treat-to-target trial comparing insulin detemir with NPH insulin as add-on therapy to oral glucose-lowering drugs in insulin-naïve people with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:1269–1274
84. Yki-Järvinen H, Kauppinen-Mäkelin R, Tiikkainen M, et al. Insulin glargine or NPH combined with metformin in type 2 diabetes: the LANMET study. *Diabetologia* 2006;49:442–451
85. Bolli GB, Riddle MC, Bergenstal RM, et al.; on behalf of the EDITION 3 study investigators. New insulin glargine 300 U/ml compared with glargine 100 U/ml in insulin-naïve people with type 2 diabetes on oral glucose-lowering drugs: a randomized controlled trial (EDITION 3). *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:386–394
86. Terauchi Y, Koyama M, Cheng X, et al. New insulin glargine 300 U/ml versus glargine 100 U/ml in Japanese people with type 2 diabetes using basal insulin and oral antihyperglycaemic drugs: glucose control and hypoglycaemia in a randomized controlled trial (EDITION JP 2). *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2016;18:366–374
87. Yki-Järvinen H, Bergenstal RM, Bolli GB, et al. Glycaemic control and hypoglycaemia with new insulin glargine 300 U/ml versus insulin glargine 100 U/ml in people with type 2 diabetes using basal insulin and oral antihyperglycaemic drugs: the EDITION 2 randomized 12-month trial including 6-month extension. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:1142–1149
88. Marso SP, McGuire DK, Zinman B, et al.; DEVOTE Study Group. Efficacy and safety of degludec versus glargine in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:723–732
89. Rodbard HW, Cariou B, Zinman B, et al.; BEGIN Once Long trial investigators. Comparison of insulin degludec with insulin glargine in insulin-naïve subjects with type 2 diabetes: a 2-year randomized, treat-to-target trial. *Diabet Med* 2013;30:1298–1304
90. Wysham C, Bhargava A, Chaykin L, et al. Effect of insulin degludec vs insulin glargine U100 on hypoglycemia in patients with type 2 diabetes: the SWITCH 2 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2017;318:45–56
91. Zinman B, Philis-Tsimikas A, Cariou B, et al.; NN1250-3579 (BEGIN Once Long) Trial Investigators. Insulin degludec versus insulin glargine in insulin-naïve patients with type 2 diabetes: a 1-year, randomized, treat-to-target trial (BEGIN Once Long). *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:2464–2471
92. Cowart K. Overbasalization: addressing hesitancy in treatment intensification beyond basal insulin. *Clin Diabetes* 2020;38:304–310
93. Cefalu WT, Dawes DE, Gavlak G, et al.; Insulin Access and Affordability Working Group. Insulin Access and Affordability Working Group: conclusions and recommendations. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1299–1311.
94. Lipska KJ, Parker MM, Moffet HH, Huang ES, Karter AJ. Association of initiation of basal insulin analogs vs neutral protamine hagedorn insulin with hypoglycemia-related emergency department visits or hospital admissions and with glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes. *JAMA* 2018;320:53–62
95. McCall AL. Insulin therapy and hypoglycemia. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am* 2012;41:57–87
96. Mannucci E, Monami M, Marchionni N. Short-acting insulin analogues vs. regular human insulin in type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2009;11:53–59
97. Heller S, Bode B, Kozlovski P, Svendsen AL. Meta-analysis of insulin aspart versus regular human insulin used in a basal-bolus regimen for the treatment of diabetes mellitus. *J Diabetes* 2013;5:482–491
98. Wysham C, Hood RC, Warren ML, Wang T, Morwick TM, Jackson JA. Effect of total daily dose on efficacy, dosing, and safety of 2 dose titration regimens of human regular U500 insulin in severely insulin-resistant patients with type 2 diabetes. *Endocr Pract* 2016;22:653–665
99. Riddle MC, Yki-Järvinen H, Bolli GB, et al. One-year sustained glycaemic control and less hypoglycaemia with new insulin glargine 300 U/ml compared with 100 U/ml in people with type 2 diabetes using basal plus meal-time insulin: the EDITION 1 12-month randomized trial, including 6-month extension. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2015;17:835–842
100. Yki-Järvinen H, Bergenstal R, Ziemer M, et al.; EDITION 2 Study Investigators. New insulin glargine 300 units/mL versus glargine 100 units/mL in people with type 2 diabetes using oral agents and basal insulin: glucose control and hypoglycemia in a 6-month randomized controlled trial (EDITION 2). *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:3235–3243
101. Akturk HK, Snell-Bergeon JK, Rewers A, et al. Improved postprandial glucose with inhaled technosphere insulin compared with insulin aspart in patients with type 1 diabetes on multiple daily injections: the STAT study. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:639–647
102. Diamant M, Nauck MA, Shaginian R, et al.; 4B Study Group. Glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist or bolus insulin with optimized basal insulin in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2763–2773
103. Eng C, Kramer CK, Zinman B, Retnakaran R. Glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist and basal insulin combination treatment for the management of type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2014;384:2228–2234
104. Maiorino MI, Chiodini P, Bellastella G, Capuano A, Esposito K, Giugliano D. Insulin and glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist combination therapy in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:614–624
105. Aroda VR, Rosenstock J, Wysham C, et al.; LixiLan-L Trial Investigators. Efficacy and safety of LixiLan, a titratable fixed-ratio combination of insulin glargine plus lixisenatide in type 2 diabetes inadequately controlled on basal insulin and metformin: the LixiLan-L randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1972–1980
106. Lingvay I, Pérez Manghi F, García-Hernández P, et al.; DUAL V Investigators. Effect of insulin glargine up-titration vs insulin degludec/liraglutide on glycated hemoglobin levels in patients with uncontrolled type 2 diabetes: the DUAL V randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2016;315:898–907
107. Taybani Z, Bótyik B, Katkó M, Gyimesi A, Várkonyi T. Simplifying complex insulin regimens while preserving good glycemic control in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Ther* 2019;10:1869–1878
108. Rodbard HW, Visco VE, Andersen H, Hiort LC, Shu DHW. Treatment intensification with stepwise addition of prandial insulin aspart boluses compared with full basal-bolus therapy (FullSTEP Study): a randomised, treat-to-target clinical trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2:30–37
109. Tsapas A, Karagiannis T, Kakotrichi P, et al. Comparative efficacy of glucose-lowering medications on body weight and blood pressure in patients with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2021;23:2116–2124



# 10. Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S144–S174 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>

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).

*For prevention and management of diabetes complications in children and adolescents, please refer to Section 14, “Children and Adolescents” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>).*

Atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD)—defined as coronary heart disease (CHD), cerebrovascular disease, or peripheral arterial disease presumed to be of atherosclerotic origin—is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality for individuals with diabetes and results in an estimated \$37.3 billion in cardiovascular-related spending per year associated with diabetes (1). Common conditions coexisting with type 2 diabetes (e.g., hypertension and dyslipidemia) are clear risk factors for ASCVD, and diabetes itself confers independent risk. Numerous studies have shown the efficacy of controlling individual cardiovascular risk factors in preventing or slowing ASCVD in people with diabetes. Furthermore, large benefits are seen when multiple cardiovascular risk factors are addressed simultaneously. Under the current paradigm of aggressive risk factor modification in patients with diabetes, there is evidence that measures of 10-year coronary heart disease (CHD) risk among U.S. adults with diabetes have improved significantly over the past decade (2) and that ASCVD morbidity and mortality have decreased (3,4).

Heart failure is another major cause of morbidity and mortality from cardiovascular disease. Recent studies have found that rates of incident heart failure hospitalization (adjusted for age and sex) were twofold higher in patients with diabetes compared with those without (5,6). People with diabetes may have heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF) or with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF). Hypertension is often a precursor of heart failure of either type, and ASCVD can coexist with either type (7), whereas prior myocardial infarction (MI) is often a major factor in HFpEF. Rates of heart failure hospitalization have been improved in recent trials including patients with type 2

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

This section has received endorsement from the American College of Cardiology.

Suggested citation: American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee. 10. Cardiovascular disease and risk management: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S144–S174

© 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>.

diabetes, most of whom also had ASCVD, with sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors (8–10).

For prevention and management of both ASCVD and heart failure, cardiovascular risk factors should be systematically assessed at least annually in all patients with diabetes. These risk factors include duration of diabetes, obesity/overweight, hypertension, dyslipidemia, smoking, a family history of premature coronary disease, chronic kidney disease, and the presence of albuminuria. Modifiable abnormal risk factors should be treated as described in these guidelines. Notably, the majority of evidence supporting interventions to reduce cardiovascular risk in diabetes comes from trials of patients with type 2 diabetes. Few trials have been specifically designed to assess the impact of cardiovascular risk reduction strategies in patients with type 1 diabetes.

As depicted in **Fig. 10.1**, a comprehensive approach to the reduction in risk of diabetes-related complications is recommended. Therapy that includes multiple, concurrent evidence-based approaches to care will provide complementary reduction in the risks of microvascular, kidney, neurologic, and cardiovascular complications. Management of glycemia,

blood pressure, and lipids and the incorporation of specific therapies with cardiovascular and kidney outcomes benefit (as individually appropriate) are considered fundamental elements of global risk reduction in diabetes.

### THE RISK CALCULATOR

The American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association ASCVD risk calculator (Risk Estimator Plus) is generally a useful tool to estimate 10-year risk of a first ASCVD event (available online at [tools.acc.org/ASCVD-Risk-Estimator-Plus](https://tools.acc.org/ASCVD-Risk-Estimator-Plus)). The calculator includes diabetes as a risk factor, since diabetes itself confers increased risk for ASCVD, although it should be acknowledged that these risk calculators do not account for the duration of diabetes or the presence of diabetes complications, such as albuminuria. Although some variability in calibration exists in various subgroups, including by sex, race, and diabetes, the overall risk prediction does not differ in those with or without diabetes (11–14), validating the use of risk calculators in people with diabetes. The 10-year risk of a first ASCVD event should be assessed to better stratify

ASCVD risk and help guide therapy, as described below.

Recently, risk scores and other cardiovascular biomarkers have been developed for risk stratification of secondary prevention patients (i.e., those who are already high risk because they have ASCVD) but are not yet in widespread use (15,16). With newer, more expensive lipid-lowering therapies now available, use of these risk assessments may help target these new therapies to “higher risk” ASCVD patients in the future.

### HYPERTENSION/BLOOD PRESSURE CONTROL


Hypertension, defined as a sustained blood pressure  $\geq 140/90$  mmHg, is common among patients with either type 1 or type 2 diabetes. Hypertension is a major risk factor for both ASCVD and microvascular complications. Moreover, numerous studies have shown that antihypertensive therapy reduces ASCVD events, heart failure, and microvascular complications. Please refer to the American Diabetes Association (ADA) position statement “Diabetes and Hypertension” for a detailed review of the epidemiology, diagnosis, and treatment of hypertension (17).

### Screening and Diagnosis

#### Recommendations

- 10.1** Blood pressure should be measured at every routine clinical visit. When possible, patients found to have elevated blood pressure ( $\geq 140/90$  mmHg) should have blood pressure confirmed using multiple readings, including measurements on a separate day, to diagnose hypertension. **A** Patients with blood pressure  $\geq 180/110$  mmHg and cardiovascular disease could be diagnosed with hypertension at a single visit. **E**
- 10.2** All hypertensive patients with diabetes should monitor their blood pressure at home. **A**

Blood pressure should be measured at every routine clinical visit by a trained individual and should follow the guidelines established for the general population: measurement in the seated position, with feet on the floor and arm supported at heart level, after 5



**Figure 10.1**—Multifactorial approach to reduction in risk of diabetes complications. \*Risk reduction interventions to be applied as individually appropriate.

min of rest. Cuff size should be appropriate for the upper-arm circumference. Elevated values should preferably be confirmed on a separate day; however, in patients with cardiovascular disease and blood pressure  $\geq 180/110$  mmHg, it is reasonable to diagnose hypertension at a single visit (18). Postural changes in blood pressure and pulse may be evidence of autonomic neuropathy and therefore require adjustment of blood pressure targets. Orthostatic blood pressure measurements should be checked on initial visit and as indicated.

Home blood pressure self-monitoring and 24-h ambulatory blood pressure monitoring may provide evidence of white coat hypertension, masked hypertension, or other discrepancies between office and “true” blood pressure (17,18a,18b). In addition to confirming or refuting a diagnosis of hypertension, home blood pressure assessment may be useful to monitor antihypertensive treatment. Studies of individuals without diabetes found that home measurements may better correlate with ASCVD risk than office measurements (19,20). Moreover, home blood pressure monitoring may improve patient medication adherence and thus help reduce cardiovascular risk (21).

## Treatment Goals

### Recommendations

- 10.3** For patients with diabetes and hypertension, blood pressure targets should be individualized through a shared decision-making process that addresses cardiovascular risk, potential adverse effects of antihypertensive medications, and patient preferences. **B**
- 10.4** For individuals with diabetes and hypertension at higher cardiovascular risk (existing atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease [ASCVD] or 10-year ASCVD risk  $\geq 15\%$ ), a blood pressure target of  $<130/80$  mmHg may be appropriate, if it can be safely attained. **B**
- 10.5** For individuals with diabetes and hypertension at lower risk for cardiovascular disease (10-year atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk  $<15\%$ ), treat

to a blood pressure target of  $<140/90$  mmHg. **A**

- 10.6** In pregnant patients with diabetes and preexisting hypertension, a blood pressure target of  $110\text{--}135/85$  mmHg is suggested in the interest of reducing the risk for accelerated maternal hypertension **A** and minimizing impaired fetal growth. **E**

Randomized clinical trials have demonstrated unequivocally that treatment of hypertension to blood pressure  $<140/90$  mmHg reduces cardiovascular events as well as microvascular complications (22–28). Therefore, patients with type 1 or type 2 diabetes who have hypertension should, at a minimum, be treated to blood pressure targets of  $<140/90$  mmHg. The benefits and risks of intensifying antihypertensive therapy to target blood pressures lower than  $<140/90$  mmHg (e.g.,  $<130/80$  or  $<120/80$  mmHg) have been evaluated in large randomized clinical trials and meta-analyses of clinical trials. Notably, there is an absence of high-quality data available to guide blood pressure targets in type 1 diabetes.

### Randomized Controlled Trials of Intensive Versus Standard Blood Pressure Control

The Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Blood Pressure (ACCORD BP) trial provides the strongest direct assessment of the benefits and risks of intensive blood pressure control among people with type 2 diabetes (29). In ACCORD BP, compared with standard blood pressure control (target systolic blood pressure  $<140$  mmHg), intensive blood pressure control (target systolic blood pressure  $<120$  mmHg) did not reduce total major atherosclerotic cardiovascular events but did reduce the risk of stroke, at the expense of increased adverse events (Table 10.1). The ACCORD BP results suggest that blood pressure targets more intensive than  $<140/90$  mmHg are not likely to improve cardiovascular outcomes among most people with type 2 diabetes but may be reasonable for patients who may derive the most benefit and have been educated about added treatment burden, side effects, and costs, as discussed below.

Additional studies, such as the Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial (SPRINT) and the Hypertension Optimal Treatment (HOT) trial, also examined effects of intensive versus standard control (Table 10.1), though the relevance of their results to people with diabetes is less clear. The Action in Diabetes and Vascular Disease: Preterax and Diamicon MR Controlled Evaluation–Blood Pressure (ADVANCE BP) trial did not explicitly test blood pressure targets (30); the achieved blood pressure in the intervention group was higher than that achieved in the ACCORD BP intensive arm and would be consistent with a target blood pressure of  $<140/90$  mmHg. Notably, ACCORD BP and SPRINT measured blood pressure using automated office blood pressure measurement, which yields values that are generally lower than typical office blood pressure readings by approximately 5–10 mmHg (31), suggesting that implementing the ACCORD BP or SPRINT protocols in an outpatient clinic might require a systolic blood pressure target higher than  $<120$  mmHg, such as  $<130$  mmHg.

A number of post hoc analyses have attempted to explain the apparently divergent results of ACCORD BP and SPRINT. Some investigators have argued that the divergent results are not due to differences between people with and without diabetes but rather are due to differences in study design or to characteristics other than diabetes (32–34). Others have opined that the divergent results are most readily explained by the lack of benefit of intensive blood pressure control on cardiovascular mortality in ACCORD BP, which may be due to differential mechanisms underlying cardiovascular disease in type 2 diabetes, to chance, or both (35). Interestingly, a post hoc analysis has found that intensive blood pressure lowering increased the risk of incident chronic kidney disease in both ACCORD BP and SPRINT, with the absolute risk of incident chronic kidney disease being higher in individuals with type 2 diabetes (36).

### Meta-analyses of Trials

To clarify optimal blood pressure targets in patients with diabetes, meta-analyses have stratified clinical trials by mean



**Table 10.1—Randomized controlled trials of intensive versus standard hypertension treatment strategies**

Clinical trial	Population	Intensive	Standard	Outcomes
ACCORD BP (29)	4,733 participants with T2D aged 40–79 years with prior evidence of CVD or multiple cardiovascular risk factors	SBP target: <120 mmHg Achieved (mean) SBP/DBP: 119.3/64.4 mmHg	SBP target: 130–140 mmHg Achieved (mean) SBP/DBP: 135/70.5 mmHg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No benefit in primary end point: composite of nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, and CVD death</li> <li>Stroke risk reduced 41% with intensive control, not sustained through follow-up beyond the period of active treatment</li> <li>Adverse events more common in intensive group, particularly elevated serum creatinine and electrolyte abnormalities</li> </ul>
ADVANCE BP (30)	11,140 participants with T2D aged 55 years and older with prior evidence of CVD or multiple cardiovascular risk factors	Intervention: a single-pill, fixed-dose combination of perindopril and indapamide Achieved (mean) SBP/DBP: 136/73 mmHg	Control: placebo Achieved (mean) SBP/DBP: 141.6/75.2 mmHg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intervention reduced risk of primary composite end point of major macrovascular and microvascular events (9%), death from any cause (14%), and death from CVD (18%)</li> <li>6-year observational follow-up found reduction in risk of death in intervention group attenuated but still significant (198)</li> </ul>
HOT (221)	18,790 participants, including 1,501 with diabetes	DBP target: ≤80 mmHg Achieved (mean): 81.1 mmHg, ≤80 group; 85.2 mmHg, ≤90 group	DBP target: ≤90 mmHg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the overall trial, there was no cardiovascular benefit with more intensive targets</li> <li>In the subpopulation with diabetes, an intensive DBP target was associated with a significantly reduced risk (51%) of CVD events</li> </ul>
SPRINT (41)	9,361 participants without diabetes	SBP target: <120 mmHg Achieved (mean): 121.4 mmHg	SBP target: <140 mmHg Achieved (mean): 136.2 mmHg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensive SBP target lowered risk of the primary composite outcome 25% (MI, ACS, stroke, heart failure, and death due to CVD)</li> <li>Intensive target reduced risk of death 27%</li> <li>Intensive therapy increased risks of electrolyte abnormalities and AKI</li> </ul>

ACCORD BP, Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Blood Pressure trial; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; ADVANCE BP, Action in Diabetes and Vascular Disease: Preterax and Diamicon MR Controlled Evaluation—Blood Pressure trial; AKI, acute kidney injury; CVD, cardiovascular disease; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; HOT, Hypertension Optimal Treatment trial; MI, myocardial infarction; SBP, systolic blood pressure; SPRINT, Systolic Blood Pressure Intervention Trial; T2D, type 2 diabetes. Data from this table can also be found in the ADA position statement “Diabetes and Hypertension” (17).

baseline blood pressure or mean blood pressure attained in the intervention (or intensive treatment) arm. Based on these analyses, antihypertensive treatment appears to be beneficial when mean baseline blood pressure is  $\geq 140/90$  mmHg or mean attained intensive blood pressure is  $\geq 130/80$  mmHg (17,22,23,25–27). Among trials with lower baseline or attained blood pressure, antihypertensive treatment reduced the risk of stroke, retinopathy, and albuminuria, but effects on other ASCVD outcomes and heart failure were not evident. Taken together, these meta-analyses consistently show that treating patients with baseline

blood pressure  $\geq 140$  mmHg to targets  $<140$  mmHg is beneficial, while more intensive targets may offer additional (though probably less robust) benefits.

#### **Individualization of Treatment Targets**

Patients and clinicians should engage in a shared decision-making process to determine individual blood pressure targets (17). This approach acknowledges that the benefits and risks of intensive blood pressure targets are uncertain and may vary across patients and is consistent with a patient-focused approach to care that values patient priorities and provider

judgment (37). Secondary analyses of ACCORD BP and SPRINT suggest that clinical factors can help determine individuals more likely to benefit and less likely to be harmed by intensive blood pressure control (38,39).

Absolute benefit from blood pressure reduction correlated with absolute baseline cardiovascular risk in SPRINT and in earlier clinical trials conducted at higher baseline blood pressure levels (11,39). Extrapolation of these studies suggests that patients with diabetes may also be more likely to benefit from intensive blood pressure control when

they have high absolute cardiovascular risk. Therefore, it may be reasonable to target blood pressure <130/80 mmHg among patients with diabetes and either clinically diagnosed cardiovascular disease (particularly stroke, which was significantly reduced in ACCORD BP) or 10-year ASCVD risk  $\geq 15\%$ , if it can be attained safely. This approach is consistent with guidelines from the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association, which advocate a blood pressure target <130/80 mmHg for all patients, with or without diabetes (40).

Potential adverse effects of antihypertensive therapy (e.g., hypotension, syncope, falls, acute kidney injury, and electrolyte abnormalities) should also be taken into account (29,36,41,42). Patients with older age, chronic kidney disease, and frailty have been shown to be at higher risk of adverse effects of intensive blood pressure control (42). In addition, patients with orthostatic hypotension, substantial comorbidity, functional limitations, or polypharmacy may be at high risk of adverse effects, and some patients may prefer higher blood pressure targets to enhance quality of life. However, in ACCORD BP, it was found that intensive blood pressure lowering decreased the risk of cardiovascular events irrespective of baseline diastolic blood pressure in patients who also received standard glycemic control (43). Therefore, the presence of low diastolic blood pressure is not necessarily a contraindication to more intensive blood pressure management in the context of otherwise standard care.

Patients with low absolute cardiovascular risk (10-year ASCVD risk <15%) or with a history of adverse effects of intensive blood pressure control or at high risk of adverse effects should have a higher blood pressure target. In such patients, a blood pressure target of <140/90 mmHg is recommended, if it can be safely attained.

#### **Pregnancy and Antihypertensive Medications**

There are few randomized controlled trials of antihypertensive therapy in pregnant women with diabetes. A 2014 Cochrane systematic review of antihypertensive therapy for mild to moderate chronic hypertension that included 49 trials and over 4,700 women did not find

any conclusive evidence for or against blood pressure treatment to reduce the risk of preeclampsia for the mother or effects on perinatal outcomes such as preterm birth, small-for-gestational-age infants, or fetal death (44). The more recent Control of Hypertension in Pregnancy Study (CHIPS) (45) enrolled mostly women with chronic hypertension. In CHIPS, targeting a diastolic blood pressure of 85 mmHg during pregnancy was associated with reduced likelihood of developing accelerated maternal hypertension and no demonstrable adverse outcome for infants compared with targeting a higher diastolic blood pressure. The mean systolic blood pressure achieved in the more intensively treated group was  $133.1 \pm 0.5$  mmHg, and the mean diastolic blood pressure achieved in that group was  $85.3 \pm 0.3$  mmHg. A similar approach is supported by the International Society for the Study of Hypertension in Pregnancy, which specifically recommends use of antihypertensive therapy to maintain systolic blood pressure between 110 and 140 mmHg and diastolic blood pressure between 80 and 85 mmHg (46). Current evidence supports controlling blood pressure to 110–135/85 mmHg to reduce the risk of accelerated maternal hypertension but also to minimize impairment of fetal growth. During pregnancy, treatment with ACE inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, and spironolactone are contraindicated as they may cause fetal damage. Antihypertensive drugs known to be effective and safe in pregnancy include methyldopa, labetalol, and long-acting nifedipine, while hydralazine may be considered in the acute management of hypertension in pregnancy or severe preeclampsia (47). Diuretics are not recommended for blood pressure control in pregnancy but may be used during late-stage pregnancy if needed for volume control (47,48). The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists also recommends that postpartum patients with gestational hypertension, preeclampsia, and superimposed preeclampsia have their blood pressures observed for 72 h in the hospital and for 7–10 days postpartum. Long-term follow-up is recommended for these women as they have increased lifetime cardiovascular risk (49). See Section 15, “Management of Diabetes in Pregnancy” ([https://](https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S015)

[doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S015](https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S015)), for additional information.

## **Treatment Strategies**

### **Lifestyle Intervention**

#### **Recommendation**

**10.7** For patients with blood pressure >120/80 mmHg, lifestyle intervention consists of weight loss when indicated, a Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH)-style eating pattern including reducing sodium and increasing potassium intake, moderation of alcohol intake, and increased physical activity. **A**

Lifestyle management is an important component of hypertension treatment because it lowers blood pressure, enhances the effectiveness of some antihypertensive medications, promotes other aspects of metabolic and vascular health, and generally leads to few adverse effects. Lifestyle therapy consists of reducing excess body weight through caloric restriction (see Section 8, “Obesity and Weight Management for the Prevention and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S008>), restricting sodium intake (<2,300 mg/day), increasing consumption of fruits and vegetables (8–10 servings per day) and low-fat dairy products (2–3 servings per day), avoiding excessive alcohol consumption (no more than 2 servings per day in men and no more than 1 serving per day in women) (50), and increasing activity levels (51).

These lifestyle interventions are reasonable for individuals with diabetes and mildly elevated blood pressure (systolic >120 mmHg or diastolic >80 mmHg) and should be initiated along with pharmacologic therapy when hypertension is diagnosed (**Fig. 10.2**) (51). A lifestyle therapy plan should be developed in collaboration with the patient and discussed as part of diabetes management. Use of internet or mobile-based digital platforms to reinforce healthy behaviors may be considered as a component of care, as these interventions have been found to enhance the efficacy of medical therapy for hypertension (52,53).

**Pharmacologic Interventions**


**Recommendations**

**10.8** Patients with confirmed office-based blood pressure  $\geq 140/90$  mmHg should, in addition to lifestyle therapy, have prompt initiation and timely titration of pharmacologic therapy

to achieve blood pressure goals. **A**  
**10.9** Patients with confirmed office-based blood pressure  $\geq 160/100$  mmHg should, in addition to lifestyle therapy, have prompt initiation and timely titration of two drugs or a single-pill combination of drugs

demonstrated to reduce cardiovascular events in patients with diabetes. **A**  
**10.10** Treatment for hypertension should include drug classes demonstrated to reduce cardiovascular events in patients with diabetes. **A** ACE inhibitors or angiotensin receptor

**Recommendations for the Treatment of Confirmed Hypertension in People With Diabetes**



**Figure 10.2**—Recommendations for the treatment of confirmed hypertension in people with diabetes. \*An ACE inhibitor (ACEi) or angiotensin receptor blocker (ARB) is suggested to treat hypertension for patients with coronary artery disease (CAD) or urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio 30–299 mg/g creatinine and strongly recommended for patients with urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio  $\geq 300$  mg/g creatinine. \*\*Thiazide-like diuretic; long-acting agents shown to reduce cardiovascular events, such as chlorthalidone and indapamide, are preferred. \*\*\*Dihydropyridine calcium channel blocker (CCB). BP, blood pressure. Adapted from de Boer et al. (17).

blockers are recommended first-line therapy for hypertension in people with diabetes and coronary artery disease. **A**

**10.11** Multiple-drug therapy is generally required to achieve blood pressure targets. However, combinations of ACE inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers and combinations of ACE inhibitors or angiotensin receptor blockers with direct renin inhibitors should not be used. **A**

**10.12** An ACE inhibitor or angiotensin receptor blocker, at the maximum tolerated dose indicated for blood pressure treatment, is the recommended first-line treatment for hypertension in patients with diabetes and urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio  $\geq 300$  mg/g creatinine **A** or 30–299 mg/g creatinine. **B** If one class is not tolerated, the other should be substituted. **B**

**10.13** For patients treated with an ACE inhibitor, angiotensin receptor blocker, or diuretic, serum creatinine/estimated glomerular filtration rate and serum potassium levels should be monitored at least annually. **B**

**Initial Number of Antihypertensive Medications.** Initial treatment for people with diabetes depends on the severity of hypertension (**Fig. 10.2**). Those with blood pressure between 140/90 mmHg and 159/99 mmHg may begin with a single drug. For patients with blood pressure  $\geq 160/100$  mmHg, initial pharmacologic treatment with two antihypertensive medications is recommended in order to more effectively achieve adequate blood pressure control (54–56). Single-pill antihypertensive combinations may improve medication adherence in some patients (57).

**Classes of Antihypertensive Medications.** Initial treatment for hypertension should include any of the drug classes demonstrated to reduce cardiovascular events in patients with diabetes: ACE inhibitors (58,59), angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs) (58,59), thiazide-like diuretics (60), or dihydropyridine calcium channel blockers (61). In patients with diabetes and established coronary

artery disease, ACE inhibitors or ARBs are recommended first-line therapy for hypertension (62–64). For patients with albuminuria (urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio [UACR]  $\geq 30$  mg/g), initial treatment should include an ACE inhibitor or ARB in order to reduce the risk of progressive kidney disease (17) (**Fig. 10.2**). In patients receiving ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy, continuation of those medications as kidney function declines to estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR)  $< 30$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> may provide cardiovascular benefit without significantly increasing the risk of end-stage kidney disease (65). In the absence of albuminuria, risk of progressive kidney disease is low, and ACE inhibitors and ARBs have not been found to afford superior cardioprotection when compared with thiazide-like diuretics or dihydropyridine calcium channel blockers (66).  $\beta$ -Blockers are indicated in the setting of prior MI, active angina, or HfrEF but have not been shown to reduce mortality as blood pressure-lowering agents in the absence of these conditions (24,67,68).

**Multiple-Drug Therapy.** Multiple-drug therapy is often required to achieve blood pressure targets (**Fig. 10.2**), particularly in the setting of diabetic kidney disease. However, the use of both ACE inhibitors and ARBs in combination, or the combination of an ACE inhibitor or ARB and a direct renin inhibitor, is contraindicated given the lack of added ASCVD benefit and increased rate of adverse events—namely, hyperkalemia, syncope, and acute kidney injury (AKI) (69–71). Titration of and/or addition of further blood pressure medications should be made in a timely fashion to overcome therapeutic inertia in achieving blood pressure targets.

**Bedtime Dosing.** Although prior analyses of randomized clinical trials found a benefit to evening versus morning dosing of antihypertensive medications (72,73), these results have not been reproduced in subsequent trials. Therefore, preferential use of antihypertensives at bedtime is not recommended (73a).

**Hyperkalemia and Acute Kidney Injury.** Treatment with ACE inhibitors or ARBs can cause AKI and hyperkalemia, while diuretics can cause AKI and either hypokalemia or hyperkalemia (depending on

mechanism of action) (74,75). Detection and management of these abnormalities is important because AKI and hyperkalemia each increase the risks of cardiovascular events and death (76). Therefore, serum creatinine and potassium should be monitored during treatment with an ACE inhibitor, ARB, or diuretic, particularly among patients with reduced glomerular filtration who are at increased risk of hyperkalemia and AKI (74,75,77).

### Resistant Hypertension

#### Recommendation

**10.14** Patients with hypertension who are not meeting blood pressure targets on three classes of antihypertensive medications (including a diuretic) should be considered for mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist therapy. **B**

Resistant hypertension is defined as blood pressure  $\geq 140/90$  mmHg despite a therapeutic strategy that includes appropriate lifestyle management plus a diuretic and two other antihypertensive drugs with complimentary mechanisms of action at adequate doses. Prior to diagnosing resistant hypertension, a number of other conditions should be excluded, including medication nonadherence, white coat hypertension, and secondary hypertension. In general, barriers to medication adherence (such as cost and side effects) should be identified and addressed (**Fig. 10.2**). Mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists are effective for management of resistant hypertension in patients with type 2 diabetes when added to existing treatment with an ACE inhibitor or ARB, thiazide-like diuretic, and dihydropyridine calcium channel blocker (78). Mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists also reduce albuminuria and have additional cardiovascular benefits (79–82). However, adding a mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist to a regimen including an ACE inhibitor or ARB may increase the risk for hyperkalemia, emphasizing the importance of regular monitoring for serum creatinine and potassium in these patients, and long-term outcome studies are needed to better evaluate the role



of mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists in blood pressure management.

## LIPID MANAGEMENT

### Lifestyle Intervention

#### Recommendations

**10.15** Lifestyle modification focusing on weight loss (if indicated); application of a Mediterranean style or Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) eating pattern; reduction of saturated fat and *trans* fat; increase of dietary n-3 fatty acids, viscous fiber, and plant stanols/sterols intake; and increased physical activity should be recommended to improve the lipid profile and reduce the risk of developing atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease in patients with diabetes. **A**

**10.16** Intensify lifestyle therapy and optimize glycemic control for patients with elevated triglyceride levels ( $\geq 150$  mg/dL [1.7 mmol/L]) and/or low HDL cholesterol ( $< 40$  mg/dL [1.0 mmol/L] for men,  $< 50$  mg/dL [1.3 mmol/L] for women). **C**

Lifestyle intervention, including weight loss (83), increased physical activity, and medical nutrition therapy, allows some patients to reduce ASCVD risk factors. Nutrition intervention should be tailored according to each patient's age, diabetes type, pharmacologic treatment, lipid levels, and medical conditions.

Recommendations should focus on application of a Mediterranean style diet (84) or Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) eating pattern, reducing saturated and *trans* fat intake and increasing plant stanols/sterols, n-3 fatty acids, and viscous fiber (such as in oats, legumes, and citrus) intake (85,86). Glycemic control may also beneficially modify plasma lipid levels, particularly in patients with very high triglycerides and poor glycemic control. See Section 5, "Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>), for additional nutrition information.

### Ongoing Therapy and Monitoring With Lipid Panel

#### Recommendations

**10.17** In adults not taking statins or other lipid-lowering therapy, it is reasonable to obtain a lipid profile at the time of diabetes diagnosis, at an initial medical evaluation, and every 5 years thereafter if under the age of 40 years, or more frequently if indicated. **E**

**10.18** Obtain a lipid profile at initiation of statins or other lipid-lowering therapy, 4–12 weeks after initiation or a change in dose, and annually thereafter as it may help to monitor the response to therapy and inform medication adherence. **E**

In adults with diabetes, it is reasonable to obtain a lipid profile (total cholesterol, LDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, and triglycerides) at the time of diagnosis, at the initial medical evaluation, and at least every 5 years thereafter in patients under the age of 40 years. In younger patients with longer duration of disease (such as those with youth-onset type 1 diabetes), more frequent lipid profiles may be reasonable. A lipid panel should also be obtained immediately before initiating statin therapy. Once a patient is taking a statin, LDL cholesterol levels should be assessed 4–12 weeks after initiation of statin therapy, after any change in dose, and on an individual basis (e.g., to monitor for medication adherence and efficacy). If LDL cholesterol levels are not responding in spite of medication adherence, clinical judgment is recommended to determine the need for and timing of lipid panels. In individual patients, the highly variable LDL cholesterol-lowering response seen with statins is poorly understood (87). Clinicians should attempt to find a dose or alternative statin that is tolerable if side effects occur. There is evidence for benefit from even extremely low, less than daily statin doses (88).

## STATIN TREATMENT

### Primary Prevention

#### Recommendations

**10.19** For patients with diabetes aged 40–75 years without

atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, use moderate-intensity statin therapy in addition to lifestyle therapy. **A**

**10.20** For patients with diabetes aged 20–39 years with additional atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk factors, it may be reasonable to initiate statin therapy in addition to lifestyle therapy. **C**

**10.21** In patients with diabetes at higher risk, especially those with multiple atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk factors or aged 50–70 years, it is reasonable to use high-intensity statin therapy. **B**

**10.22** In adults with diabetes and 10-year atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk of 20% or higher, it may be reasonable to add ezetimibe to maximally tolerated statin therapy to reduce LDL cholesterol levels by 50% or more. **C**

### Secondary Prevention

#### Recommendations

**10.23** For patients of all ages with diabetes and atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, high-intensity statin therapy should be added to lifestyle therapy. **A**

**10.24** For patients with diabetes and atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease considered very high risk using specific criteria, if LDL cholesterol is  $\geq 70$  mg/dL on maximally tolerated statin dose, consider adding additional LDL-lowering therapy (such as ezetimibe or PCSK9 inhibitor). **A**

**10.25** For patients who do not tolerate the intended intensity, the maximally tolerated statin dose should be used. **E**

**10.26** In adults with diabetes aged  $> 75$  years already on statin therapy, it is reasonable to continue statin treatment. **B**

**10.27** In adults with diabetes aged  $> 75$  years, it may be reasonable to initiate statin therapy after discussion of potential benefits and risks. **C**

**10.28** Statin therapy is contraindicated in pregnancy. **B**

### Initiating Statin Therapy Based on Risk

Patients with type 2 diabetes have an increased prevalence of lipid abnormalities, contributing to their high risk of ASCVD. Multiple clinical trials have demonstrated the beneficial effects of statin therapy on ASCVD outcomes in subjects with and without CHD (89,90). Subgroup analyses of patients with diabetes in larger trials (91–95) and trials in patients with diabetes (96,97) showed significant primary and secondary prevention of ASCVD events and CHD death in patients with diabetes. Meta-analyses, including data from over 18,000 patients with diabetes from 14 randomized trials of statin therapy (mean follow-up 4.3 years), demonstrate a 9% proportional reduction in all-cause mortality and 13% reduction in vascular mortality for each 1 mmol/L (39 mg/dL) reduction in LDL cholesterol (98).

Accordingly, statins are the drugs of choice for LDL cholesterol lowering and cardioprotection. **Table 10.2** shows the two statin dosing intensities that are recommended for use in clinical practice: high-intensity statin therapy will achieve approximately a  $\geq 50\%$  reduction in LDL cholesterol, and moderate-intensity statin regimens achieve 30–49% reductions in LDL cholesterol. Low-dose statin therapy is generally not recommended in patients with diabetes but is sometimes the only dose of statin that a patient can tolerate. For patients who do not tolerate the intended intensity of statin, the maximally tolerated statin dose should be used.

As in those without diabetes, absolute reductions in ASCVD outcomes (CHD death and nonfatal MI) are greatest in people with high baseline ASCVD risk (known ASCVD and/or very high LDL cholesterol levels), but the overall benefits of statin therapy in people with diabetes at moderate or even low risk for ASCVD are convincing (99,100). The *relative* benefit of lipid-lowering therapy has been uniform across most subgroups tested (90,98), including subgroups that varied with respect to age and other risk factors.

#### Primary Prevention (Patients Without ASCVD)

For primary prevention, moderate-dose statin therapy is recommended for those 40 years and older (92,99,100), though high-intensity therapy may be considered on an individual basis in the context of additional ASCVD risk factors. The evidence is strong for patients with diabetes

aged 40–75 years, an age-group well represented in statin trials showing benefit. Since risk is enhanced in patients with diabetes, as noted above, patients who also have multiple other coronary risk factors have increased risk, equivalent to that of those with ASCVD. As such, recent guidelines recommend that in patients with diabetes who are at higher risk, especially those with multiple ASCVD risk factors or aged 50–70 years, it is reasonable to prescribe high-intensity statin therapy (12,101). Furthermore, for patients with diabetes whose ASCVD risk is  $\geq 20\%$ , i.e., an ASCVD risk equivalent, the same high-intensity statin therapy is recommended as for those with documented ASCVD (12). In those individuals, it may also be reasonable to add ezetimibe to maximally tolerated statin therapy if needed to reduce LDL cholesterol levels by 50% or more (12). The evidence is lower for patients aged  $>75$  years; relatively few older patients with diabetes have been enrolled in primary prevention trials. However, heterogeneity by age has not been seen in the relative benefit of lipid-lowering therapy in trials that included older participants (90,97,98), and because older age confers higher risk, the absolute benefits are actually greater (90,102). Moderate-intensity statin therapy is recommended in patients with diabetes who are 75 years or older. However, the risk-benefit profile should be routinely evaluated in this population, with downward titration of dose performed as needed. See Section 13, “Older Adults” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>), for more details on clinical considerations for this population.

#### Age $<40$ Years and/or Type 1 Diabetes.

Very little clinical trial evidence exists for patients with type 2 diabetes under the age of 40 years or for patients with type

1 diabetes of any age. For pediatric recommendations, see Section 14, “Children and Adolescents” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>). In the Heart Protection Study (lower age limit 40 years), the subgroup of  $\sim 600$  patients with type 1 diabetes had a proportionately similar, although not statistically significant, reduction in risk to that in patients with type 2 diabetes (92). Even though the data are not definitive, similar statin treatment approaches should be considered for patients with type 1 or type 2 diabetes, particularly in the presence of other cardiovascular risk factors. Patients below the age of 40 have lower risk of developing a cardiovascular event over a 10-year horizon; however, their lifetime risk of developing cardiovascular disease and suffering an MI, stroke, or cardiovascular death is high. For patients who are younger than 40 years of age and/or have type 1 diabetes with other ASCVD risk factors, it is recommended that the patient and health care provider discuss the relative benefits and risks and consider the use of moderate-intensity statin therapy. Please refer to “Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus and Cardiovascular Disease: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association and American Diabetes Association” (103) for additional discussion.

#### Secondary Prevention (Patients With ASCVD)

Because risk is high in patients with ASCVD, intensive therapy is indicated and has been shown to be of benefit in multiple large randomized cardiovascular outcomes trials (98,102,104,105). High-intensity statin therapy is recommended for all patients with diabetes and ASCVD. This recommendation is based on the Cholesterol Treatment Trialists’ Collaboration involving 26 statin trials, of which 5 compared high-intensity versus moderate-intensity statins. Together, they found

**Table 10.2—High-intensity and moderate-intensity statin therapy\***

High-intensity statin therapy (lowers LDL cholesterol by $\geq 50\%$ )	Moderate-intensity statin therapy (lowers LDL cholesterol by 30–49%)
Atorvastatin 40–80 mg	Atorvastatin 10–20 mg
Rosuvastatin 20–40 mg	Rosuvastatin 5–10 mg
	Simvastatin 20–40 mg
	Pravastatin 40–80 mg
	Lovastatin 40 mg
	Fluvastatin XL 80 mg
	Pitavastatin 1–4 mg

\*Once-daily dosing. XL, extended release.

reductions in nonfatal cardiovascular events with more intensive therapy, in patients with and without diabetes (90,94,104).

Over the past few years, there have been multiple large randomized trials investigating the benefits of adding non-statin agents to statin therapy, including those that evaluated further lowering of LDL cholesterol with ezetimibe (102,106) and proprotein convertase subtilisin/kexin type 9 (PCSK9) inhibitors (105). Each trial found a significant benefit in the reduction of ASCVD events that was directly related to the degree of further LDL cholesterol lowering. These large trials included a significant number of participants with diabetes. For very high-risk patients with ASCVD who are on high-intensity (and maximally tolerated) statin therapy and have an LDL cholesterol  $\geq 70$  mg/dL, the addition of nonstatin LDL-lowering therapy can be considered. The decision to add a nonstatin agent should be made following a clinician-patient discussion about the net benefit, safety, and cost of combination therapy. Although the costs of PCSK9 inhibitor therapy have decreased over time, the lower cost of ezetimibe may be preferred by many patients. Definition of very high-risk patients with ASCVD includes the use of specific criteria (major ASCVD events and high-risk conditions); refer to the “2018 AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA Guideline on the Management of Blood Cholesterol: Executive Summary: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines” (12) for further details regarding this definition of risk, and to the additional “2018 ACC Expert Consensus Decision Pathway on Novel Therapies for Cardiovascular Risk Reduction in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes and Atherosclerotic Cardiovascular Disease” (107) for recommendations for primary and secondary prevention and for statin and combination treatment in adults with diabetes.

### Combination Therapy for LDL Cholesterol Lowering

#### Statins and Ezetimibe

The IMPROVED Reduction of Outcomes: Vytorin Efficacy International Trial (IMPROVE-IT) was a randomized controlled trial in 18,144 patients comparing the addition of ezetimibe to

simvastatin therapy versus simvastatin alone. Individuals were  $\geq 50$  years of age, had experienced a recent acute coronary syndrome (ACS) and were treated for an average of 6 years. Overall, the addition of ezetimibe led to a 6.4% relative benefit and a 2% absolute reduction in major adverse cardiovascular events (atherosclerotic cardiovascular events), with the degree of benefit being directly proportional to the change in LDL cholesterol, which was 70 mg/dL in the statin group on average and 54 mg/dL in the combination group (102). In those with diabetes (27% of participants), the combination of moderate-intensity simvastatin (40 mg) and ezetimibe (10 mg) showed a significant reduction of major adverse cardiovascular events with an absolute risk reduction of 5% (40% vs. 45% cumulative incidence at 7 years) and a relative risk reduction of 14% (hazard ratio [HR] 0.86 [95% CI 0.78–0.94]) over moderate-intensity simvastatin (40 mg) alone (106).

#### Statins and PCSK9 Inhibitors

Placebo-controlled trials evaluating the addition of the PCSK9 inhibitors evolocumab and alirocumab to maximally tolerated doses of statin therapy in participants who were at high risk for ASCVD demonstrated an average reduction in LDL cholesterol ranging from 36% to 59%. These agents have been approved as adjunctive therapy for patients with ASCVD or familial hypercholesterolemia who are receiving maximally tolerated statin therapy but require additional lowering of LDL cholesterol (108,109).

The effects of PCSK9 inhibition on ASCVD outcomes was investigated in the Further Cardiovascular Outcomes Research With PCSK9 Inhibition in Subjects With Elevated Risk (FOURIER) trial, which enrolled 27,564 patients with prior ASCVD and an additional high-risk feature who were receiving their maximally tolerated statin therapy (two-thirds were on high-intensity statin) but who still had LDL cholesterol  $\geq 70$  mg/dL or non-HDL cholesterol  $\geq 100$  mg/dL (105). Patients were randomized to receive subcutaneous injections of evolocumab (either 140 mg every 2 weeks or 420 mg every month based on patient preference) versus placebo. Evolocumab reduced LDL cholesterol by

59% from a median of 92 to 30 mg/dL in the treatment arm.

During the median follow-up of 2.2 years, the composite outcome of cardiovascular death, MI, stroke, hospitalization for angina, or revascularization occurred in 11.3% vs. 9.8% of the placebo and evolocumab groups, respectively, representing a 15% relative risk reduction ( $P < 0.001$ ). The combined end point of cardiovascular death, MI, or stroke was reduced by 20%, from 7.4% to 5.9% ( $P < 0.001$ ). Evolocumab therapy also significantly reduced all strokes (1.5% vs. 1.9%; HR 0.79 [95% CI 0.66–0.95];  $P = 0.01$ ) and ischemic stroke (1.2% vs. 1.6%; HR 0.75 [95% CI 0.62–0.92];  $P = 0.005$ ) in the total population, with findings being consistent in patients with or without a history of ischemic stroke at baseline (110). Importantly, similar benefits were seen in a prespecified subgroup of patients with diabetes, comprising 11,031 patients (40% of the trial) (111).

In the ODYSSEY OUTCOMES trial (Evaluation of Cardiovascular Outcomes After an Acute Coronary Syndrome During Treatment With Alirocumab), 18,924 patients (28.8% of whom had diabetes) with recent acute coronary syndrome were randomized to the PCSK9 inhibitor alirocumab or placebo every 2 weeks in addition to maximally tolerated statin therapy, with alirocumab dosing titrated between 75 and 150 mg to achieve LDL cholesterol levels between 25 and 50 mg/dL (112). Over a median follow-up of 2.8 years, a composite primary end point (comprising death from coronary heart disease, nonfatal MI, fatal or nonfatal ischemic stroke, or unstable angina requiring hospital admission) occurred in 903 patients (9.5%) in the alirocumab group and in 1,052 patients (11.1%) in the placebo group (HR 0.85 [95% CI 0.78–0.93];  $P < 0.001$ ). Combination therapy with alirocumab plus statin therapy resulted in a greater absolute reduction in the incidence of the primary end point in patients with diabetes (2.3% [95% CI 0.4–4.2]) than in those with prediabetes (1.2% [0.0–2.4]) or normoglycemia (1.2% [–0.3 to 2.7]) (113).

#### Statins and Bempedoic Acid

Bempedoic acid is a novel LDL cholesterol-lowering agent that is indicated as an adjunct to diet and maximally tolerated statin therapy for the

treatment of adults with heterozygous familial hypercholesterolemia or established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease who require additional lowering of LDL cholesterol. A pooled analysis suggests that bempedoic acid therapy lowers LDL cholesterol levels by about 23% compared with placebo (114). At this time, there are no completed trials demonstrating a cardiovascular outcomes benefit to use of this medication; however, this agent may be considered for patients who cannot use or tolerate other evidence-based LDL cholesterol-lowering approaches, or for whom those other therapies are inadequately effective (115).

### Treatment of Other Lipoprotein Fractions or Targets

#### Recommendations

- 10.29** For patients with fasting triglyceride levels  $\geq 500$  mg/dL, evaluate for secondary causes of hypertriglyceridemia and consider medical therapy to reduce the risk of pancreatitis. **C**
- 10.30** In adults with moderate hypertriglyceridemia (fasting or non-fasting triglycerides 175–499 mg/dL), clinicians should address and treat lifestyle factors (obesity and metabolic syndrome), secondary factors (diabetes, chronic liver or kidney disease and/or nephrotic syndrome, hypothyroidism), and medications that raise triglycerides. **C**
- 10.31** In patients with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease or other cardiovascular risk factors on a statin with controlled LDL cholesterol but elevated triglycerides (135–499 mg/dL), the addition of icosapent ethyl can be considered to reduce cardiovascular risk. **A**

Hypertriglyceridemia should be addressed with dietary and lifestyle changes including weight loss and abstinence from alcohol (116). Severe hypertriglyceridemia (fasting triglycerides  $\geq 500$  mg/dL and especially  $>1,000$  mg/dL) may warrant pharmacologic therapy (fibrates and/or fish oil) and reduction in dietary fat to reduce the risk of acute

pancreatitis. Moderate- or high-intensity statin therapy should also be used as indicated to reduce risk of cardiovascular events (see *STATIN TREATMENT*). In patients with moderate hypertriglyceridemia, lifestyle interventions, treatment of secondary factors, and avoidance of medications that might raise triglycerides are recommended.

The Reduction of Cardiovascular Events with Icosapent Ethyl—Intervention Trial (REDUCE-IT) enrolled 8,179 adults receiving statin therapy with moderately elevated triglycerides (135–499 mg/dL, median baseline of 216 mg/dL) who had either established cardiovascular disease (secondary prevention cohort) or diabetes plus at least one other cardiovascular risk factor (primary prevention cohort). Patients were randomized to icosapent ethyl 4 g/day (2 g twice daily with food) versus placebo. The trial met its primary end point, demonstrating a 25% relative risk reduction ( $P < 0.001$ ) for the primary end point composite of cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, coronary revascularization, or unstable angina. This reduction in risk was seen in patients with or without diabetes at baseline. The composite of cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, or nonfatal stroke was reduced by 26% ( $P < 0.001$ ). Additional ischemic end points were significantly lower in the icosapent ethyl group than in the placebo group, including cardiovascular death, which was reduced by 20% ( $P = 0.03$ ). The proportions of patients experiencing adverse events and serious adverse events were similar between the active and placebo treatment groups. It should be noted that data are lacking with other n-3 fatty acids, and results of the REDUCE-IT trial should not be extrapolated to other products (117). As an example, the addition of 4 g per day of a carboxylic acid formulation of the n-3 fatty acids eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA) and docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) (n-3 carboxylic acid) to statin therapy in patients with atherogenic dyslipidemia and high cardiovascular risk, 70% of whom had diabetes, did not reduce the risk of major adverse cardiovascular events compared with the inert comparator of corn oil (118).

Low levels of HDL cholesterol, often associated with elevated triglyceride levels, are the most prevalent pattern of dyslipidemia in individuals with type 2 diabetes. However, the evidence for

the use of drugs that target these lipid fractions is substantially less robust than that for statin therapy (119). In a large trial in patients with diabetes, fenofibrate failed to reduce overall cardiovascular outcomes (120).

### Other Combination Therapy

#### Recommendations

- 10.32** Statin plus fibrate combination therapy has not been shown to improve atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease outcomes and is generally not recommended. **A**
- 10.33** Statin plus niacin combination therapy has not been shown to provide additional cardiovascular benefit above statin therapy alone, may increase the risk of stroke with additional side effects, and is generally not recommended. **A**

#### Statin and Fibrate Combination Therapy

Combination therapy (statin and fibrate) is associated with an increased risk for abnormal transaminase levels, myositis, and rhabdomyolysis. The risk of rhabdomyolysis is more common with higher doses of statins and renal insufficiency and appears to be higher when statins are combined with gemfibrozil (compared with fenofibrate) (121).

In the ACCORD study, in patients with type 2 diabetes who were at high risk for ASCVD, the combination of fenofibrate and simvastatin did not reduce the rate of fatal cardiovascular events, nonfatal MI, or nonfatal stroke as compared with simvastatin alone. Prespecified subgroup analyses suggested heterogeneity in treatment effects with possible benefit for men with both a triglyceride level  $\geq 204$  mg/dL (2.3 mmol/L) and an HDL cholesterol level  $\leq 34$  mg/dL (0.9 mmol/L) (122). A prospective trial of a newer fibrate in this specific population of patients is ongoing (123).

#### Statin and Niacin Combination Therapy

The Atherothrombosis Intervention in Metabolic Syndrome With Low HDL/High Triglycerides: Impact on Global Health Outcomes (AIM-HIGH) trial randomized over 3,000 patients (about one-third with diabetes) with established ASCVD, LDL cholesterol levels  $<180$  mg/dL [4.7



mmol/L], low HDL cholesterol levels (men <40 mg/dL [1.0 mmol/L] and women <50 mg/dL [1.3 mmol/L]), and triglyceride levels of 150–400 mg/dL (1.7–4.5 mmol/L) to statin therapy plus extended-release niacin or placebo. The trial was halted early due to lack of efficacy on the primary ASCVD outcome (first event of the composite of death from CHD, nonfatal MI, ischemic stroke, hospitalization for an ACS, or symptom-driven coronary or cerebral revascularization) and a possible increase in ischemic stroke in those on combination therapy (124).

The much larger Heart Protection Study 2—Treatment of HDL to Reduce the Incidence of Vascular Events (HPS2-THRIVE) trial also failed to show a benefit of adding niacin to background statin therapy (125). A total of 25,673 patients with prior vascular disease were randomized to receive 2 g of extended-release niacin and 40 mg of laropiprant (an antagonist of the prostaglandin D2 receptor DP1 that has been shown to improve adherence to niacin therapy) versus a matching placebo daily and followed for a median follow-up period of 3.9 years. There was no significant difference in the rate of coronary death, MI, stroke, or coronary revascularization with the addition of niacin–laropiprant versus placebo (13.2% vs. 13.7%; rate ratio 0.96;  $P = 0.29$ ). Niacin–laropiprant was associated with an increased incidence of new-onset diabetes (absolute excess, 1.3 percentage points;  $P < 0.001$ ) and disturbances in diabetes control among those with diabetes. In addition, there was an increase in serious adverse events associated with the gastrointestinal system, musculoskeletal system, skin, and, unexpectedly, infection and bleeding.

Therefore, combination therapy with a statin and niacin is not recommended given the lack of efficacy on major ASCVD outcomes and increased side effects.

#### Diabetes Risk With Statin Use

Several studies have reported a modestly increased risk of incident diabetes with statin use (126,127), which may be limited to those with diabetes risk factors. An analysis of one of the initial studies suggested that although statin use was associated with diabetes risk,

the cardiovascular event rate reduction with statins far outweighed the risk of incident diabetes even for patients at highest risk for diabetes (128). The absolute risk increase was small (over 5 years of follow-up, 1.2% of participants on placebo developed diabetes and 1.5% on rosuvastatin developed diabetes) (128). A meta-analysis of 13 randomized statin trials with 91,140 participants showed an odds ratio of 1.09 for a new diagnosis of diabetes, so that (on average) treatment of 255 patients with statins for 4 years resulted in one additional case of diabetes while simultaneously preventing 5.4 vascular events among those 255 patients (127).

#### Lipid-Lowering Agents and Cognitive Function

Although concerns regarding a potential adverse impact of lipid-lowering agents on cognitive function have been raised, several lines of evidence point against this association, as detailed in a 2018 European Atherosclerosis Society Consensus Panel statement (129). First, there are three large randomized trials of statin versus placebo where specific cognitive tests were performed, and no differences were seen between statin and placebo (130–133). In addition, no change in cognitive function has been reported in studies with the addition of ezetimibe (102) or PCSK9 inhibitors (105,134) to statin therapy, including among patients treated to very low LDL cholesterol levels. In addition, the most recent systematic review of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's (FDA's) postmarketing surveillance databases, randomized controlled trials, and cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies evaluating cognition in patients receiving statins found that published data do not reveal an adverse effect of statins on cognition (135). Therefore, a concern that statins or other lipid-lowering agents might cause cognitive dysfunction or dementia is not currently supported by evidence and should not deter their use in individuals with diabetes at high risk for ASCVD (135).

#### ANTIPLATELET AGENTS

##### Recommendations

**10.34** Use aspirin therapy (75–162 mg/day) as a secondary pre-

vention strategy in those with diabetes and a history of atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease. **A**

**10.35** For patients with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease and documented aspirin allergy, clopidogrel (75 mg/day) should be used. **B**

**10.36** Dual antiplatelet therapy (with low-dose aspirin and a P2Y12 inhibitor) is reasonable for a year after an acute coronary syndrome and may have benefits beyond this period. **A**

**10.37** Long-term treatment with dual antiplatelet therapy should be considered for patients with prior coronary intervention, high ischemic risk, and low bleeding risk to prevent major adverse cardiovascular events. **A**

**10.38** Combination therapy with aspirin plus low-dose rivaroxaban should be considered for patients with stable coronary and/or peripheral artery disease and low bleeding risk to prevent major adverse limb and cardiovascular events. **A**

**10.39** Aspirin therapy (75–162 mg/day) may be considered as a primary prevention strategy in those with diabetes who are at increased cardiovascular risk, after a comprehensive discussion with the patient on the benefits versus the comparable increased risk of bleeding. **A**

#### Risk Reduction

Aspirin has been shown to be effective in reducing cardiovascular morbidity and mortality in high-risk patients with previous MI or stroke (secondary prevention) and is strongly recommended. In primary prevention, however, among patients with no previous cardiovascular events, its net benefit is more controversial (136,137).

Previous randomized controlled trials of aspirin specifically in patients with diabetes failed to consistently show a significant reduction in overall ASCVD end points, raising questions about the efficacy of aspirin for primary prevention in people with diabetes, although

some sex differences were suggested (138–140).

The Antithrombotic Trialists' Collaboration published an individual patient-level meta-analysis (136) of the six large trials of aspirin for primary prevention in the general population. These trials collectively enrolled over 95,000 participants, including almost 4,000 with diabetes. Overall, they found that aspirin reduced the risk of serious vascular events by 12% (relative risk 0.88 [95% CI 0.82–0.94]). The largest reduction was for nonfatal MI, with little effect on CHD death (relative risk 0.95 [95% CI 0.78–1.15]) or total stroke.

Most recently, the ASCEND (A Study of Cardiovascular Events in Diabetes) trial randomized 15,480 patients with diabetes but no evident cardiovascular disease to aspirin 100 mg daily or placebo (141). The primary efficacy end point was vascular death, MI, or stroke or transient ischemic attack. The primary safety outcome was major bleeding (i.e., intracranial hemorrhage, sight-threatening bleeding in the eye, gastrointestinal bleeding, or other serious bleeding). During a mean follow-up of 7.4 years, there was a significant 12% reduction in the primary efficacy end point (8.5% vs. 9.6%;  $P = 0.01$ ). In contrast, major bleeding was significantly increased from 3.2% to 4.1% in the aspirin group (rate ratio 1.29;  $P = 0.003$ ), with most of the excess being gastrointestinal bleeding and other extracranial bleeding. There were no significant differences by sex, weight, or duration of diabetes or other baseline factors including ASCVD risk score.

Two other large randomized trials of aspirin for primary prevention, in patients without diabetes (ARRIVE [Aspirin to Reduce Risk of Initial Vascular Events]) (142) and in the elderly (ASPREE [Aspirin in Reducing Events in the Elderly]) (143), which included 11% with diabetes, found no benefit of aspirin on the primary efficacy end point and an increased risk of bleeding. In ARRIVE, with 12,546 patients over a period of 60 months follow-up, the primary end point occurred in 4.29% vs. 4.48% of patients in the aspirin versus placebo groups (HR 0.96 [95% CI 0.81–1.13];  $P = 0.60$ ). Gastrointestinal bleeding events (characterized as mild) occurred in 0.97% of patients in the aspirin group vs. 0.46% in the placebo group (HR 2.11 [95% CI

1.36–3.28];  $P = 0.0007$ ). In ASPREE, including 19,114 individuals, for cardiovascular disease (fatal CHD, MI, stroke, or hospitalization for heart failure) after a median of 4.7 years of follow-up, the rates per 1,000 person-years were 10.7 vs. 11.3 events in aspirin vs. placebo groups (HR 0.95 [95% CI 0.83–1.08]). The rate of major hemorrhage per 1,000 person-years was 8.6 events vs. 6.2 events, respectively (HR 1.38 [95% CI 1.18–1.62];  $P < 0.001$ ).

Thus, aspirin appears to have a modest effect on ischemic vascular events, with the absolute decrease in events depending on the underlying ASCVD risk. The main adverse effect is an increased risk of gastrointestinal bleeding. The excess risk may be as high as 5 per 1,000 per year in real-world settings. However, for adults with ASCVD risk  $>1\%$  per year, the number of ASCVD events prevented will be similar to the number of episodes of bleeding induced, although these complications do not have equal effects on long-term health (144).

Recommendations for using aspirin as primary prevention include both men and women aged  $\geq 50$  years with diabetes and at least one additional major risk factor (family history of premature ASCVD, hypertension, dyslipidemia, smoking, or chronic kidney disease/albuminuria) who are not at increased risk of bleeding (e.g., older age, anemia, renal disease) (145–148). Noninvasive imaging techniques such as coronary calcium scoring may potentially help further tailor aspirin therapy, particularly in those at low risk (149,150). For patients over the age of 70 years (with or without diabetes), the balance appears to have greater risk than benefit (141,143). Thus, for primary prevention, the use of aspirin needs to be carefully considered and may generally not be recommended. Aspirin may be considered in the context of high cardiovascular risk with low bleeding risk, but generally not in older adults. Aspirin therapy for primary prevention may be considered in the context of shared decision-making, which carefully weighs the cardiovascular benefits with the fairly comparable increase in risk of bleeding.

For patients with documented ASCVD, use of aspirin for secondary prevention has far greater benefit than risk; for this indication, aspirin is still recommended (136).

### Aspirin Use in People $<50$ Years of Age

Aspirin is not recommended for those at low risk of ASCVD (such as men and women aged  $<50$  years with diabetes with no other major ASCVD risk factors) as the low benefit is likely to be outweighed by the risks of bleeding. Clinical judgment should be used for those at intermediate risk (younger patients with one or more risk factors or older patients with no risk factors) until further research is available. Patients' willingness to undergo long-term aspirin therapy should also be considered (151). Aspirin use in patients aged  $<21$  years is generally contraindicated due to the associated risk of Reye syndrome.

### Aspirin Dosing

Average daily dosages used in most clinical trials involving patients with diabetes ranged from 50 mg to 650 mg but were mostly in the range of 100–325 mg/day. There is little evidence to support any specific dose, but using the lowest possible dose may help to reduce side effects (152). In the ADAPTABLE (Aspirin Dosing: A Patient-Centric Trial Assessing Benefits and Long-term Effectiveness) trial of patients with established cardiovascular disease, 38% of whom had diabetes, there were no significant differences in cardiovascular events or major bleeding between patients assigned to 81 mg and those assigned to 325 mg of aspirin daily (153). In the U.S., the most common low-dose tablet is 81 mg. Although platelets from patients with diabetes have altered function, it is unclear what, if any, effect that finding has on the required dose of aspirin for cardioprotective effects in the patient with diabetes. Many alternate pathways for platelet activation exist that are independent of thromboxane  $A_2$  and thus are not sensitive to the effects of aspirin (154). "Aspirin resistance" has been described in patients with diabetes when measured by a variety of ex vivo and in vitro methods (platelet aggregometry, measurement of thromboxane  $B_2$ ) (155), but other studies suggest no impairment in aspirin response among patients with diabetes (156). A recent trial suggested that more frequent dosing regimens of aspirin may reduce platelet reactivity in individuals with diabetes (157); however, these observations alone are insufficient to empirically recommend that higher

doses of aspirin be used in this group at this time. Another recent meta-analysis raised the hypothesis that low-dose aspirin efficacy is reduced in those weighing more than 70 kg (158); however, the ASCEND trial found benefit of low-dose aspirin in those in this weight range, which would thus not validate this suggested hypothesis (141). It appears that 75–162 mg/day is optimal.

### Indications for P2Y12 Receptor Antagonist Use

A P2Y12 receptor antagonist in combination with aspirin is reasonable for at least 1 year in patients following an ACS and may have benefits beyond this period. Evidence supports use of either ticagrelor or clopidogrel if no percutaneous coronary intervention was performed and clopidogrel, ticagrelor, or prasugrel if a percutaneous coronary intervention was performed (159). In patients with diabetes and prior MI (1–3 years before), adding ticagrelor to aspirin significantly reduces the risk of recurrent ischemic events including cardiovascular and CHD death (160). Similarly, the addition of ticagrelor to aspirin reduced the risk of ischemic cardiovascular events compared with aspirin alone in patients with diabetes and stable coronary artery disease (161,162). However, a higher incidence of major bleeding, including intracranial hemorrhage, was noted with dual antiplatelet therapy. The net clinical benefit (ischemic benefit vs. bleeding risk) was improved with ticagrelor therapy in the large prespecified subgroup of patients with history of percutaneous coronary intervention, while no net benefit was seen in patients without prior percutaneous coronary intervention (162). However, early aspirin discontinuation compared with continued dual antiplatelet therapy after coronary stenting may reduce the risk of bleeding without a corresponding increase in the risks of mortality and ischemic events, as shown in a prespecified analysis of patients with diabetes enrolled in the TWILIGHT (Ticagrelor With Aspirin or Alone in High-Risk Patients After Coronary Intervention) trial and a recent meta-analysis (163,164).

### Combination Antiplatelet and Anticoagulation Therapy

Combination therapy with aspirin plus low dose rivaroxaban may be considered for patients with stable coronary and/or

peripheral artery disease to prevent major adverse limb and cardiovascular complications. In the COMPASS (Cardiovascular Outcomes for People Using Anticoagulation Strategies) trial of 27,395 patients with established coronary artery disease and/or peripheral artery disease, aspirin plus rivaroxaban 2.5 mg twice daily was superior to aspirin plus placebo in the reduction of cardiovascular ischemic events including major adverse limb events. The absolute benefits of combination therapy appeared larger in patients with diabetes, who comprised 10,341 of the trial participants (165,166). A similar treatment strategy was evaluated in the Vascular Outcomes Study of ASA (acetylsalicylic acid) Along with Rivaroxaban in Endovascular or Surgical Limb Revascularization for Peripheral Artery Disease (VOYAGER PAD) trial (167), in which 6,564 patients with peripheral artery disease who had undergone revascularization were randomly assigned to receive rivaroxaban 2.5 mg twice daily plus aspirin or placebo plus aspirin. Rivaroxaban treatment in this group of patients was also associated with a significantly lower incidence of ischemic cardiovascular events, including major adverse limb events. However, an increased risk of major bleeding was noted with rivaroxaban added to aspirin treatment in both COMPASS and VOYAGER PAD.

The risks and benefits of dual antiplatelet or antiplatelet plus anticoagulant treatment strategies should be thoroughly discussed with eligible patients, and shared decision-making should be used to determine an individually appropriate treatment approach. This field of cardiovascular risk reduction is evolving rapidly, as are the definitions of optimal care for patients with differing types and circumstances of cardiovascular complications.

## CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE

### Screening

#### Recommendations

**10.40** In asymptomatic patients, routine screening for coronary artery disease is not recommended as it does not improve outcomes as long as atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk factors are treated. **A**

**10.41** Consider investigations for coronary artery disease in the

presence of any of the following: atypical cardiac symptoms (e.g., unexplained dyspnea, chest discomfort); signs or symptoms of associated vascular disease including carotid bruits, transient ischemic attack, stroke, claudication, or peripheral arterial disease; or electrocardiogram abnormalities (e.g., Q waves). **E**

### Treatment

#### Recommendations

**10.42** Among patients with type 2 diabetes who have established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease or established kidney disease, a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor or glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist with demonstrated cardiovascular disease benefit (**Table 10.3B** and **Table 10.3C**) is recommended as part of the comprehensive cardiovascular risk reduction and/or glucose-lowering regimens. **A**

**10.42a** In patients with type 2 diabetes and established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, multiple atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease risk factors, or diabetic kidney disease, a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor with demonstrated cardiovascular benefit is recommended to reduce the risk of major adverse cardiovascular events and/or heart failure hospitalization. **A**

**10.42b** In patients with type 2 diabetes and established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease or multiple risk factors for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, a glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist with demonstrated cardiovascular benefit is recommended to reduce the risk of major adverse cardiovascular events. **A**

**10.42c** In patients with type 2 diabetes and established athero-



sclerotic cardiovascular disease or multiple risk factors for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, combined therapy with a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor with demonstrated cardiovascular benefit and a glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist with demonstrated cardiovascular benefit may be considered for additive reduction in the risk of adverse cardiovascular and kidney events. **A**

**10.43** In patients with type 2 diabetes and established heart failure with reduced ejection fraction, a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor with proven benefit in this patient population is recommended to reduce risk of worsening heart failure and cardiovascular death. **A**

**10.44** In patients with known atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, particularly coronary artery disease, ACE inhibitor or angiotensin receptor blocker therapy is recommended to reduce the risk of cardiovascular events. **A**

**10.45** In patients with prior myocardial infarction,  $\beta$ -blockers should be continued for 3 years after the event. **B**

**10.46** Treatment of patients with heart failure with reduced ejection fraction should include a  $\beta$ -blocker with proven cardiovascular outcomes benefit, unless otherwise contraindicated. **A**

**10.47** In patients with type 2 diabetes with stable heart failure, metformin may be continued for glucose lowering if estimated glomerular filtration rate remains  $>30$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> but should be avoided in unstable or hospitalized patients with heart failure. **B**

### Cardiac Testing

Candidates for advanced or invasive cardiac testing include those with 1) typical or atypical cardiac symptoms

and 2) an abnormal resting electrocardiogram (ECG). Exercise ECG testing without or with echocardiography may be used as the initial test. In adults with diabetes  $\geq 40$  years of age, measurement of coronary artery calcium is also reasonable for cardiovascular risk assessment. Pharmacologic stress echocardiography or nuclear imaging should be considered in individuals with diabetes in whom resting ECG abnormalities preclude exercise stress testing (e.g., left bundle branch block or ST-T abnormalities). In addition, individuals who require stress testing and are unable to exercise should undergo pharmacologic stress echocardiography or nuclear imaging.

### Screening Asymptomatic Patients

The screening of asymptomatic patients with high ASCVD risk is not recommended (168), in part because these high-risk patients should already be receiving intensive medical therapy—an approach that provides benefit similar to invasive revascularization (169,170). There is also some evidence that silent ischemia may reverse over time, adding to the controversy concerning aggressive screening strategies (171). In prospective studies, coronary artery calcium has been established as an independent predictor of future ASCVD events in patients with diabetes and is consistently superior to both the UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) risk engine and the Framingham Risk Score in predicting risk in this population (172–174). However, a randomized observational trial demonstrated no clinical benefit to routine screening of asymptomatic patients with type 2 diabetes and normal ECGs (175). Despite abnormal myocardial perfusion imaging in more than one in five patients, cardiac outcomes were essentially equal (and very low) in screened versus unscreened patients. Accordingly, indiscriminate screening is not considered cost-effective. Studies have found that a risk factor–based approach to the initial diagnostic evaluation and subsequent follow-up for coronary artery disease fails to identify which patients with type 2 diabetes will have silent ischemia on screening tests (176,177).

Any benefit of newer noninvasive coronary artery disease screening methods, such as computed tomography calcium

scoring and computed tomography angiography, to identify patient subgroups for different treatment strategies remains unproven in asymptomatic patients with diabetes, though research is ongoing. Although asymptomatic patients with diabetes with higher coronary disease burden have more future cardiac events (172,178,179), the role of these tests beyond risk stratification is not clear.

While coronary artery screening methods, such as calcium scoring, may improve cardiovascular risk assessment in people with type 2 diabetes (180), their routine use leads to radiation exposure and may result in unnecessary invasive testing such as coronary angiography and revascularization procedures. The ultimate balance of benefit, cost, and risks of such an approach in asymptomatic patients remains controversial, particularly in the modern setting of aggressive ASCVD risk factor control.

### Lifestyle and Pharmacologic Interventions

Intensive lifestyle intervention focusing on weight loss through decreased caloric intake and increased physical activity as performed in the Action for Health in Diabetes (Look AHEAD) trial may be considered for improving glucose control, fitness, and some ASCVD risk factors (181). Patients at increased ASCVD risk should receive statin, ACE inhibitor, or ARB therapy if the patient has hypertension, and possibly aspirin, unless there are contraindications to a particular drug class. Clear benefit exists for ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy in patients with diabetic kidney disease or hypertension, and these agents are recommended for hypertension management in patients with known ASCVD (particularly coronary artery disease) (63,64,182).  $\beta$ -Blockers should be used in patients with active angina or HFrEF and for 3 years after MI in patients with preserved left ventricular function (183,184).

### Glucose-Lowering Therapies and Cardiovascular Outcomes

In 2008, the FDA issued a guidance for industry to perform cardiovascular outcomes trials for all new medications for the treatment for type 2 diabetes amid concerns of increased cardiovascular risk (185). Previously approved diabetes medications were not subject to the



**Table 10.3A—Cardiovascular and cardiorenal outcomes trials of available antihyperglycemic medications completed after the issuance of the FDA 2008 guidelines: DPP-4 inhibitors**

	SAVOR-TIMI 53 (214) (n = 16,492)	EXAMINE (222) (n = 5,380)	TECOS (216) (n = 14,671)	CARMELINA (186,223) (n = 6,979)	CAROLINA (186,224) (n = 6,042)
Intervention	Saxagliptin/placebo	Alogliptin/placebo	Sitagliptin/placebo	Linagliptin/placebo	Linagliptin/ glimepiride
Main inclusion criteria	Type 2 diabetes and history of or multiple risk factors for CVD	Type 2 diabetes and ACS within 15–90 days before randomization	Type 2 diabetes and preexisting CVD	Type 2 diabetes and high CV and renal risk	Type 2 diabetes and high CV risk
A1C inclusion criteria (%)	≥6.5	6.5–11.0	6.5–8.0	6.5–10.0	6.5–8.5
Age (years) <sup>†</sup>	65.1	61.0	65.4	65.8	64.0
Race (% White)	75.2	72.7	67.9	80.2	73.0
Sex (% male)	66.9	67.9	70.7	62.9	60.0
Diabetes duration (years) <sup>†</sup>	10.3	7.1	11.6	14.7	6.2
Median follow-up (years)	2.1	1.5	3.0	2.2	6.3
Statin use (%)	78	91	80	71.8	64.1
Metformin use (%)	70	66	82	54.8	82.5
Prior CVD/CHF (%)	78/13	100/28	74/18	57/26.8	34.5/4.5
Mean baseline A1C (%)	8.0	8.0	7.2	7.9	7.2
Mean difference in A1C between groups at end of treatment (%)	−0.3‡	−0.3‡	−0.3‡	−0.36‡	0
Year started/reported	2010/2013	2009/2013	2008/2015	2013/2018	2010/2019
Primary outcome§	3-point MACE 1.00 (0.89–1.12)	3-point MACE 0.96 (95% UL ≤1.16)	4-point MACE 0.98 (0.89–1.08)	3-point MACE 1.02 (0.89–1.17)	3-point MACE 0.98 (0.84–1.14)
Key secondary outcome§	Expanded MACE 1.02 (0.94–1.11)	4-point MACE 0.95 (95% UL ≤1.14)	3-point MACE 0.99 (0.89–1.10)	Kidney composite (ESRD, sustained ≥40% decrease in eGFR, or renal death) 1.04 (0.89–1.22)	4-point MACE 0.99 (0.86–1.14)
Cardiovascular death§	1.03 (0.87–1.22)	0.85 (0.66–1.10)	1.03 (0.89–1.19)	0.96 (0.81–1.14)	1.00 (0.81–1.24)
MI§	0.95 (0.80–1.12)	1.08 (0.88–1.33)	0.95 (0.81–1.11)	1.12 (0.90–1.40)	1.03 (0.82–1.29)
Stroke§	1.11 (0.88–1.39)	0.91 (0.55–1.50)	0.97 (0.79–1.19)	0.91 (0.67–1.23)	0.86 (0.66–1.12)
HF hospitalization§	1.27 (1.07–1.51)	1.19 (0.90–1.58)	1.00 (0.83–1.20)	0.90 (0.74–1.08)	1.21 (0.92–1.59)
Unstable angina hospitalization§	1.19 (0.89–1.60)	0.90 (0.60–1.37)	0.90 (0.70–1.16)	0.87 (0.57–1.31)	1.07 (0.74–1.54)
All-cause mortality§	1.11 (0.96–1.27)	0.88 (0.71–1.09)	1.01 (0.90–1.14)	0.98 (0.84–1.13)	0.91 (0.78–1.06)
Worsening nephropathy§	1.08 (0.88–1.32)	—	—	Kidney composite (see above)	—

—, not assessed/reported; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; CHF, congestive heart failure; CV, cardiovascular; CVD, cardiovascular disease; DPP-4, dipeptidyl peptidase 4; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; ESRD, end-stage renal disease; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1; HF, heart failure; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular event; MI, myocardial infarction; UL, upper limit. Data from this table was adapted from Cefalu et al. (225) in the January 2018 issue of *Diabetes Care*. <sup>†</sup>Age was reported as means in all trials except EXAMINE, which reported medians; diabetes duration was reported as means in all trials except SAVOR-TIMI 53 and EXAMINE, which reported medians. <sup>‡</sup>Significant difference in A1C between groups (*P* < 0.05). <sup>§</sup>Outcomes reported as hazard ratio (95% CI). <sup>||</sup>Worsening nephropathy is defined as a doubling of creatinine level, initiation of dialysis, renal transplantation, or creatinine >6.0 mg/dL (530 mmol/L) in SAVOR-TIMI 53. Worsening nephropathy was a prespecified exploratory adjudicated outcome in SAVOR-TIMI 53.

**Table 10.3B—Cardiovascular and cardiorenal outcomes trials of available antihyperglycemic medications completed after the issuance of the FDA 2008 guidelines: GLP-1 receptor agonists**

Intervention	ELIXA (199) (n = 6,068)	LEADER (194) (n = 9,340)	SUSTAIN-6 (195)* (n = 3,297)	EXSCCEL (200) (n = 14,752)	REWIND (198) (n = 9,901)	PIONEER-6 (196) (n = 3,183)
	Lixisenatide/placebo	Liraglutide/placebo	Semaglutide s.c. injection/placebo	Exenatide QW/placebo	Dulaglutide/placebo	Semaglutide oral/placebo
Main inclusion criteria	Type 2 diabetes and history of ACS (<180 days)	Type 2 diabetes and preexisting CVD, CKD, or HF at ≥50 years of age or CV risk at ≥60 years of age	Type 2 diabetes and preexisting CVD, HF, or CKD at ≥50 years of age or CV risk at ≥60 years of age	Type 2 diabetes with or without preexisting CVD	Type 2 diabetes and prior ASCVD event or risk factors for ASCVD	Type 2 diabetes and high CV risk (age of ≥50 years with established CVD or CKD, or age of ≥60 years with CV risk factors only)
A1C inclusion criteria (%)	5.5–11.0	≥7.0	≥7.0	6.5–10.0	≤9.5	None
Age (years)†	60.3	64.3	64.6	62	66.2	66
Race (% White)	75.2	77.5	83.0	75.8	75.7	72.3
Sex (% male)	69.3	64.3	60.7	62	53.7	68.4
Diabetes duration (years)†	9.3	12.8	13.9	12	10.5	14.9
Median follow-up (years)	2.1	3.8	2.1	3.2	5.4	1.3
Statin use (%)	93	72	73	74	66	85.2 (all lipid-lowering)
Metformin use (%)	66	76	73	77	81	77.4
Prior CVD/CHF (%)	100/22	81/18	60/24	73.1/16.2	32/9	84.7/12.2
Mean baseline A1C (%)	7.7	8.7	8.7	8.0	7.4	8.2
Mean difference in A1C between groups at end of treatment (%)	−0.3‡	−0.4‡	−0.7 or −1.0^	−0.53‡	−0.61‡	−0.7
Year started/reported	2010/2015	2010/2016	2013/2016	2010/2017	2011/2019	2017/2019
Primary outcome§	4-point MACE 1.02 (0.89–1.17)	3-point MACE 0.87 (0.78–0.97)	3-point MACE 0.74 (0.58–0.95)	3-point MACE 0.91 (0.83–1.00)	3-point MACE 0.88 (0.79–0.99)	3-point MACE 0.79 (0.57–1.11)

Continued on p. S161

**Table 10.3B—Continued**

Key secondary outcomes§	ELIXA (199) (n = 6,068) Expanded MACE 1.02 (0.90–1.11)	LEADER (194) (n = 9,340) Expanded MACE 0.88 (0.81–0.96)	SUSTAIN-6 (195)* (n = 3,297) Expanded MACE 0.74 (0.62–0.89)	EXSCEL (200) (n = 14,752) Individual components of MACE (see below)	REWIND (198) (n = 9,901) Composite microvascular outcome (eye or renal outcome) 0.87 (0.79–0.95)	PIONEER-6 (196) (n = 3,183) Expanded MACE or HF hospitalization 0.82 (0.61–1.10)
Cardiovascular death§	0.98 (0.78–1.22)	0.78 (0.66–0.93)	0.98 (0.65–1.48)	0.88 (0.76–1.02)	0.91 (0.78–1.06)	0.49 (0.27–0.92)
MIS	1.03 (0.87–1.22)	0.86 (0.73–1.00)	0.74 (0.51–1.08)	0.97 (0.85–1.10)	0.96 (0.79–1.15)	1.18 (0.73–1.90)
Stroke§	1.12 (0.79–1.58)	0.86 (0.71–1.06)	0.61 (0.38–0.99)	0.85 (0.70–1.03)	0.76 (0.61–0.95)	0.74 (0.35–1.57)
HF hospitalization§	0.96 (0.75–1.23)	0.87 (0.73–1.05)	1.11 (0.77–1.61)	0.94 (0.78–1.13)	0.93 (0.77–1.12)	0.86 (0.48–1.55)
Unstable angina hospitalization§	1.11 (0.47–2.62)	0.98 (0.76–1.26)	0.82 (0.47–1.44)	1.05 (0.94–1.18)	1.14 (0.84–1.54)	1.56 (0.60–4.01)
All-cause mortality§	0.94 (0.78–1.13)	0.85 (0.74–0.97)	1.05 (0.74–1.50)	0.86 (0.77–0.97)	0.90 (0.80–1.01)	0.51 (0.31–0.84)
Worsening nephropathy	—	0.78 (0.67–0.92)	0.64 (0.46–0.88)	—	0.85 (0.77–0.93)	—

—, not assessed/reported; ACS, acute coronary syndrome; ASCVD, atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; CHF, congestive heart failure; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CV, cardiovascular; CVD, cardiovascular disease; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1; HF, heart failure; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular event; MI, myocardial infarction. Data from this table was adapted from Cefalu et al. (225) in the January 2018 issue of *Diabetes Care*. \*Powered to rule out a hazard ratio of 1.8; superiority hypothesis not prespecified. †Age was reported as means in all trials; diabetes duration was reported as means in all trials except EXSCEL, which reported medians. ‡Significant difference in A1C between groups ( $P < 0.05$ ). ^A1C change of 0.66% with 0.5 mg and 1.05% with 1 mg dose of semaglutide. §Outcomes reported as hazard ratio (95% CI). ||Worsening nephropathy is defined as the new onset of urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio  $>300$  mg/g creatinine or a doubling of the serum creatinine level and an estimated glomerular filtration rate of  $<45$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, the need for continuous renal replacement therapy, or death from renal disease in LEADER and SUSTAIN-6 and as new macroalbuminuria, a sustained decline in estimated glomerular filtration rate of 30% or more from baseline, or chronic renal replacement therapy in REWIND. Worsening nephropathy was a prespecified exploratory adjudicated outcome in LEADER, SUSTAIN-6, and REWIND.

guidance. Recently published cardiovascular outcomes trials have provided additional data on cardiovascular and renal outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes with cardiovascular disease or at high risk for cardiovascular disease (see **Table 10.3A**, **Table 10.3B**, and **Table 10.3C**). An expanded review of the effects of glucose-lowering and other therapies in patients with chronic kidney disease is included in Section 11, “Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>).

Cardiovascular outcomes trials of dipeptidyl peptidase 4 (DPP-4) inhibitors have all, so far, not shown cardiovascular benefits relative to placebo. In addition, the CAROLINA (Cardiovascular Outcome Study of Linagliptin Versus Glimepiride in Type 2 Diabetes) study demonstrated noninferiority between a DPP-4 inhibitor, linagliptin, and a sulfonylurea, glimepiride, on cardiovascular outcomes despite lower rates of hypoglycemia in the linagliptin treatment group (186). However, results from other new agents have provided a mix of results.

**SGLT2 Inhibitor Trials**

The BI 10773 (Empagliflozin) Cardiovascular Outcome Event Trial in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients (EMPA-REG OUTCOME) was a randomized, double-blind trial that assessed the effect of empagliflozin, an SGLT2 inhibitor, versus placebo on cardiovascular outcomes in 7,020 patients with type 2 diabetes and existing cardiovascular disease. Study participants had a mean age of 63 years, 57% had diabetes for more than 10 years, and 99% had established cardiovascular disease. EMPA-REG OUTCOME showed that over a median follow-up of 3.1 years, treatment reduced the composite outcome of MI, stroke, and cardiovascular death by 14% (absolute rate 10.5% vs. 12.1% in the placebo group, HR in the empagliflozin group 0.86 [95% CI 0.74–0.99];  $P = 0.04$  for superiority) and cardiovascular death by 38% (absolute rate 3.7% vs. 5.9%, HR 0.62 [95% CI 0.49–0.77];  $P < 0.001$ ) (8). The FDA added an indication for empagliflozin to reduce the risk of major adverse cardiovascular death in adults with type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease.

Two large outcomes trials of the SGLT2 inhibitor canagliflozin have been conducted that separately assessed 1)

**Table 10.3C—Cardiovascular and cardiorenal outcomes trials of available antihyperglycemic medications completed after the issuance of the FDA 2008 guidelines: SGLT2 inhibitors**

Intervention	EMPA-REG OUTCOME (8) (n = 7,020)	CANVAS Program (9) (n = 10,142)	DECLARE-TIMI 58 (189) (n = 17,160)	CREDESCENCE (187) (n = 4,401)	DAPA-CKD (190,226) (n = 4,304; 2,906 with diabetes)	VERTIS CV (192,227) (n = 8,246)	DAPA-HF (191) (n = 4,744; 1,983 with diabetes)	EMPEROR-Reduced (217,219) (n = 3,730; 1,856 with diabetes)
	Empagliflozin/ placebo	Canagliflozin/ placebo	Dapagliflozin/ placebo	Canagliflozin/ placebo	Dapagliflozin/ placebo	Ertugliflozin/ placebo	Dapagliflozin/ placebo	Empagliflozin/ placebo*
Main inclusion criteria	Type 2 diabetes and preexisting CVD	Type 2 diabetes and preexisting CVD at ≥30 years of age or >2 CV risk factors at ≥50 years of age	Type 2 diabetes and established ASCVD or multiple risk factors for ASCVD	Type 2 diabetes and albuminuric kidney disease	Type 2 diabetes and albuminuric kidney disease, with or without diabetes	Type 2 diabetes and ASCVD	NYHA class II, III, or IV heart failure and an ejection fraction ≤40%, with or without diabetes	NYHA class II, III, or IV heart failure and an ejection fraction ≤40%, with or without diabetes
A1C inclusion criteria (%)	7.0–10.0	7.0–10.5	≥6.5	6.5–12	—	7.0–10.5	—	—
Age (years)†	63.1	63.3	64.0	63	61.8	64.4	66	67.2, 66.5
Race (% White)	72.4	78.3	79.6	66.6	53.2	87.8	70.3	71.1, 69.8
Sex (% male)	71.5	64.2	62.6	66.1	66.9	70	76.6	76.5, 75.6
Diabetes duration (years)†	57% >10	13.5	11.0	15.8	—	12.9	—	—
Median follow-up (years)	3.1	3.6	4.2	2.6	2.4	3.5	1.5	1.3
Statin use (%)	77	75	75 (statin or ezetimibe use)	69	64.9	—	—	—
Metformin use (%)	74	77	82	57.8	29	—	51.2% (of patients with diabetes)	—
Prior CVD/CHF (%)	99/10	65.6/14.4	40/10	50.4/14.8	37.4/10.9	99.9/23.1	100% with CHF	100% with CHF
Mean baseline A1C (%)	8.1	8.2	8.3	8.3	7.1% (7.8% in those with diabetes)	8.2	—	—
Mean difference in A1C between groups at end of treatment (%)	−0.3^	−0.58‡	−0.43‡	−0.31	N/A	−0.48 to −0.5	N/A	N/A
Year started/ reported	2010/2015	2009/2017	2013/2018	2017/2019	2017/2020	2013/2020	2017/2019	2017/2020

Continued on p. S163



**Table 10.3C—Continued**

	EMPA-REG OUTCOME (8) (n = 7,020)	CANVAS Program (9) (n = 10,142)	DECLARE-TIMI 58 (189) (n = 17,160)	CREDESCENCE (187) (n = 4,401)	DAPA-CKD (190,226) (n = 4,304; 2,906 with diabetes)	VERTIS CV (192,227) (n = 8,246)	DAPA-HF (191) (n = 4,744; 1,983 with diabetes)	EMPEROR-Reduced (217,219) (n = 3,730; 1,856 with diabetes)
Primary outcome§	3-point MACE 0.86 (0.74–0.99)	3-point MACE 0.86 (0.75–0.97)	3-point MACE 0.93 (0.84–1.03) CV death or HF hospitalization 0.83 (0.73–0.95)	ESRD, doubling of creatinine, or death from renal or CV cause 0.70 (0.59–0.82)	≥50% decline in eGFR, ESKD, or death from renal or CV cause 0.61 (0.51–0.72)	3-point MACE 0.97 (0.85–1.11)	Worsening heart failure or death from CV causes 0.74 (0.65–0.85) Results did not differ by diabetes status	CV death or HF hospitalization 0.75 (0.65–0.86)
Key secondary outcome§	4-point MACE 0.89 (0.78–1.01)	All-cause and CV mortality (see below)	Death from any cause 0.93 (0.82–1.04)	CV death or HF hospitalization 0.69 (0.57–0.83) 3-point MACE 0.80 (0.67–0.95)	≥50% decline in eGFR, ESKD, or death from renal cause 0.56 (0.45–0.68)	CV death or HF hospitalization 0.88 (0.75–1.03)	CV death or HF hospitalization 0.75 (0.65–0.85)	Total HF hospitalizations 0.70 (0.58–0.85)
Cardiovascular deaths	0.62 (0.49–0.77)	0.87 (0.72–1.06)	0.98 (0.82–1.17)	0.78 (0.61–1.00)	0.81 (0.58–1.12)	0.92 (0.77–1.11)	0.82 (0.69–0.98)	0.92 (0.75–1.12)
MIS	0.87 (0.70–1.09)	0.89 (0.73–1.09)	0.89 (0.77–1.01)	—	—	1.04 (0.86–1.26)	—	—
Stroke§	1.18 (0.89–1.56)	0.87 (0.69–1.09)	1.01 (0.84–1.21)	—	—	1.06 (0.82–1.37)	—	—
HF hospitalizations	0.65 (0.50–0.85)	0.67 (0.52–0.87)	0.73 (0.61–0.88)	0.61 (0.47–0.80)	—	0.70 (0.54–0.90)	0.70 (0.59–0.83)	0.69 (0.59–0.81)
Unstable angina hospitalizations	0.99 (0.74–1.34)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
All-cause mortality§	0.68 (0.57–0.82)	0.87 (0.74–1.01)	0.93 (0.82–1.04)	0.83 (0.68–1.02)	0.69 (0.53–0.88)	0.93 (0.80–1.08)	0.83 (0.71–0.97)	0.92 (0.77–1.10)
Worsening nephropathy	0.61 (0.53–0.70)	0.60 (0.47–0.77)	0.53 (0.43–0.66)	(See primary outcome)	(See primary outcome)	(See secondary outcomes)	0.71 (0.44–1.16)	Composite renal outcome 0.50 (0.32–0.77)

—, not assessed/reported; CHF, congestive heart failure; CV, cardiovascular; CVD, cardiovascular disease; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; ESRD, end-stage renal disease; HF, heart failure; MACE, major adverse cardiovascular event; MI, myocardial infarction; SGLT2, sodium–glucose cotransporter 2; NYHA, New York Heart Association. Data from this table was adapted from Cefalu et al. (225) in the January 2018 issue of *Diabetes Care*. \*Baseline characteristics for EMPEROR-Reduced displayed as empagliflozin, placebo. †Age was reported as means in all trials; diabetes duration was reported as means in all trials except EMPA-REG OUTCOME, which reported as percentage of population with diabetes duration >10 years; and DECLARE-TIMI 58, which reported median. ‡Significant difference in A1C between groups (P < 0.05). ^A1C change of 0.30 in EMPA-REG OUTCOME is based on pooled results for both doses (i.e., 0.24% for 10 mg and 0.36% for 25 mg of empagliflozin). §Outcomes reported as hazard ratio (95% CI). ||Definitions of worsening nephropathy differed between trials.

the cardiovascular effects of treatment in patients at high risk for major adverse cardiovascular events and 2) the impact of canagliflozin therapy on cardiorenal outcomes in patients with diabetes-related chronic kidney disease (187). First, the Canagliflozin Cardiovascular Assessment Study (CANVAS) Program integrated data from two trials. The CANVAS trial that started in 2009 was partially unblinded prior to completion because of the need to file interim cardiovascular outcomes data for regulatory approval of the drug (188). Thereafter, the postapproval CANVAS-Renal (CANVAS-R) trial was started in 2014. Combining both of these trials, 10,142 participants with type 2 diabetes were randomized to canagliflozin or placebo and were followed for an average 3.6 years. The mean age of patients was 63 years, and 66% had a history of cardiovascular disease. The combined analysis of the two trials found that canagliflozin significantly reduced the composite outcome of cardiovascular death, MI, or stroke versus placebo (occurring in 26.9 vs. 31.5 participants per 1,000 patient-years; HR 0.86 [95% CI 0.75–0.97]). The specific estimates for canagliflozin versus placebo on the primary composite cardiovascular outcome were HR 0.88 (95% CI 0.75–1.03) for the CANVAS trial and 0.82 (0.66–1.01) for CANVAS-R, with no heterogeneity found between trials. Of note, there was an increased risk of lower-limb amputation with canagliflozin (6.3 vs. 3.4 participants per 1,000 patient-years; HR 1.97 [95% CI 1.41–2.75]) (9). Second, the Canagliflozin and Renal Events in Diabetes with Established Nephropathy Clinical Evaluation (CRENCE) trial randomized 4,401 patients with type 2 diabetes and chronic diabetes-related kidney disease (UACR >300 mg/g and eGFR 30 to <90 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>) to canagliflozin 100 mg daily or placebo (187). The primary outcome was a composite of end-stage kidney disease, doubling of serum creatinine, or death from renal or cardiovascular causes. The trial was stopped early due to conclusive evidence of efficacy identified during a prespecified interim analysis with no unexpected safety signals. The risk of the primary composite outcome was 30% lower with canagliflozin treatment when compared with placebo (HR 0.70 [95% CI 0.59–0.82]). Moreover, it reduced the prespecified

end point of end-stage kidney disease alone by 32% (HR 0.68 [95% CI 0.54–0.86]). Canagliflozin was additionally found to have a lower risk of the composite of cardiovascular death, MI, or stroke (HR 0.80 [95% CI 0.67–0.95]), as well as lower risk of hospitalizations for heart failure (HR 0.61 [95% CI 0.47–0.80]) and of the composite of cardiovascular death or hospitalization for heart failure (HR 0.69 [95% CI 0.57–0.83]). In terms of safety, no significant increase in lower-limb amputations, fractures, acute kidney injury, or hyperkalemia was noted for canagliflozin relative to placebo in CRENCE. An increased risk for diabetic ketoacidosis was noted, however, with 2.2 and 0.2 events per 1,000 patient-years noted in the canagliflozin and placebo groups, respectively (HR 10.80 [95% CI 1.39–83.65]) (187).

The Dapagliflozin Effect on Cardiovascular Events—Thrombosis in Myocardial Infarction 58 (DECLARE-TIMI 58) trial was another randomized, double-blind trial that assessed the effects of dapagliflozin versus placebo on cardiovascular and renal outcomes in 17,160 patients with type 2 diabetes and established ASCVD or multiple risk factors for atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (189). Study participants had a mean age of 64 years, with ~40% of study participants having established ASCVD at baseline—a characteristic of this trial that differs from other large cardiovascular trials where a majority of participants had established cardiovascular disease. DECLARE-TIMI 58 met the prespecified criteria for noninferiority to placebo with respect to major adverse cardiovascular events but did not show a lower rate of major adverse cardiovascular events when compared with placebo (8.8% in the dapagliflozin group and 9.4% in the placebo group; HR 0.93 [95% CI 0.84–1.03];  $P = 0.17$ ). A lower rate of cardiovascular death or hospitalization for heart failure was noted (4.9% vs. 5.8%; HR 0.83 [95% CI 0.73–0.95];  $P = 0.005$ ), which reflected a lower rate of hospitalization for heart failure (HR 0.73 [95% CI 0.61–0.88]). No difference was seen in cardiovascular death between groups.

In the Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Chronic Kidney Disease (DAPA-CKD) trial (190), 4,304 patients with chronic kidney disease (UACR 200–5,000 mg/g and eGFR 25–75 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>), with or without diabetes, were randomized to dapagliflozin 10

mg daily or placebo. The primary outcome was a composite of sustained decline in eGFR of at least 50%, end-stage kidney disease, or death from renal or cardiovascular causes. Over a median follow-up period of 2.4 years, a primary outcome event occurred in 9.2% of participants in the dapagliflozin group and 14.5% of those in the placebo group. The risk of the primary composite outcome was significantly lower with dapagliflozin therapy compared with placebo (HR 0.61 [95% CI 0.51–0.72]), as were the risks for a renal composite outcome of sustained decline in eGFR of at least 50%, end-stage kidney disease, or death from renal causes (HR 0.56 [95% CI 0.45–0.68]), and a composite of cardiovascular death or hospitalization for heart failure (HR 0.71 [95% CI 0.55–0.92]). The effects of dapagliflozin therapy were similar in patients with and without type 2 diabetes.

Results of the Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Heart Failure (DAPA-HF) trial and the Empagliflozin Outcome Trial in Patients With Chronic Heart Failure and a Reduced Ejection Fraction (EMPEROR-Reduced), which assessed the effects of dapagliflozin and empagliflozin, respectively, in patients with established heart failure (191), are described below in GLUCOSE-LOWERING THERAPIES AND HEART FAILURE.

The Evaluation of Ertugliflozin Efficacy and Safety Cardiovascular Outcomes Trial (VERTIS CV) (192) was a randomized, double-blind trial that established the effects of ertugliflozin versus placebo on cardiovascular outcomes in 8,246 patients with type 2 diabetes and established ASCVD. Participants were assigned to the addition of 5 mg or 15 mg of ertugliflozin or to placebo once daily to background standard care. Study participants had a mean age of 64.4 years and a mean duration of diabetes of 13 years at baseline and were followed for a median of 3.0 years. VERTIS CV met the prespecified criteria for noninferiority of ertugliflozin to placebo with respect to the primary outcome of major adverse cardiovascular events (11.9% in the pooled ertugliflozin group and 11.9% in the placebo group; HR 0.97 [95% CI 0.85–1.11];  $P < 0.001$ ). Ertugliflozin was not superior to placebo for the key secondary outcomes of death from cardiovascular causes or

hospitalization for heart failure; death from cardiovascular causes; or the composite of death from renal causes, renal replacement therapy, or doubling of the serum creatinine level. The hazard ratio for a secondary outcome of hospitalization for heart failure (ertugliflozin vs. placebo) was 0.70 [95% CI 0.54–0.90], consistent with findings from other SGLT2 inhibitor cardiovascular outcomes trials.

Sotagliflozin, an investigational SGLT1 and SGLT2 inhibitor that lowers glucose via delayed glucose absorption in the gut in addition to increasing urinary glucose excretion, has been evaluated in the Effect of Sotagliflozin on Cardiovascular and Renal Events in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes and Moderate Renal Impairment Who Are at Cardiovascular Risk (SCORED) trial (193). A total of 10,584 patients with type 2 diabetes, chronic kidney disease, and additional cardiovascular risk were enrolled in SCORED and randomized to sotagliflozin 200 mg once daily (up-titrated to 400 mg once daily if tolerated) or placebo. SCORED ended early due to a lack of funding; thus, changes to the prespecified primary end points were made prior to unblinding to accommodate a lower than anticipated number of end point events. The primary end point of the trial was the total number of deaths from cardiovascular causes, hospitalizations for heart failure, and urgent visits for heart failure. After a median of 16 months of follow-up, the rate of primary end point events was reduced with sotagliflozin (5.6 events per 100 patient-years in the sotagliflozin group and 7.5 events per 100 patient-years in the placebo group [HR 0.74 (95% CI 0.63–0.88);  $P < 0.001$ ]). Sotagliflozin also reduced the risk of the secondary end point of total number of hospitalizations for heart failure and urgent visits for heart failure (3.5% in the sotagliflozin group and 5.1% in the placebo group; HR 0.67 [95% CI 0.55–0.82];  $P < 0.001$ ) but not the secondary end point of deaths from cardiovascular causes. No significant between-group differences were found for the outcome of all-cause mortality or for a composite renal outcome comprising the first occurrence of long-term dialysis, renal transplantation, or a sustained reduction in eGFR. In general, the adverse effects of sotagliflozin were similar to those seen with use of SGLT2 inhibitors, but they also included an increased rate of

diarrhea potentially related to the inhibition of SGLT1.

#### GLP-1 Receptor Agonist Trials

The Liraglutide Effect and Action in Diabetes: Evaluation of Cardiovascular Outcome Results (LEADER) trial was a randomized, double-blind trial that assessed the effect of liraglutide, a glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) receptor agonist, versus placebo on cardiovascular outcomes in 9,340 patients with type 2 diabetes at high risk for cardiovascular disease or with cardiovascular disease. Study participants had a mean age of 64 years and a mean duration of diabetes of nearly 13 years. Over 80% of study participants had established cardiovascular disease. After a median follow-up of 3.8 years, LEADER showed that the primary composite outcome (MI, stroke, or cardiovascular death) occurred in fewer participants in the treatment group (13.0%) when compared with the placebo group (14.9%) (HR 0.87 [95% CI 0.78–0.97];  $P < 0.001$  for noninferiority;  $P = 0.01$  for superiority). Deaths from cardiovascular causes were significantly reduced in the liraglutide group (4.7%) compared with the placebo group (6.0%) (HR 0.78 [95% CI 0.66–0.93];  $P = 0.007$ ) (194). The FDA approved the use of liraglutide to reduce the risk of major adverse cardiovascular events, including heart attack, stroke, and cardiovascular death, in adults with type 2 diabetes and established cardiovascular disease.

Results from a moderate-sized trial of another GLP-1 receptor agonist, semaglutide, were consistent with the LEADER trial (195). Semaglutide is a once-weekly GLP-1 receptor agonist approved by the FDA for the treatment of type 2 diabetes. The Trial to Evaluate Cardiovascular and Other Long-term Outcomes With Semaglutide in Subjects With Type 2 Diabetes (SUSTAIN-6) was the initial randomized trial powered to test noninferiority of semaglutide for the purpose of regulatory approval. In this study, 3,297 patients with type 2 diabetes were randomized to receive once-weekly semaglutide (0.5 mg or 1.0 mg) or placebo for 2 years. The primary outcome (the first occurrence of cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, or nonfatal stroke) occurred in 108 patients (6.6%) in the semaglutide group vs. 146 patients (8.9%) in the placebo group

(HR 0.74 [95% CI 0.58–0.95];  $P < 0.001$ ). More patients discontinued treatment in the semaglutide group because of adverse events, mainly gastrointestinal. The cardiovascular effects of the oral formulation of semaglutide compared with placebo have been assessed in Peptide Innovation for Early Diabetes Treatment (PIONEER) 6, a pre-approval trial designed to rule out an unacceptable increase in cardiovascular risk. In this trial of 3,183 patients with type 2 diabetes and high cardiovascular risk followed for a median of 15.9 months, oral semaglutide was noninferior to placebo for the primary composite outcome of cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, or nonfatal stroke (HR 0.79 [95% CI 0.57–1.11];  $P < 0.001$  for noninferiority) (196). The cardiovascular effects of this formulation of semaglutide will be further tested in a large, longer-term outcomes trial.

The Harmony Outcomes trial randomized 9,463 patients with type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease to once-weekly subcutaneous albiglutide or matching placebo, in addition to their standard care. Over a median duration of 1.6 years, the GLP-1 receptor agonist reduced the risk of cardiovascular death, MI, or stroke to an incidence rate of 4.6 events per 100 person-years in the albiglutide group vs. 5.9 events in the placebo group (HR ratio 0.78,  $P = 0.0006$  for superiority) (197). This agent is not currently available for clinical use.

The Researching Cardiovascular Events With a Weekly Incretin in Diabetes (REWIND) trial was a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial that assessed the effect of the once-weekly GLP-1 receptor agonist dulaglutide versus placebo on major adverse cardiovascular events in ~9,990 patients with type 2 diabetes at risk for cardiovascular events or with a history of cardiovascular disease (198). Study participants had a mean age of 66 years and a mean duration of diabetes of ~10 years. Approximately 32% of participants had history of atherosclerotic cardiovascular events at baseline. After a median follow-up of 5.4 years, the primary composite outcome of nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, or death from cardiovascular causes occurred in 12.0% and 13.4% of participants in the dulaglutide and placebo treatment groups, respectively (HR 0.88 [95% CI 0.79–0.99];  $P = 0.026$ ). These

findings equated to incidence rates of 2.4 and 2.7 events per 100 person-years, respectively. The results were consistent across the subgroups of patients with and without history of CV events. All-cause mortality did not differ between groups ( $P = 0.067$ ).

The Evaluation of Lixisenatide in Acute Coronary Syndrome (ELIXA) trial studied the once-daily GLP-1 receptor agonist lixisenatide on cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes who had had a recent acute coronary event (199). A total of 6,068 patients with type 2 diabetes with a recent hospitalization for MI or unstable angina within the previous 180 days were randomized to receive lixisenatide or placebo in addition to standard care and were followed for a median of  $\sim 2.1$  years. The primary outcome of cardiovascular death, MI, stroke, or hospitalization for unstable angina occurred in 406 patients (13.4%) in the lixisenatide group vs. 399 (13.2%) in the placebo group (HR 1.2 [95% CI 0.89–1.17]), which demonstrated the noninferiority of lixisenatide to placebo ( $P < 0.001$ ) but did not show superiority ( $P = 0.81$ ).

The Exenatide Study of Cardiovascular Event Lowering (EXSCEL) trial also reported results with the once-weekly GLP-1 receptor agonist extended-release exenatide and found that major adverse cardiovascular events were numerically lower with use of extended-release exenatide compared with placebo, although this difference was not statistically significant (200). A total of 14,752 patients with type 2 diabetes (of whom 10,782 [73.1%] had previous cardiovascular disease) were randomized to receive extended-release exenatide 2 mg or placebo and followed for a median of 3.2 years. The primary end point of cardiovascular death, MI, or stroke occurred in 839 patients (11.4%; 3.7 events per 100 person-years) in the exenatide group and in 905 patients (12.2%; 4.0 events per 100 person-years) in the placebo group (HR 0.91 [95% CI 0.83–1.00];  $P < 0.001$  for noninferiority), but exenatide was not superior to placebo with respect to the primary end point ( $P = 0.06$  for superiority). However, all-cause mortality was lower in the exenatide group (HR 0.86 [95% CI 0.77–0.97]). The incidence of acute pancreatitis, pancreatic cancer, medullary thyroid carcinoma, and serious adverse events did

not differ significantly between the two groups.

In summary, there are now numerous large randomized controlled trials reporting statistically significant reductions in cardiovascular events for three of the FDA-approved SGLT2 inhibitors (empagliflozin, canagliflozin, dapagliflozin, with lesser benefits seen with ertugliflozin) and four FDA-approved GLP-1 receptor agonists (liraglutide, albiglutide [although that agent was removed from the market for business reasons], semaglutide [lower risk of cardiovascular events in a moderate-sized clinical trial but one not powered as a cardiovascular outcomes trial], and dulaglutide). Meta-analyses of the trials reported to date suggest that GLP-1 receptor agonists and SGLT2 inhibitors reduce risk of atherosclerotic major adverse cardiovascular events to a comparable degree in patients with type 2 diabetes and established ASCVD (201,202). SGLT2 inhibitors also reduce risk of heart failure hospitalization and progression of kidney disease in patients with established ASCVD, multiple risk factors for ASCVD, or albuminuric kidney disease (203,204). In patients with type 2 diabetes and established ASCVD, multiple ASCVD risk factors, or diabetic kidney disease, an SGLT2 inhibitor with demonstrated cardiovascular benefit is recommended to reduce the risk of major adverse cardiovascular events and/or heart failure hospitalization. In patients with type 2 diabetes and established ASCVD or multiple risk factors for ASCVD, a glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist with demonstrated cardiovascular benefit is recommended to reduce the risk of major adverse cardiovascular events. For many patients, use of either an SGLT2 inhibitor or a GLP-1 receptor agonist to reduce cardiovascular risk is appropriate. Emerging data suggest that use of both classes of drugs will provide an additive cardiovascular and kidney outcomes benefit; thus, combination therapy with an SGLT2 inhibitor and a GLP-1 receptor agonist may be considered to provide the complementary outcomes benefits associated with these classes of medication. Evidence to support such an approach includes findings from AMPLITUDE-O (Effect of Efglenatide on Cardiovascular Outcomes), the recently completed outcomes trial of patients with type 2 diabetes and either cardiovascular or kidney disease plus at least one other risk factor randomized to

the investigational GLP-1 receptor agonist efglenatide or placebo (205). Randomization was stratified by current or potential use of SGLT2 inhibitor therapy, a class ultimately used by  $>15\%$  of the trial participants. Over a median follow-up of 1.8 years, efglenatide therapy reduced the risk of incident major adverse cardiovascular events by 27% and of a composite renal outcome event by 32%. Importantly, the effects of efglenatide did not vary by use of SGLT2 inhibitors, suggesting that the beneficial effects of the GLP-1 receptor agonist were independent of those provided by SGLT2 inhibitor therapy.

### Glucose-Lowering Therapies and Heart Failure

As many as 50% of patients with type 2 diabetes may develop heart failure (206). These conditions, which are each associated with increased morbidity and mortality, commonly coincide and independently contribute to adverse outcomes (207). Strategies to mitigate these risks are needed, and the heart failure–related risks and benefits of glucose-lowering medications should be considered carefully when determining a regimen of care for patients with diabetes and either established heart failure or high risk for the development of heart failure.

Data on the effects of glucose-lowering agents on heart failure outcomes have demonstrated that thiazolidinediones have a strong and consistent relationship with increased risk of heart failure (208–210). Therefore, thiazolidinedione use should be avoided in patients with symptomatic heart failure. Restrictions to use of metformin in patients with medically treated heart failure were removed by the FDA in 2006 (211). Observational studies of patients with type 2 diabetes and heart failure suggest that metformin users have better outcomes than patients treated with other antihyperglycemic agents (212); however, no randomized trial of metformin therapy has been conducted in patients with heart failure. Metformin may be used for the management of hyperglycemia in patients with stable heart failure as long as kidney function remains within the recommended range for use (213).

Recent studies examining the relationship between DPP-4 inhibitors and heart failure have had mixed results.



The Saxagliptin Assessment of Vascular Outcomes Recorded in Patients with Diabetes Mellitus – Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction 53 (SAVOR-TIMI 53) study showed that patients treated with the DPP-4 inhibitor saxagliptin were more likely to be hospitalized for heart failure than those given placebo (3.5% vs. 2.8%, respectively) (214). However, three other cardiovascular outcomes trials—Examination of Cardiovascular Outcomes with Alogliptin versus Standard of Care (EXAMINE) (215), Trial Evaluating Cardiovascular Outcomes with Sitagliptin (TECOS) (216), and the Cardiovascular and Renal Microvascular Outcome Study With Linagliptin (CARMELINA) (186)—did not find a significant increase in risk of heart failure hospitalization with DPP-4 inhibitor use compared with placebo. No increased risk of heart failure hospitalization has been identified in the cardiovascular outcomes trials of the GLP-1 receptor agonists lixisenatide, liraglutide, semaglutide, exenatide once-weekly, albiglutide, or dulaglutide compared with placebo (**Table 10.3B**) (194,195,198–200).

Reduced incidence of heart failure has been observed with the use of SGLT2 inhibitors (187,189). In EMPA-REG OUTCOME, the addition of empagliflozin to standard care led to a significant 35% reduction in hospitalization for heart failure compared with placebo (8). Although the majority of patients in the study did not have heart failure at baseline, this benefit was consistent in patients with and without a history of heart failure (10). Similarly, in CANVAS and DECLARE-TIMI 58, there were 33% and 27% reductions in hospitalization for heart failure, respectively, with SGLT2 inhibitor use versus placebo (9,189). Additional data from the CREDENCE trial with canagliflozin showed a 39% reduction in hospitalization for heart failure, and 31% reduction in the composite of cardiovascular death or hospitalization for heart failure, in a diabetic kidney disease population with albuminuria (UACR of >300 to 5,000 mg/g) (187). These combined findings from four large outcomes trials of three different SGLT2 inhibitors are highly consistent and clearly indicate robust benefits of SGLT2 inhibitors in the prevention of heart failure hospitalizations. The EMPA-REG OUTCOME, CANVAS, DECLARE-TIMI 58, and CREDENCE trials

suggested, but did not prove, that SGLT2 inhibitors would be beneficial in the treatment of patients with established heart failure. More recently, the placebo-controlled DAPA-HF trial evaluated the effects of dapagliflozin on the primary outcome of a composite of worsening heart failure or cardiovascular death in patients with New York Heart Association (NYHA) class II, III, or IV heart failure and an ejection fraction of 40% or less. Of the 4,744 trial participants, 45% had a history of type 2 diabetes. Over a median of 18.2 months, the group assigned to dapagliflozin treatment had a lower risk of the primary outcome (HR 0.74 [95% CI 0.65–0.85]), lower risk of first worsening heart failure event (HR 0.70 [95% CI 0.59–0.83]), and lower risk of cardiovascular death (HR 0.82 [95% CI 0.69–0.98]) compared with placebo. The effect of dapagliflozin on the primary outcome was consistent regardless of the presence or absence of type 2 diabetes (191). Ongoing trials are assessing the effects of several SGLT2 inhibitors in heart failure patients with both reduced and preserved ejection fraction.

EMPEROR-Reduced assessed the effects of empagliflozin 10 mg once daily versus placebo on a primary composite outcome of cardiovascular death or hospitalization for worsening heart failure in a population of 3,730 patients with NYHA class II, III, or IV heart failure and an ejection fraction of 40% or less (217). At baseline, 49.8% of participants had a history of diabetes. Over a median follow-up of 16 months, those in the empagliflozin-treated group had a reduced risk of the primary outcome (HR 0.75 [95% CI 0.65–0.86];  $P < 0.001$ ) and fewer total hospitalizations for heart failure (HR 0.70 [95% CI 0.58–0.85];  $P < 0.001$ ). The effect of empagliflozin on the primary outcome was consistent irrespective of diabetes diagnosis at baseline. The risk of a prespecified renal composite outcome (chronic dialysis, renal transplantation, or a sustained reduction in eGFR) was lower in the empagliflozin group than in the placebo group (1.6% in the empagliflozin group vs. 3.1% in the placebo group; HR 0.50 [95% CI 0.32–0.77]).

Therefore, in patients with type 2 diabetes and established HFrEF, an SGLT2 inhibitor with proven benefit in this patient population is recommended to reduce the risk of worsening heart failure and cardiovascular death. The benefits seen in this patient population likely

represent a class effect, and they appear unrelated to glucose lowering given comparable outcomes in HFrEF patients with and without diabetes.

Additional data are accumulating regarding the effects of SGLT inhibition in patients hospitalized for acute decompensated heart failure and in heart failure patients with HFpEF. As an example, the investigational SGLT1 and SGLT2 inhibitor sotagliflozin has also been studied in the Effect of Sotagliflozin on Cardiovascular Events in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Post Worsening Heart Failure (SOLOIST-WHF) trial (218). In SOLOIST-WHF, 1,222 patients with type 2 diabetes who were recently hospitalized for worsening heart failure were randomized to sotagliflozin 200 mg once daily (with uptitration to 400 mg once daily if tolerated) or placebo either before or within 3 days after hospital discharge. Patients were eligible if hospitalized for signs and symptoms of heart failure (including elevated natriuretic peptide levels) requiring treatment with intravenous diuretic therapy. Exclusion criteria included end-stage heart failure or recent acute coronary syndrome or intervention, or an eGFR <30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. Patients were required to be clinically stable prior to randomization, defined as no use of supplemental oxygen, a systolic blood pressure  $\geq 100$  mmHg, and no need for intravenous inotropic or vasodilator therapy other than nitrates. Similar to SCORED, SOLOIST-WHF ended early due to a lack of funding, resulting in a change to the prespecified primary end point prior to unblinding to accommodate a lower than anticipated number of end point events. At a median follow-up of 9 months, the rate of primary end point events (the total number of cardiovascular deaths and hospitalizations and urgent visits for heart failure) was lower in the sotagliflozin group than in the placebo group (51.0 vs. 76.3; HR 0.67 [95% CI 0.52–0.85];  $P < 0.001$ ). No significant between-group differences were found in the rates of cardiovascular death or all-cause mortality. Both diarrhea (6.1% vs. 3.4%) and severe hypoglycemia (1.5% vs. 0.3%) were more common with sotagliflozin than with placebo. The trial was originally also intended to evaluate the effects of SGLT inhibition in patients with HFpEF, and ultimately no evidence of heterogeneity of

treatment effect by ejection fraction was noted. However, the relatively small percentage of such patients enrolled (only 21% of participants had ejection fraction >50%) and the early termination of the trial limited the ability to determine the effects of sotagliflozin in HFpEF specifically. Additional data regarding the impact of SGLT2 inhibitor therapy in patients with HFpEF will soon be available from EMPEROR-Preserved, the empagliflozin outcome trial of nearly 6,000 patients with symptomatic heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (left ventricular ejection fraction >40%) (219), with or without type 2 diabetes.


#### Clinical Approach

As has been carefully outlined in **Fig. 9.3** in the preceding Section 9, “Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/>

dc22-S009), patients with type 2 diabetes with or at high risk for ASCVD, heart failure, or CKD should be treated with a cardioprotective SGLT2 inhibitor and/or GLP-1 receptor agonist as part of the comprehensive approach to cardiovascular and kidney risk reduction. Importantly, these agents should be included in the regimen of care irrespective of the need for additional glucose lowering, and irrespective of metformin use. Such an approach has also been described in the ADA-endorsed American College of Cardiology “2020 Expert Consensus Decision Pathway on Novel Therapies for Cardiovascular Risk Reduction in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes” (220). **Figure 10.3**, reproduced from that decision pathway, outlines the approach to risk reduction with SGLT2 inhibitor or GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy in conjunction with other

traditional, guideline-based preventive medical therapies for blood pressure, lipids, and glycemia and antiplatelet therapy.

Adoption of these agents should be reasonably straightforward in patients with established cardiovascular or kidney disease who are later diagnosed with diabetes, as the cardioprotective agents can be used from the outset of diabetes management. On the other hand, incorporation of SGLT2 inhibitor or GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy in the care of patients with more long-standing diabetes may be more challenging, particularly if patients are using an already complex glucose-lowering regimen. In such patients, SGLT2 inhibitor or GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy may need to replace some or all of their existing medications to minimize risks of hypoglycemia and adverse side effects, and potentially to minimize medication



\*ASCVD is defined as a history of an acute coronary syndrome or MI, stable or unstable angina, coronary heart disease with or without revascularization, other arterial revascularization, stroke, or peripheral artery disease assumed to be atherosclerotic in origin.

†DKD is a clinical diagnosis marked by reduced eGFR, the presence of albuminuria, or both.

‡ Consider an SGLT2 inhibitor when your patient has established ASCVD, HF, DKD or is at high risk for ASCVD. Consider a GLP-1RA when your patient has established ASCVD or is at high risk for ASCVD.

§ Patients at high risk for ASCVD include those with end organ damage such as left ventricular hypertrophy or retinopathy or with multiple CV risk factors (e.g., age, hypertension, smoking, dyslipidemia, obesity).

¶ Most patients enrolled in the relevant trials were on metformin at baseline as glucose-lowering therapy.

ASCVD = atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease; CV = cardiovascular; DKD = diabetic kidney disease; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; GLP-1RA = glucagon-like peptide-1 receptor agonist; HF = heart failure; MI = myocardial infarction; SGLT2 = sodium-glucose cotransporter-2; T2D = type 2 diabetes

**Figure 10.3**—Approach to risk reduction with SGLT2 inhibitor or GLP-1 receptor agonist therapy in conjunction with other traditional, guideline-based preventive medical therapies for blood pressure, lipids, and glycemia and antiplatelet therapy. Reprinted with permission from Das et al. (220).

costs. Close collaboration between primary and specialty care providers can help to facilitate these transitions in clinical care and, in turn, improve outcomes for high-risk patients with type 2 diabetes.

## References

- American Diabetes Association. Economic costs of diabetes in the U.S. in 2017. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:917–928
- Ali MK, Bullard KM, Saaddine JB, Cowie CC, Imperatore G, Gregg EW. Achievement of goals in U.S. diabetes care, 1999–2010. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368:1613–1624
- Buse JB, Ginsberg HN, Bakris GL, et al.; American Heart Association; American Diabetes Association. Primary prevention of cardiovascular diseases in people with diabetes mellitus: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association and the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:162–172
- Gaede P, Lund-Andersen H, Parving H-H, Pedersen O. Effect of a multifactorial intervention on mortality in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:580–591
- Cavender MA, Steg PG, Smith SC Jr, et al.; REACH Registry Investigators. Impact of diabetes mellitus on hospitalization for heart failure, cardiovascular events, and death: outcomes at 4 years from the Reduction of Atherothrombosis for Continued Health (REACH) Registry. *Circulation* 2015;132:923–931
- McAllister DA, Read SH, Kerssens J, et al. Incidence of hospitalization for heart failure and case-fatality among 3.25 million people with and without diabetes mellitus. *Circulation* 2018;138:2774–2786
- Lam CSP, Voors AA, de Boer RA, Solomon SD, van Veldhuisen DJ. Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction: from mechanisms to therapies. *Eur Heart J* 2018;39:2780–2792
- Zinman B, Wanner C, Lachin JM, et al.; EMPA-REG OUTCOME Investigators. Empagliflozin, cardiovascular outcomes, and mortality in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:2117–2128
- Neal B, Perkovic V, Mahaffey KW, et al.; CANVAS Program Collaborative Group. Canagliflozin and cardiovascular and renal events in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:644–657
- Fitchett D, Butler J, van de Borne P, et al.; EMPA-REG OUTCOME® trial investigators. Effects of empagliflozin on risk for cardiovascular death and heart failure hospitalization across the spectrum of heart failure risk in the EMPA-REG OUTCOME® trial. *Eur Heart J* 2018;39:363–370.
- Blood Pressure Lowering Treatment Trialists' Collaboration. Blood pressure-lowering treatment based on cardiovascular risk: a meta-analysis of individual patient data. *Lancet* 2014;384:591–598
- Grundy SM, Stone NJ, Bailey AL, et al. 2018 AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA Guideline on the management of blood cholesterol: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2019;73:3168–3209
- Muntner P, Colantonio LD, Cushman M, et al. Validation of the atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease Pooled Cohort risk equations. *JAMA* 2014;311:1406–1415
- DeFilippis AP, Young R, McEvoy JW, et al. Risk score overestimation: the impact of individual cardiovascular risk factors and preventive therapies on the performance of the American Heart Association-American College of Cardiology-Atherosclerotic Cardiovascular Disease risk score in a modern multi-ethnic cohort. *Eur Heart J* 2017;38:598–608
- Bohula EA, Morrow DA, Giugliano RP, et al. Atherothrombotic risk stratification and ezetimibe for secondary prevention. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017;69:911–921
- Bohula EA, Bonaca MP, Braunwald E, et al. Atherothrombotic risk stratification and the efficacy and safety of vorapaxar in patients with stable ischemic heart disease and previous myocardial infarction. *Circulation* 2016;134:304–313
- de Boer IH, Bangalore S, Benetos A, et al. Diabetes and hypertension: a position statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1273–1284
- Unger T, Borghi C, Charchar F, et al. 2020 International Society of Hypertension Global Hypertension Practice Guidelines. *Hypertension* 2020;75:1334–1357
- 18a. Stergiou GS, Parati G, McManus RJ, Head GA, Myers MG, Whelton PK. Guidelines for blood pressure measurement: development over 30 years. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)* 2018;20:1089–1091
- 18b. Stergiou GS, Palatini P, Gianfranco P, et al.; European Society of Hypertension Council and the European Society of Hypertension Working Group on Blood Pressure Monitoring and Cardiovascular Variability. 2021 European Society of Hypertension practice guidelines for office and out-of-office blood pressure measurement. *J Hypertens* 2021;39:1293–1302
- Bobbie G, Genès N, Vaur L, et al. Is “isolated home” hypertension as opposed to “isolated office” hypertension a sign of greater cardiovascular risk? *Arch Intern Med* 2001;161:2205–2211
- Sega R, Facchetti R, Bombelli M, et al. Prognostic value of ambulatory and home blood pressures compared with office blood pressure in the general population: follow-up results from the Pressioni Arteriose Monitorate e Loro Associazioni (PAMELA) study. *Circulation* 2005;111:1777–1783
- Omboni S, Gazzola T, Carabelli G, Parati G. Clinical usefulness and cost effectiveness of home blood pressure telemonitoring: meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies. *J Hypertens* 2013;31:455–467; discussion 467–468
- Emdin CA, Rahimi K, Neal B, Callender T, Perkovic V, Patel A. Blood pressure lowering in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2015;313:603–615
- Arguedas JA, Leiva V, Wright JM. Blood pressure targets for hypertension in people with diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013;10:CD008277
- Ettehad D, Emdin CA, Kiran A, et al. Blood pressure lowering for prevention of cardiovascular disease and death: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2016;387:957–967
- Brunström M, Carlberg B. Effect of antihypertensive treatment at different blood pressure levels in patients with diabetes mellitus: systematic review and meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2016;352:i717
- Bangalore S, Kumar S, Lobach I, Messerli FH. Blood pressure targets in subjects with type 2 diabetes mellitus/impaired fasting glucose: observations from traditional and bayesian random-effects meta-analyses of randomized trials. *Circulation* 2011;123:2799–2810
- Thomopoulos C, Parati G, Zanchetti A. Effects of blood-pressure-lowering treatment on outcome incidence in hypertension: 10 - Should blood pressure management differ in hypertensive patients with and without diabetes mellitus? Overview and meta-analyses of randomized trials. *J Hypertens* 2017;35:922–944
- Xie X, Atkins E, Lv J, et al. Effects of intensive blood pressure lowering on cardiovascular and renal outcomes: updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2016;387:435–443
- Cushman WC, Evans GW, Byington RP, et al.; ACCORD Study Group. Effects of intensive blood-pressure control in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1575–1585
- Patel A, MacMahon S, Chalmers J, et al.; ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Effects of a fixed combination of perindopril and indapamide on macrovascular and microvascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (the ADVANCE trial): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2007;370:829–840
- Bakris GL. The implications of blood pressure measurement methods on treatment targets for blood pressure. *Circulation* 2016;134:904–905
- Margolis KL, O'Connor PJ, Morgan TM, et al. Outcomes of combined cardiovascular risk factor management strategies in type 2 diabetes: the ACCORD randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:1721–1728
- Buckley LF, Dixon DL, Wohlford GF 4th, Wijesinghe DS, Baker WL, Van Tassel BW. Intensive versus standard blood pressure control in SPRINT-eligible participants of ACCORD-BP. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1733–1738
- Brouwer TF, Vehmeijer JT, Kalkman DN, et al. Intensive blood pressure lowering in patients with and patients without type 2 diabetes: a pooled analysis from two randomized trials. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1142–1148
- Lamprea-Montealegre JA, de Boer IH. Reevaluating the evidence for blood pressure targets in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1132–1133
- Beddhu S, Greene T, Boucher R, et al. Intensive systolic blood pressure control and incident chronic kidney disease in people with and without diabetes mellitus: secondary analyses of two randomised controlled trials. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2018;6:555–563
- de Boer IH, Bakris G, Cannon CP. Individualizing blood pressure targets for people with diabetes and hypertension: comparing the ADA and the ACC/AHA recommendations. *JAMA* 2018;319:1319–1320
- Basu S, Sussman JB, Rigdon J, Steimle L, Denton BT, Hayward RA. Benefit and harm of intensive blood pressure treatment: derivation and validation of risk models using data from the SPRINT and ACCORD trials. *PLoS Med* 2017;14:e1002410
- Phillips RA, Xu J, Peterson LE, Arnold RM, Diamond JA, Schussheim AE. Impact of cardiovascular risk on the relative benefit and



- harm of intensive treatment of hypertension. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;71:1601–1610
40. Whelton PK, Carey RM, Aronow WS, et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APhA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA guideline for the prevention, detection, evaluation, and management of high blood pressure in adults: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;71:e127–e248
41. Wright JT Jr, Williamson JD, Whelton PK, et al.; SPRINT Research Group. A randomized trial of intensive versus standard blood-pressure control. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:2103–2116
42. Sink KM, Evans GW, Shorr RI, et al. Syncope, hypotension, and falls in the treatment of hypertension: results from the randomized clinical systolic blood pressure intervention trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2018;66:679–686
43. Ilkun OL, Greene T, Cheung AK, et al. The influence of baseline diastolic blood pressure on the effects of intensive blood pressure lowering on cardiovascular outcomes and all-cause mortality in type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1878–1884
44. Abalos E, Duley L, Steyn DW. Antihypertensive drug therapy for mild to moderate hypertension during pregnancy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014;2:CD002252
45. Magee LA, von Dadelszen P, Rey E, et al. Less-tight versus tight control of hypertension in pregnancy. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:407–417
46. Brown MA, Magee LA, Kenny LC, et al.; International Society for the Study of Hypertension in Pregnancy (ISSHP). Hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: ISSHP classification, diagnosis, and management recommendations for international practice. *Hypertension* 2018;72:24–43
47. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Task Force on Hypertension in Pregnancy. Hypertension in pregnancy. Report of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Task Force on Hypertension in Pregnancy. *Obstet Gynecol* 2013;122:1122–1131
48. Al-Balas M, Bozzo P, Einarson A. Use of diuretics during pregnancy. *Can Fam Physician* 2009;55:44–45
49. Irgens HU, Reisaeter L, Irgens LM, Lie RT. Long term mortality of mothers and fathers after pre-eclampsia: population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2001;323:1213–1217
50. Sacks FM, Svetkey LP, Vollmer WM, et al.; DASH-Sodium Collaborative Research Group. Effects on blood pressure of reduced dietary sodium and the Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension (DASH) diet. *N Engl J Med* 2001;344:3–10
51. James PA, Oparil S, Carter BL, et al. 2014 evidence-based guideline for the management of high blood pressure in adults: report from the panel members appointed to the Eighth Joint National Committee (JNC 8). *JAMA* 2014;311:507–520
52. Mao Y, Lin W, Wen J, Chen G. Impact and efficacy of mobile health intervention in the management of diabetes and hypertension: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2020;8:e001225
53. Stogios N, Kaur B, Huszti E, Vasanthan J, Nolan RP. Advancing digital health interventions as a clinically applied science for blood pressure reduction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Can J Cardiol* 2020;36:764–774
54. Bakris GL, Weir MR; Study of Hypertension and the Efficacy of Lotrel in Diabetes (SHIELD) Investigators. Achieving goal blood pressure in patients with type 2 diabetes: conventional versus fixed-dose combination approaches. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)* 2003;5:202–209
55. Feldman RD, Zou GY, Vandervoort MK, Wong CJ, Nelson SAE, Feagan BG. A simplified approach to the treatment of uncomplicated hypertension: a cluster randomized, controlled trial. *Hypertension* 2009;53:646–653
56. Webster R, Salam A, de Silva HA, et al.; TRIUMPH Study Group. Fixed low-dose triple combination antihypertensive medication vs usual care for blood pressure control in patients with mild to moderate hypertension in Sri Lanka: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2018;320:566–579
57. Bangalore S, Kamalakkannan G, Parkar S, Messerli FH. Fixed-dose combinations improve medication compliance: a meta-analysis. *Am J Med* 2007;120:713–719
58. Catalá-López F, Macías Saint-Gerons D, González-Bermejo D, et al. Cardiovascular and renal outcomes of renin-angiotensin system blockade in adult patients with diabetes mellitus: a systematic review with network meta-analyses. *PLoS Med* 2016;13:e1001971
59. Palmer SC, Mavridis D, Navarese E, et al. Comparative efficacy and safety of blood pressure-lowering agents in adults with diabetes and kidney disease: a network meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2015;385:2047–2056
60. Barzilay JI, Davis BR, Bettencourt J, et al.; ALLHAT Collaborative Research Group. Cardiovascular outcomes using doxazosin vs. chlorthalidone for the treatment of hypertension in older adults with and without glucose disorders: a report from the ALLHAT study. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)* 2004;6:116–125
61. Weber MA, Bakris GL, Jamerson K, et al.; ACCOMPLISH Investigators. Cardiovascular events during differing hypertension therapies in patients with diabetes. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2010;56:77–85
62. Heart Outcomes Prevention Evaluation Study Investigators. Effects of ramipril on cardiovascular and microvascular outcomes in people with diabetes mellitus: results of the HOPE study and MICRO-HOPE substudy. *Lancet* 2000;355:253–259
63. Arnold SV, Bhatt DL, Barsness GW, et al.; American Heart Association Council on Lifestyle and Cardiometabolic Health and Council on Clinical Cardiology. Clinical management of stable coronary artery disease in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2020;141:e779–e806
64. Yusuf S, Teo K, Anderson C, et al.; Telmisartan Randomised Assessment Study in ACE Intolerant subjects with Cardiovascular Disease (TRANSCEND) Investigators. Effects of the angiotensin-receptor blocker telmisartan on cardiovascular events in high-risk patients intolerant to angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2008;372:1174–1183
65. Qiao Y, Shin J-I, Chen TK, et al. Association between renin-angiotensin system blockade and all-cause mortality among persons with low estimated glomerular filtration rate. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020;180:718–726
66. Bangalore S, Fakheri R, Toklu B, Messerli FH. Diabetes mellitus as a compelling indication for use of renin angiotensin system blockers: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *BMJ* 2016;352:i438
67. Carlberg B, Samuelsson O, Lindholm LH. Atenolol in hypertension: is it a wise choice? *Lancet* 2004;364:1684–1689
68. Murphy SP, Ibrahim NE, Januzzi JL Jr. Heart failure with reduced ejection fraction: a review. *JAMA* 2020;324:488–504
69. Yusuf S, Teo KK, Pogue J, et al.; ONTARGET Investigators. Telmisartan, ramipril, or both in patients at high risk for vascular events. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:1547–1559
70. Fried LF, Emanuele N, Zhang JH, et al.; VA NEPHRON-D Investigators. Combined angiotensin inhibition for the treatment of diabetic nephropathy. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1892–1903
71. Makani H, Bangalore S, Desouza KA, Shah A, Messerli FH. Efficacy and safety of dual blockade of the renin-angiotensin system: meta-analysis of randomised trials. *BMJ* 2013;346:f360
72. Zhao P, Xu P, Wan C, Wang Z. Evening versus morning dosing regimen drug therapy for hypertension. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011;10:CD004184
73. Hermida RC, Ayala DE, Mojón A, Fernández JR. Influence of time of day of blood pressure-lowering treatment on cardiovascular risk in hypertensive patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1270–1276
- 73a. Rahman M, Greene T, Phillips RA, et al. A trial of 2 strategies to reduce nocturnal blood pressure in blacks with chronic kidney disease. *Hypertension* 2013;61:82–88
74. Nilsson E, Gasparini A, Ärnlöv J, et al. Incidence and determinants of hyperkalemia and hypokalemia in a large healthcare system. *Int J Cardiol* 2017;245:277–284
75. Bandak G, Sang Y, Gasparini A, et al. Hyperkalemia after initiating renin-angiotensin system blockade: the Stockholm Creatinine Measurements (SCREAM) project. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2017;6:e005428
76. Hughes-Austin JM, Rifkin DE, Beben T, et al. The relation of serum potassium concentration with cardiovascular events and mortality in community-living individuals. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2017;12:245–252
77. James MT, Grams ME, Woodward M, et al.; CKD Prognosis Consortium. A meta-analysis of the association of estimated GFR, albuminuria, diabetes mellitus, and hypertension with acute kidney injury. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2015;66:602–612
78. Iliescu R, Lohmeier TE, Tudorancea I, Laffin L, Bakris GL. Renal denervation for the treatment of resistant hypertension: review and clinical perspective. *Am J Physiol Renal Physiol* 2015;309:F583–F594
79. Bakris GL, Agarwal R, Chan JC, et al.; Mineralocorticoid Receptor Antagonist Tolerability Study—Diabetic Nephropathy (ARTS-DN) Study Group. Effect of finerenone on albuminuria in patients with diabetic nephropathy: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2015;314:884–894
80. Williams B, MacDonald TM, Morant S, et al.; British Hypertension Society's PATHWAY Studies Group. Spironolactone versus placebo, bisoprolol,



- and doxazosin to determine the optimal treatment for drug-resistant hypertension (PATHWAY-2): a randomised, double-blind, crossover trial. *Lancet* 2015;386:2059–2068
81. Filippatos G, Anker SD, Böhm M, et al. A randomized controlled study of finerenone vs. eplerenone in patients with worsening chronic heart failure and diabetes mellitus and/or chronic kidney disease. *Eur Heart J* 2016;37:2105–2114
82. Bombardieri AS, Klemmer PJ. Mineralocorticoid receptor blockade in chronic kidney disease. *Blood Purif* 2012;33:119–124
83. Jensen MD, Ryan DH, Apovian CM, et al.; American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines; Obesity Society. 2013 AHA/ACC/TOS guideline for the management of overweight and obesity in adults: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and The Obesity Society. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2014;63(25 Pt B):2985–3023
84. Estruch R, Ros E, Salas-Salvadó J, et al.; PREDIMED Study Investigators. Primary prevention of cardiovascular disease with a Mediterranean diet supplemented with extra-virgin olive oil or nuts. *N Engl J Med* 2018;378:e34
85. Eckel RH, Jakicic JM, Ard JD, et al. 2013 AHA/ACC guideline on lifestyle management to reduce cardiovascular risk: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *Circulation* 2013;129:S76–S99
86. Arnett DK, Blumenthal RS, Albert MA, et al. 2019 ACC/AHA guideline on the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation* 2019;140:e596–e646
87. Chasman DI, Posada D, Subrahmanyam L, Cook NR, Stanton VP Jr, Ridker PM. Pharmacogenetic study of statin therapy and cholesterol reduction. *JAMA* 2004;291:2821–2827
88. Meeck C, Wierzbicki AS, Jewkes C, et al. Daily and intermittent rosuvastatin 5 mg therapy in statin intolerant patients: an observational study. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2012;28:371–378
89. Mihaylova B, Emberson J, Blackwell L, et al.; Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' (CTT) Collaborators. The effects of lowering LDL cholesterol with statin therapy in people at low risk of vascular disease: meta-analysis of individual data from 27 randomised trials. *Lancet* 2012;380:581–590
90. Baigent C, Keech A, Kearney PM, et al.; Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' (CTT) Collaborators. Efficacy and safety of cholesterol-lowering treatment: prospective meta-analysis of data from 90,056 participants in 14 randomised trials of statins. *Lancet* 2005;366:1267–1278
91. Pyörälä K, Pedersen TR, Kjekshus J, Faergeman O, Olsson AG, Thorgeirsson G. Cholesterol lowering with simvastatin improves prognosis of diabetic patients with coronary heart disease. A subgroup analysis of the Scandinavian Simvastatin Survival Study (4S). *Diabetes Care* 1997;20:614–620
92. Collins R, Armitage J, Parish S, Sleight P; Heart Protection Study Collaborative Group. MRC/BHF Heart Protection Study of cholesterol-lowering with simvastatin in 5963 people with diabetes: a randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2003;361:2005–2016
93. Goldberg RB, Mellies MJ, Sacks FM, et al.; The Care Investigators. Cardiovascular events and their reduction with pravastatin in diabetic and glucose-intolerant myocardial infarction survivors with average cholesterol levels: subgroup analyses in the Cholesterol and Recurrent Events (CARE) trial. *Circulation* 1998;98:2513–2519
94. Shepherd J, Barter P, Carmena R, et al. Effect of lowering LDL cholesterol substantially below currently recommended levels in patients with coronary heart disease and diabetes: the Treating to New Targets (TNT) study. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:1220–1226
95. Sever PS, Poulter NR, Dahlöf B, et al. Reduction in cardiovascular events with atorvastatin in 2,532 patients with type 2 diabetes: Anglo-Scandinavian Cardiac Outcomes Trial–lipid-lowering arm (ASCOT-LLA). *Diabetes Care* 2005;28:1151–1157
96. Knopp RH, d'Emden M, Smilde JG, Pocock SJ. Efficacy and safety of atorvastatin in the prevention of cardiovascular end points in subjects with type 2 diabetes: the Atorvastatin Study for Prevention of Coronary Heart Disease Endpoints in non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus (ASPEN). *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:1478–1485
97. Colhoun HM, Betteridge DJ, Durrington PN, et al.; CARDS investigators. Primary prevention of cardiovascular disease with atorvastatin in type 2 diabetes in the Collaborative Atorvastatin Diabetes Study (CARDS): multicentre randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2004;364:685–696
98. Kearney PM, Blackwell L, Collins R, et al.; Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' (CTT) Collaborators. Efficacy of cholesterol-lowering therapy in 18,686 people with diabetes in 14 randomised trials of statins: a meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2008;371:117–125
99. Taylor F, Huffman MD, Macedo AF, et al. Statins for the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013;1:CD004816.
100. Carter AA, Gomes T, Camacho X, Juurlink DN, Shah BR, Mamdani MM. Risk of incident diabetes among patients treated with statins: population based study. *BMJ* 2013;346:f2610–f2610
101. Baigent C, Blackwell L, Emberson J, et al.; Cholesterol Treatment Trialists' (CTT) Collaborators. Efficacy and safety of more intensive lowering of LDL cholesterol: a meta-analysis of data from 170,000 participants in 26 randomised trials. *Lancet* 2010;376:1670–1681
102. Cannon CP, Blazing MA, Giugliano RP, et al.; IMPROVE-IT Investigators. Ezetimibe added to statin therapy after acute coronary syndromes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:2387–2397
103. de Ferranti SD, de Boer IH, Fonseca V, et al. Type 1 diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association and American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2843–2863
104. Cannon CP, Braunwald E, McCabe CH, et al.; Pravastatin or Atorvastatin Evaluation and Infection Therapy-Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction 22 Investigators. Intensive versus moderate lipid lowering with statins after acute coronary syndromes. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:1495–1504
105. Sabatine MS, Giugliano RP, Keech AC, et al.; FOURIER Steering Committee and Investigators. Evolocumab and clinical outcomes in patients with cardiovascular disease. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:1713–1722
106. Giugliano RP, Cannon CP, Blazing MA, et al.; IMPROVE-IT (Improved Reduction of Outcomes: Vytorin Efficacy International Trial) Investigators. Benefit of adding ezetimibe to statin therapy on cardiovascular outcomes and safety in patients with versus without diabetes mellitus: results from IMPROVE-IT (Improved Reduction of Outcomes: Vytorin Efficacy International Trial). *Circulation* 2018;137:1571–1582
107. Das SR, Everett BM, Birtcher KK, et al. 2018 ACC expert consensus decision pathway on novel therapies for cardiovascular risk reduction in patients with type 2 diabetes and atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology Task Force on Expert Consensus Decision Pathways. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72:3200–3223
108. Moriarty PM, Jacobson TA, Bruckert E, et al. Efficacy and safety of alirocumab, a monoclonal antibody to PCSK9, in statin-intolerant patients: design and rationale of ODYSSEY ALTERNATIVE, a randomized phase 3 trial. *J Clin Lipidol* 2014;8:554–561
109. Zhang X-L, Zhu Q-Q, Zhu L, et al. Safety and efficacy of anti-PCSK9 antibodies: a meta-analysis of 25 randomized, controlled trials. *BMC Med* 2015;13:123
110. Giugliano RP, Pedersen TR, Saver JL, et al.; FOURIER Investigators. Stroke prevention with the PCSK9 (proprotein convertase subtilisin-kexin type 9) inhibitor evolocumab added to statin in high-risk patients with stable atherosclerosis. *Stroke* 2020;51:1546–1554
111. Sabatine MS, Leiter LA, Wiviott SD, et al. Cardiovascular safety and efficacy of the PCSK9 inhibitor evolocumab in patients with and without diabetes and the effect of evolocumab on glycaemia and risk of new-onset diabetes: a prespecified analysis of the FOURIER randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;5:941–950
112. Schwartz GG, Steg PG, Szarek M, et al.; ODYSSEY OUTCOMES Committees and Investigators. Alirocumab and cardiovascular outcomes after acute coronary syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2018;379:2097–2107
113. Ray KK, Colhoun HM, Szarek M, et al.; ODYSSEY OUTCOMES Committees and Investigators. Effects of alirocumab on cardiovascular and metabolic outcomes after acute coronary syndrome in patients with or without diabetes: a prespecified analysis of the ODYSSEY OUTCOMES randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2019;7:618–628
114. Dai L, Zuo Y, You Q, Zeng H, Cao S. Efficacy and safety of bempedoic acid in patients with hypercholesterolemia: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Eur J Prev Cardiol* 2021;28:825–833
115. Di Minno A, Lupoli R, Calcaterra I, et al. Efficacy and safety of bempedoic acid in patients with hypercholesterolemia: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2020;9:e016262
116. Berglund L, Brunzell JD, Goldberg AC, et al.; Endocrine Society. Evaluation and treatment of hypertriglyceridemia: an Endocrine Society clinical

- practice guideline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2012;97:2969–2989
117. Bhatt DL, Steg PG, Miller M, et al.; REDUCE-IT Investigators. Cardiovascular risk reduction with icosapent ethyl for hypertriglyceridemia. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380:11–22
118. Nicholls SJ, Lincoff AM, Garcia M, et al. Effect of high-dose omega-3 fatty acids vs corn oil on major adverse cardiovascular events in patients at high cardiovascular risk: the STRENGTH randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2020;324:2268–2280
119. Singh IM, Shishehbor MH, Ansell BJ. High-density lipoprotein as a therapeutic target: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2007;298:786–798
120. Keech A, Simes RJ, Barter P, et al.; FIELD study investigators. Effects of long-term fenofibrate therapy on cardiovascular events in 9795 people with type 2 diabetes mellitus (the FIELD study): randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005;366:1849–1861
121. Jones PH, Davidson MH. Reporting rate of rhabdomyolysis with fenofibrate + statin versus gemfibrozil + any statin. *Am J Cardiol* 2005;95:120–122
122. Ginsberg HN, Elam MB, Lovato LC, et al.; ACCORD Study Group. Effects of combination lipid therapy in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1563–1574
123. Kowa Research Institute, Inc. Pemafibrate to Reduce Cardiovascular Outcomes by Reducing Triglycerides in Patients With Diabetes (PROMINENT) In: ClinicalTrials.gov. Bethesda, MD, National Library of Medicine. NLM Identifier: NCT03071692. Accessed 21 October 2021. Available from <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03071692>
124. Boden WE, Probstfield JL, Anderson T, et al.; AIM-HIGH Investigators. Niacin in patients with low HDL cholesterol levels receiving intensive statin therapy. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:2255–2267
125. Landray MJ, Haynes R, Hopewell JC, et al.; HPS2-THRIVE Collaborative Group. Effects of extended-release niacin with laropiprant in high-risk patients. *N Engl J Med* 2014;371:203–212
126. Rajpathak SN, Kumbhani DJ, Crandall J, Barzilai N, Alderman M, Ridker PM. Statin therapy and risk of developing type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1924–1929
127. Sattar N, Preiss D, Murray HM, et al. Statins and risk of incident diabetes: a collaborative meta-analysis of randomised statin trials. *Lancet* 2010;375:735–742
128. Ridker PM, Pradhan A, MacFadyen JG, Libby P, Glynn RJ. Cardiovascular benefits and diabetes risks of statin therapy in primary prevention: an analysis from the JUPITER trial. *Lancet* 2012;380:565–571
129. Mach F, Ray KK, Wiklund O, et al.; European Atherosclerosis Society Consensus Panel. Adverse effects of statin therapy: perception vs. the evidence - focus on glucose homeostasis, cognitive, renal and hepatic function, haemorrhagic stroke and cataract. *Eur Heart J* 2018;39:2526–2539
130. Heart Protection Study Collaborative Group. MRC/BHF Heart Protection Study of cholesterol lowering with simvastatin in 20,536 high-risk individuals: a randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2002;360:7–22
131. Shepherd J, Blauw GJ, Murphy MB, et al.; PROSPER study group. PROspective Study of Pravastatin in the Elderly at Risk. Pravastatin in elderly individuals at risk of vascular disease (PROSPER): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2002;360:1623–1630
132. Trompet S, van Vliet P, de Craen AJM, et al. Pravastatin and cognitive function in the elderly. Results of the PROSPER study. *J Neurol* 2010;257:85–90
133. Yusuf S, Bosch J, Dagenais G, et al.; HOPE-3 Investigators. Cholesterol lowering in intermediate-risk persons without cardiovascular disease. *N Engl J Med* 2016;374:2021–2031
134. Giugliano RP, Mach F, Zavitz K, et al.; EBBINGHAUS Investigators. Cognitive function in a randomized trial of evolocumab. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:633–643
135. Richardson K, Schoen M, French B, et al. Statins and cognitive function: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;159:688–697
136. Baigent C, Blackwell L, Collins R, et al.; Antithrombotic Trialists' (ATT) Collaboration. Aspirin in the primary and secondary prevention of vascular disease: collaborative meta-analysis of individual participant data from randomised trials. *Lancet* 2009;373:1849–1860
137. Perk J, De Backer G, Gohlke H, et al.; European Association for Cardiovascular Prevention & Rehabilitation (EACPR); ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines (CPG). European Guidelines on cardiovascular disease prevention in clinical practice (version 2012). The Fifth Joint Task Force of the European Society of Cardiology and Other Societies on Cardiovascular Disease Prevention in Clinical Practice (constituted by representatives of nine societies and by invited experts). *Eur Heart J* 2012;33:1635–1701
138. Belch J, MacCuish A, Campbell I, et al.; Prevention of Progression of Arterial Disease and Diabetes Study Group; Diabetes Registry Group; Royal College of Physicians Edinburgh. The prevention of progression of arterial disease and diabetes (POPADAD) trial: factorial randomised placebo controlled trial of aspirin and antioxidants in patients with diabetes and asymptomatic peripheral arterial disease. *BMJ* 2008;337:a1840–a1840
139. Zhang C, Sun A, Zhang P, et al. Aspirin for primary prevention of cardiovascular events in patients with diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2010;87:211–218
140. De Berardis G, Sacco M, Strippoli GFM, et al. Aspirin for primary prevention of cardiovascular events in people with diabetes: meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2009;339:b4531
141. ASCEND Study Collaborative Group. Effects of aspirin for primary prevention in persons with diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 2018;379:1529–1539.
142. Gaziano JM, Brotons C, Coppolecchia R, et al.; ARRIVE Executive Committee. Use of aspirin to reduce risk of initial vascular events in patients at moderate risk of cardiovascular disease (ARRIVE): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2018;392:1036–1046
143. McNeil JJ, Wolfe R, Woods RL, et al.; ASPREE Investigator Group. Effect of aspirin on cardiovascular events and bleeding in the healthy elderly. *N Engl J Med* 2018;379:1509–1518
144. Pignone M, Earnshaw S, Tice JA, Pletcher MJ. Aspirin, statins, or both drugs for the primary prevention of coronary heart disease events in men: a cost-utility analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2006;144:326–336
145. Huxley RR, Peters SAE, Mishra GD, Woodward M. Risk of all-cause mortality and vascular events in women versus men with type 1 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2015;3:198–206
146. Peters SAE, Huxley RR, Woodward M. Diabetes as risk factor for incident coronary heart disease in women compared with men: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 64 cohorts including 858,507 individuals and 28,203 coronary events. *Diabetologia* 2014;57:1542–1551
147. Kalyani RR, Lazo M, Ouyang P, et al. Sex differences in diabetes and risk of incident coronary artery disease in healthy young and middle-aged adults. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:830–838
148. Peters SAE, Huxley RR, Woodward M. Diabetes as a risk factor for stroke in women compared with men: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 64 cohorts, including 775,385 individuals and 12,539 strokes. *Lancet* 2014;383:1973–1980
149. Miedema MD, Duprez DA, Misialek JR, et al. Use of coronary artery calcium testing to guide aspirin utilization for primary prevention: estimates from the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2014;7:453–460
150. Dimitriu-Leen AC, Scholte AJHA, van Rosendaal AR, et al. Value of coronary computed tomography angiography in tailoring aspirin therapy for primary prevention of atherosclerotic events in patients at high risk with diabetes mellitus. *Am J Cardiol* 2016;117:887–893
151. Mora S, Ames JM, Manson JE. Low-dose aspirin in the primary prevention of cardiovascular disease: shared decision making in clinical practice. *JAMA* 2016;316:709–710
152. Campbell CL, Smyth S, Montalescot G, Steinhilb SR. Aspirin dose for the prevention of cardiovascular disease: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2007;297:2018–2024
153. Jones WS, Mulder H, Wruck LM, et al.; ADAPTABLE Team. Comparative effectiveness of aspirin dosing in cardiovascular disease. *N Engl J Med* 2021;384:1981–1990
154. Davi G, Patrono C. Platelet activation and atherothrombosis. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357:2482–2494
155. Larsen SB, Grove EL, Neergaard-Petersen S, Würtz M, Hvas A-M, Kristensen SD. Determinants of reduced antiplatelet effect of aspirin in patients with stable coronary artery disease. *PLoS One* 2015;10:e0126767
156. Zaccardi F, Rizzi A, Petrucci G, et al. In vivo platelet activation and aspirin responsiveness in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes* 2016;65:503–509
157. Bethel MA, Harrison P, Sourij H, et al. Randomized controlled trial comparing impact on platelet reactivity of twice-daily with once-daily aspirin in people with type 2 diabetes. *Diabet Med* 2016;33:224–230
158. Rothwell PM, Cook NR, Gaziano JM, et al. Effects of aspirin on risks of vascular events and cancer according to bodyweight and dose:

- analysis of individual patient data from randomised trials. *Lancet* 2018;392:387–399
159. Vandvik PO, Lincoff AM, Gore JM, et al. Primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular disease: Antithrombotic Therapy and Prevention of Thrombosis, 9th ed: American College of Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines [published correction appears in *Chest* 2012;141:1129]. *Chest* 2012;141(Suppl.):e637S–e668S.
160. Bhatt DL, Bonaca MP, Bansilal S, et al. Reduction in ischemic events with ticagrelor in diabetic patients with prior myocardial infarction in PEGASUS-TIMI 54. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2016;67:2732–2740
161. Steg PG, Bhatt DL, Simon T, et al.; THEMIS Steering Committee and Investigators. Ticagrelor in patients with stable coronary disease and diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:1309–1320
162. Bhatt DL, Steg PG, Mehta SR, et al.; THEMIS Steering Committee and Investigators. Ticagrelor in patients with diabetes and stable coronary artery disease with a history of previous percutaneous coronary intervention (THEMIS-PCI): a phase 3, placebo-controlled, randomised trial. *Lancet* 2019;394:1169–1180
163. Angiolillo DJ, Baber U, Sartori S, et al. Ticagrelor with or without aspirin in high-risk patients with diabetes mellitus undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2020;75:2403–2413
164. Wiebe J, Ndrepepa G, Kufner S, et al. Early aspirin discontinuation after coronary stenting: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2021;10:e018304
165. Bhatt DL, Eikelboom JW, Connolly SJ, et al.; COMPASS Steering Committee and Investigators. Role of combination antiplatelet and anticoagulation therapy in diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease: insights from the COMPASS trial. *Circulation* 2020;141:1841–1854
166. Connolly SJ, Eikelboom JW, Bosch J, et al.; COMPASS investigators. Rivaroxaban with or without aspirin in patients with stable coronary artery disease: an international, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2018;391:205–218
167. Bonaca MP, Bauersachs RM, Anand SS, et al. Rivaroxaban in peripheral artery disease after revascularization. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:1994–2004
168. Bax JJ, Young LH, Frye RL, Bonow RO, Steinberg HO, Barrett EJ. Screening for coronary artery disease in patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2729–2736
169. Boden WE, O'Rourke RA, Teo KK, et al.; COURAGE Trial Research Group. Optimal medical therapy with or without PCI for stable coronary disease. *N Engl J Med* 2007;356:1503–1516
170. Frye RL, August P, Brooks MM, et al.; BARI 2D Study Group. A randomized trial of therapies for type 2 diabetes and coronary artery disease. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:2503–2515
171. Wackers FJT, Chyun DA, Young LH, et al.; Detection of Ischemia in Asymptomatic Diabetics (DIAD) Investigators. Resolution of asymptomatic myocardial ischemia in patients with type 2 diabetes in the Detection of Ischemia in Asymptomatic Diabetics (DIAD) study. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2892–2898
172. Elkeles RS, Godsland IF, Feher MD, et al.; PREDICT Study Group. Coronary calcium measurement improves prediction of cardiovascular events in asymptomatic patients with type 2 diabetes: the PREDICT study. *Eur Heart J* 2008;29:2244–2251
173. Raggi P, Shaw LJ, Berman DS, Callister TQ. Prognostic value of coronary artery calcium screening in subjects with and without diabetes. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2004;43:1663–1669
174. Anand DV, Lim E, Hopkins D, et al. Risk stratification in uncomplicated type 2 diabetes: prospective evaluation of the combined use of coronary artery calcium imaging and selective myocardial perfusion scintigraphy. *Eur Heart J* 2006;27:713–721
175. Young LH, Wackers FJT, Chyun DA, et al.; DIAD Investigators. Cardiac outcomes after screening for asymptomatic coronary artery disease in patients with type 2 diabetes: the DIAD study: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2009;301:1547–1555
176. Wackers FJT, Young LH, Inzucchi SE, et al.; Detection of Ischemia in Asymptomatic Diabetics Investigators. Detection of silent myocardial ischemia in asymptomatic diabetic subjects: the DIAD study. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:1954–1961
177. Scognamiglio R, Negut C, Ramondo A, Tiengo A, Avogaro A. Detection of coronary artery disease in asymptomatic patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2006;47:65–71
178. Hadamitzky M, Hein F, Meyer T, et al. Prognostic value of coronary computed tomographic angiography in diabetic patients without known coronary artery disease. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1358–1363
179. Choi E-K, Chun EJ, Choi S-I, et al. Assessment of subclinical coronary atherosclerosis in asymptomatic patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus with single photon emission computed tomography and coronary computed tomography angiography. *Am J Cardiol* 2009;104:890–896
180. Malik S, Zhao Y, Budoff M, et al. Coronary artery calcium score for long-term risk classification in individuals with type 2 diabetes and metabolic syndrome from the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. *JAMA Cardiol* 2017;2:1332–1340
181. Wing RR, Bolin P, Brancati FL, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Cardiovascular effects of intensive lifestyle intervention in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:145–154
182. Braunwald E, Domanski MJ, Fowler SE, et al.; PEACE Trial Investigators. Angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibition in stable coronary artery disease. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:2058–2068
183. Kezerashvili A, Marzo K, De Leon J. Beta blocker use after acute myocardial infarction in the patient with normal systolic function: when is it “ok” to discontinue? *Curr Cardiol Rev* 2012;8:77–84
184. Fihn SD, Gardin JM, Abrams J, et al.; American College of Cardiology Foundation; American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines; American College of Physicians; American Association for Thoracic Surgery; Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association; Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions; Society of Thoracic Surgeons. 2012 ACCF/AHA/ACP/AATS/PCNA/SCAI/STS Guideline for the diagnosis and management of patients with stable ischemic heart disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines, and the American College of Physicians, American Association for Thoracic Surgery, Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;60:e44–e164
185. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for industry. Diabetes mellitus—evaluating cardiovascular risk in new antidiabetic therapies to treat type 2 diabetes. Silver Spring, MD, 2008. Accessed 21 October 2021. Available from <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2008/12/19/E8-30086/guidance-for-industry-on-diabetes-mellitus-evaluating-cardiovascular-risk-in-new-antidiabetic>
186. Rosenstock J, Perkovic V, Johansen OE, et al.; CARMELINA Investigators. Effect of linagliptin vs placebo on major cardiovascular events in adults with type 2 diabetes and high cardiovascular and renal risk: the CARMELINA randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2019;321:69–79
187. Perkovic V, Jardine MJ, Neal B, et al. Canagliflozin and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380:2295–2306.
188. Neal B, Perkovic V, Matthews DR, et al.; CANVAS-R Trial Collaborative Group. Rationale, design and baseline characteristics of the CANagliflozin cardioVascular Assessment Study-Renal (CANVAS-R): a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2017;19:387–393
189. Wiviott SD, Raz I, Bonaca MP, et al.; DECLARE-TIMI 58 Investigators. Dapagliflozin and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380:347–357
190. Heerspink HJL, Stefánsson BV, Correa-Rotter R, et al.; DAPA-CKD Trial Committees and Investigators. Dapagliflozin in patients with chronic kidney disease. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:1436–1446
191. McMurray JJV, Solomon SD, Inzucchi SE, et al.; DAPA-HF Trial Committees and Investigators. Dapagliflozin in patients with heart failure and reduced ejection fraction. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:1995–2008
192. Cannon CP, Pratley R, Dagogo-Jack S, et al.; VERTIS CV Investigators. Cardiovascular outcomes with ertugliflozin in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:1425–1435
193. Bhatt DL, Szarek M, Pitt B, et al.; SCORED Investigators. Sotagliflozin in patients with diabetes and chronic kidney disease. *N Engl J Med* 2021;384:129–139
194. Marso SP, Daniels GH, Brown-Frandsen K, et al.; LEADER Steering Committee; LEADER Trial Investigators. Liraglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:311–322
195. Marso SP, Bain SC, Consoli A, et al.; SUSTAIN-6 Investigators. Semaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:1834–1844
196. Husain M, Birkenfeld AL, Donsmark M, et al. Oral semaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:841–851.
197. Hernandez AF, Green JB, Janmohamed S, et al. Albiglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular disease (Harmony Outcomes): a double-blind,



- randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2018;392:1519–1529.
198. Gerstein HC, Colhoun HM, Dagenais GR, et al.; REWIND Investigators. Dulaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes (REWIND): a double-blind, randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2019;394:121–130
199. Pfeffer MA, Claggett B, Diaz R, et al.; ELIXA Investigators. Lixisenatide in patients with type 2 diabetes and acute coronary syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:2247–2257
200. Holman RR, Bethel MA, Mentz RJ, et al.; EXSCEL Study Group. Effects of once-weekly exenatide on cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:1228–1239
201. Zelniker TA, Wiviott SD, Raz I, et al. Comparison of the effects of glucagon-like peptide receptor agonists and sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors for prevention of major adverse cardiovascular and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Circulation* 2019;139:2022–2031
202. Palmer SC, Tendal B, Mustafa RA, et al. Sodium-glucose cotransporter protein-2 (SGLT-2) inhibitors and glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists for type 2 diabetes: systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2021;372:m4573
203. Zelniker TA, Wiviott SD, Raz I, et al. SGLT2 inhibitors for primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of cardiovascular outcome trials. *Lancet* 2019;393:31–39
204. McGuire DK, Shih WJ, Cosentino F, et al. Association of SGLT2 inhibitors with cardiovascular and kidney outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis. *JAMA Cardiol* 2021;6:148–158
205. Gerstein HC, Sattar N, Rosenstock J, et al.; AMPLITUDE-O Trial Investigators. Cardiovascular and renal outcomes with efglenatide in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2021;385:896–907
206. Kannel WB, Hjortland M, Castelli WP. Role of diabetes in congestive heart failure: the Framingham study. *Am J Cardiol* 1974;34:29–34
207. Dunlay SM, Givertz MM, Aguilar D, et al.; American Heart Association Heart Failure and Transplantation Committee of the Council on Clinical Cardiology; Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing; Heart Failure Society of America. Type 2 diabetes mellitus and heart failure, a scientific statement from the American Heart Association and Heart Failure Society of America. *J Card Fail* 2019;25:584–619
208. Dormandy JA, Charbonnel B, Eckland DJA, et al.; PROactive Investigators. Secondary prevention of macrovascular events in patients with type 2 diabetes in the PROactive Study (PROspective pioglitAZone Clinical Trial In macroVascular Events): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005;366:1279–1289
209. Singh S, Loke YK, Furberg CD. Long-term risk of cardiovascular events with rosiglitazone: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2007;298:1189–1195
210. Lincoff AM, Wolski K, Nicholls SJ, Nissen SE. Pioglitazone and risk of cardiovascular events in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a meta-analysis of randomized trials. *JAMA* 2007;298:1180–1188
211. Inzucchi SE, Masoudi FA, McGuire DK. Metformin in heart failure. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:e129–e129
212. Eurich DT, Majumdar SR, McAlister FA, Tsuyuki RT, Johnson JA. Improved clinical outcomes associated with metformin in patients with diabetes and heart failure. *Diabetes Care* 2005;28:2345–2351
213. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA drug safety communication: FDA revises warnings regarding use of the diabetes medicine metformin in certain patients with reduced kidney function, 2016. Accessed 21 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-drug-safety-communication-fda-revises-warnings-regarding-use-diabetes-medicine-metformin-certain>
214. Scirica BM, Bhatt DL, Braunwald E, et al.; SAVOR-TIMI 53 Steering Committee and Investigators. Saxagliptin and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1317–1326
215. Zannad F, Cannon CP, Cushman WC, et al.; EXAMINE Investigators. Heart failure and mortality outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes taking alogliptin versus placebo in EXAMINE: a multicentre, randomised, double-blind trial. *Lancet* 2015;385:2067–2076
216. Green JB, Bethel MA, Armstrong PW, et al.; TECOS Study Group. Effect of sitagliptin on cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:232–242
217. Packer M, Anker SD, Butler J, et al.; EMPEROR-Reduced Trial Investigators. Cardiovascular and renal outcomes with empagliflozin in heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:1413–1424
218. Bhatt DL, Szarek M, Steg PG, et al.; SOLOIST-WHF Trial Investigators. Sotagliflozin in patients with diabetes and recent worsening heart failure. *N Engl J Med* 2021;384:117–128
219. Anker SD, Butler J, Filippatos G, et al.; EMPEROR-Preserved Trial Committees and Investigators. Baseline characteristics of patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction in the EMPEROR-Preserved trial. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2020;22:2383–2392
220. Das SR, Everett BM, Birtcher KK, et al. 2020 expert consensus decision pathway on novel therapies for cardiovascular risk reduction in patients with type 2 diabetes: a report of the American College of Cardiology Solution Set Oversight Committee. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2020;76:1117–1145
221. Hansson L, Zanchetti A, Carruthers SG, et al.; HOT Study Group. Effects of intensive blood-pressure lowering and low-dose aspirin in patients with hypertension: principal results of the Hypertension Optimal Treatment (HOT) randomised trial. *Lancet* 1998;351:1755–1762
222. White WB, Cannon CP, Heller SR, et al.; EXAMINE Investigators. Alogliptin after acute coronary syndrome in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1327–1335
223. Rosenstock J, Perkovic V, Alexander JH, et al.; CARMELINA® investigators. Rationale, design, and baseline characteristics of the Cardiovascular safety and Renal Microvascular outcome study with LINAgliptin (CARMELINA®): a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trial in patients with type 2 diabetes and high cardio-renal risk. *Cardiovasc Diabetol* 2018;17:39
224. Marx N, Rosenstock J, Kahn SE, et al. Design and baseline characteristics of the Cardiovascular Outcome Trial of LINAgliptin Versus Glimperide in Type 2 Diabetes (CAROLINA®). *Diab Vasc Dis Res* 2015;12:164–174
225. Cefalu WT, Kaul S, Gerstein HC, et al. Cardiovascular outcomes trials in type 2 diabetes: where do we go from here? Reflections from a *Diabetes Care* Editors' Expert Forum. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:14–31
226. Wheeler DC, Stefansson BV, Batiushin M, et al. The dapagliflozin and prevention of adverse outcomes in chronic kidney disease (DAPA-CKD) trial: baseline characteristics. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2020;35:1700–1711
227. Cannon CP, McGuire DK, Pratley R, et al.; VERTIS-CV Investigators. Design and baseline characteristics of the eValuation of ERTugliflozin efficacy and Safety CardioVascular outcomes trial (VERTIS-CV). *Am Heart J* 2018;206:11–23





# 11. Chronic Kidney Disease and Risk Management: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S175–S184 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S011>

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).

For prevention and management of diabetes complications in children and adolescents, please refer to Section 14, “Children and Adolescents” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>).

## CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE

### Screening

#### Recommendations

- 11.1a** At least annually, urinary albumin (e.g., spot urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio) and estimated glomerular filtration rate should be assessed in patients with type 1 diabetes with duration of  $\geq 5$  years and in all patients with type 2 diabetes regardless of treatment. **B**
- 11.1b** Patients with diabetes and urinary albumin  $\geq 300$  mg/g creatinine and/or an estimated glomerular filtration rate 30–60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> should be monitored twice annually to guide therapy. **B**

### Treatment

#### Recommendations

- 11.2** Optimize glucose control to reduce the risk or slow the progression of chronic kidney disease. **A**
- 11.3a** For patients with type 2 diabetes and diabetic kidney disease, use of a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor in patients with an estimated glomerular filtration rate  $\geq 25$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> and urinary albumin  $\geq 300$  mg/g creatinine is recommended to reduce chronic kidney disease progression and cardiovascular events. **A**
- 11.3b** In patients with type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease, consider use of sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors additionally for cardiovascular risk reduction when estimated glomerular filtration rate and urinary

\*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. 11. Chronic kidney disease and risk management: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S175–S184

© 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>.

albumin creatinine are  $\geq 25$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> or  $\geq 300$  mg/g, respectively (Fig. 9.3). **A**

- 11.3c** In patients with chronic kidney disease who are at increased risk for cardiovascular events or chronic kidney disease progression and are unable to use a sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitor, a nonsteroidal mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist (finerenone) is recommended to reduce chronic kidney disease progression and cardiovascular events (Table 9.2). **A**
- 11.3d** In patients with chronic kidney disease who have  $\geq 300$  mg/g urinary albumin, a reduction of 30% or greater in mg/g urinary albumin is recommended to slow chronic kidney disease progression. **B**
- 11.4** Optimization of blood pressure control and reduction in blood pressure variability to reduce the risk or slow the progression of chronic kidney disease is recommended. **A**
- 11.5** Do not discontinue renin-angiotensin system blockade for minor increases in serum creatinine ( $\leq 30\%$ ) in the absence of volume depletion. **A**
- 11.6** For people with nondialysis-dependent stage 3 or higher chronic kidney disease, dietary protein intake should be a maximum of 0.8 g/kg body weight per day (the recommended daily allowance). **A** For patients on dialysis, higher levels of dietary protein intake should be considered, since malnutrition is a major problem in some dialysis patients. **B**
- 11.7** In nonpregnant patients with diabetes and hypertension, either an ACE inhibitor or an angiotensin receptor blocker is recommended for those with modestly elevated urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio (30–299 mg/g creatinine) **B** and is strongly recommended for those with urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio  $\geq 300$  mg/g creatinine and/or estimated

glomerular filtration rate  $< 60$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. **A**

- 11.8** Periodically monitor serum creatinine and potassium levels for the development of increased creatinine or changes in potassium when ACE inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, or diuretics are used. **B**
- 11.9** An ACE inhibitor or an angiotensin receptor blocker is not recommended for the primary prevention of chronic kidney disease in patients with diabetes who have normal blood pressure, normal urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio ( $< 30$  mg/g creatinine), and normal estimated glomerular filtration rate. **A**
- 11.10** Patients should be referred for evaluation by a nephrologist if they have an estimated glomerular filtration rate  $< 30$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. **A**
- 11.11** Promptly refer to a nephrologist for uncertainty about the etiology of kidney disease, difficult management issues, and rapidly progressing kidney disease. **A**

## EPIDEMIOLOGY OF DIABETES AND CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is diagnosed by the persistent elevation of urinary albumin excretion (albuminuria), low estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR), or other manifestations of kidney damage (1,2). In this section, the focus is on CKD attributed to diabetes (diabetic kidney disease), which occurs in 20–40% of patients with diabetes (1,3–5). Diabetic kidney disease typically develops after diabetes duration of 10 years in type 1 diabetes but may be present at diagnosis of type 2 diabetes. CKD can progress to end-stage renal disease (ESRD) requiring dialysis or kidney transplantation and is the leading cause of ESRD in the U.S. (6). In addition, among people with type 1 or type 2 diabetes, the presence of CKD markedly increases cardiovascular risk and health care costs (7).

## ASSESSMENT OF ALBUMINURIA AND ESTIMATED GLOMERULAR FILTRATION RATE

Screening for albuminuria can be most easily performed by urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio (UACR) in a random spot urine collection (1,2). Timed or 24-h collections are more burdensome and add little to prediction or accuracy. Measurement of a spot urine sample for albumin alone (whether by immunoassay or by using a sensitive dipstick test specific for albuminuria) without simultaneously measuring urine creatinine (Cr) is less expensive but susceptible to false-negative and false-positive determinations as a result of variation in urine concentration due to hydration (8). Thus, to be useful for patient screening, semiquantitative or qualitative (dipstick) screening tests should be  $> 85\%$  positive in those with moderately increased albuminuria ( $\geq 30$  mg/g) and be confirmed by albumin-to-creatinine values in an accredited laboratory (9,10). Hence, it is better to simply collect a spot urine sample for albumin-to-creatinine ratio because it will ultimately need to be done.

Normal UACR is defined as  $< 30$  mg/g Cr, and high urinary albumin excretion is defined as  $\geq 30$  mg/g Cr. However, UACR is a continuous measurement, and differences within the normal and abnormal ranges are associated with renal and cardiovascular outcomes (7,11,12). Furthermore, because of high biological variability of  $> 20\%$  between measurements in urinary albumin excretion, two of three specimens of UACR collected within a 3- to 6-month period should be abnormal before considering a patient to have high or very high albuminuria (1,2,13,14). Exercise within 24 h, infection, fever, congestive heart failure, marked hyperglycemia, menstruation, and marked hypertension may elevate UACR independently of kidney damage (15).

eGFR should be calculated from serum creatinine using a validated formula. The Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) equation is generally preferred (2). eGFR is routinely reported by laboratories with serum creatinine, and eGFR calculators are available online at [nkdep.nih.gov](http://nkdep.nih.gov). An eGFR persistently  $< 60$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> is considered abnormal, though optimal thresholds for clinical diagnosis are debated in older

adults (2,16). There were inequities noted in the current GFR estimating equation, and after much deliberation a special panel was convened to put forth a new, more equitable equation involving cystatin C; results are forthcoming.

**DIAGNOSIS OF DIABETIC KIDNEY DISEASE**

Diabetic kidney disease is usually a clinical diagnosis made based on the presence of albuminuria and/or reduced eGFR in the absence of signs or symptoms of other primary causes of kidney damage. The typical presentation of diabetic kidney disease is considered to include a long-standing duration of diabetes, retinopathy, albuminuria without gross hematuria, and gradually progressive loss of eGFR. However, signs of diabetic kidney disease may be present at diagnosis or without retinopathy in type

2 diabetes, and reduced eGFR without albuminuria has been frequently reported in type 1 and type 2 diabetes and is becoming more common over time as the prevalence of diabetes increases in the U.S. (3,4,17,18).

An active urinary sediment (containing red or white blood cells or cellular casts), rapidly increasing albuminuria or nephrotic syndrome, rapidly decreasing eGFR, or the absence of retinopathy (in type 1 diabetes) suggests alternative or additional causes of kidney disease. For patients with these features, referral to a nephrologist for further diagnosis, including the possibility of kidney biopsy, should be considered. It is rare for patients with type 1 diabetes to develop kidney disease without retinopathy. In type 2 diabetes, retinopathy is only moderately sensitive and specific for CKD caused by diabetes, as confirmed by kidney biopsy (19).

**STAGING OF CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE**

Stages 1–2 CKD have been defined by evidence of high albuminuria with eGFR ≥60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, while stages 3–5 CKD have been defined by progressively lower ranges of eGFR (20) (Fig. 11.1). At any eGFR, the degree of albuminuria is associated with risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD), CKD progression, and mortality (7). Therefore, Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO) recommends a more comprehensive CKD staging that incorporates albuminuria at all stages of eGFR; this system is more closely associated with risk but is also more complex and does not translate directly to treatment decisions (2). Thus, based on the current classification system, both eGFR and albuminuria must be quantified to guide treatment decisions. This is

CKD is classified based on: • Cause (C) • GFR (G) • Albuminuria (A)				Albuminuria categories		
				Description and range		
				A1	A2	A3
				Normal to mildly increased	Moderately increased	Severely increased
				<30 mg/g <3 mg/mmol	30-299 mg/g 3-29 mg/mmol	≥300 mg/g ≥30 mg/mmol
GFR categories (mL/min/1.73 m <sup>2</sup> ) Description and range	G1	Normal to high	≥90	1 if CKD	Treat 1	Refer* 2
	G2	Mildly decreased	60-89	1 if CKD	Treat 1	Refer* 2
	G3a	Mildly to moderately decreased	45-59	Treat 1	Treat 2	Refer 3
	G3b	Moderately to severely decreased	30-44	Treat 2	Treat 3	Refer 3
	G4	Severely decreased	15-29	Refer* 3	Refer* 3	Refer 4+
	G5	Kidney failure	<15	Refer 4+	Refer 4+	Refer 4+

**Figure 11.1**—Risk of chronic kidney disease (CKD) progression, frequency of visits, and referral to a nephrologist according to glomerular filtration rate (GFR) and albuminuria are depicted. The GFR and albuminuria grid depicts the risk of progression, morbidity, and mortality by color, from best to worst (green, yellow, orange, red, dark red). The numbers in the boxes are a guide to the frequency of visits (number of times per year). Green can reflect CKD with normal eGFR and albumin-to-creatinine ratio only in the presence of other markers of kidney damage, such as imaging showing polycystic kidney disease or kidney biopsy abnormalities, with follow-up measurements annually; yellow requires caution and measurements at least once per year; orange requires measurements twice per year; red requires measurements three times per year; and dark red requires measurements four times per year. These are general parameters only, based on expert opinion, and underlying comorbid conditions and disease state as well as the likelihood of impacting a change in management for any individual patient must be taken into account. “Refer” indicates that nephrology services are recommended. \*Referring clinicians may wish to discuss with their nephrology service, depending on local arrangements regarding treating or referring. Reprinted with permission from Vassalotti et al. (115).

also important since eGFR levels are essential to modify drug dosage or restrictions of use (**Fig 11.1**) (21,22). The degree of albuminuria should influence choice of antihypertensive (see Section 10, "Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management," <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>) or glucose-lowering medications (see below). Observed history of eGFR loss (which is also associated with risk of CKD progression and other adverse health outcomes) and cause of kidney damage (including possible causes other than diabetes) may also affect these decisions (23).

### ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY

Acute kidney injury (AKI) is diagnosed by a 50% or greater sustained increase in serum creatinine over a short period of time, which is also reflected as a rapid decrease in eGFR (24,25). People with diabetes are at higher risk of AKI than those without diabetes (26). Other risk factors for AKI include preexisting CKD, the use of medications that cause kidney injury (e.g., nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs), and the use of medications that alter renal blood flow and intrarenal hemodynamics. In particular, many antihypertensive medications (e.g., diuretics, ACE inhibitors, and angiotensin receptor blockers [ARBs]) can reduce intravascular volume, renal blood flow, and/or glomerular filtration. There was concern that sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors may promote AKI through volume depletion, particularly when combined with diuretics or other medications that reduce glomerular filtration; however, this has not been found to be true in randomized clinical outcome trials of advanced kidney disease (27) or high cardiovascular disease risk with normal kidney function (28–30). It is also noteworthy that the nonsteroidal mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists (MRAs) fail to increase the risk of AKI when used to slow kidney disease progression (31). Timely identification and treatment of AKI is important because AKI is associated with increased risks of progressive CKD and other poor health outcomes (32).

Small elevations in serum creatinine (up to 30% from baseline) with renin-angiotensin system (RAS) blockers (such

as ACE inhibitors and ARBs) must not be confused with AKI (33). An analysis of the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Blood Pressure (ACCORD BP) trial demonstrates that those randomized to intensive blood pressure lowering with up to a 30% increase in serum creatinine did not have any increase in mortality or progressive kidney disease (34–37). Moreover, a measure of markers for AKI showed no significant increase of any markers with increased creatinine (36). Accordingly, ACE inhibitors and ARBs should not be discontinued for minor increases in serum creatinine (<30%), in the absence of volume depletion.

Lastly, it should be noted that ACE inhibitors and ARBs are commonly not dosed at maximally tolerated doses because of fear that serum creatinine will rise. As noted above, this is an error. Note that in all clinical trials demonstrating efficacy of ACE inhibitors and ARBs in slowing kidney disease progression, the maximally tolerated doses were used—not very low doses that do not provide benefit. Moreover, there are now studies demonstrating outcome benefits on both mortality and slowed CKD progression in people with diabetes who have an eGFR <30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (37). Additionally, when increases in serum creatinine are up to 30% and do not have associated hyperkalemia, RAS blockade should be continued (35,38).

### SURVEILLANCE

Both albuminuria and eGFR should be monitored annually to enable timely diagnosis of CKD, monitor progression of CKD, detect superimposed kidney diseases including AKI, assess risk of CKD complications, dose drugs appropriately, and determine whether nephrology referral is needed. Among people with existing kidney disease, albuminuria and eGFR may change due to progression of CKD, development of a separate superimposed cause of kidney disease, AKI, or other effects of medications, as noted above. Serum potassium should also be monitored in patients treated with diuretics because these medications can cause hypokalemia, which is associated with cardiovascular risk and mortality (39–41). For patients with eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, those

receiving ACE inhibitors, ARBs, or MRAs should have serum potassium measured periodically. Additionally, people with this lower range of eGFR should have appropriate medication dosing verified, exposure to nephrotoxins (e.g., nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and iodinated contrast) should be minimized, and potential CKD complications should be evaluated (**Table 11.1**).

There is a clear need for annual quantitative assessment of albumin excretion. This is especially true after diagnosis of albuminuria, institution of ACE inhibitors or ARB therapy to maximum tolerated doses, and achievement of blood pressure control. Early changes in kidney function may be detected by increases in albuminuria before changes in eGFR (42) and this also significantly affects cardiovascular risk. Moreover, an initial reduction of >30% below where it was initially measured, subsequently maintained over at least 2 years, is considered a valid surrogate for renal benefit by the Division of Cardiology and Nephrology of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (10). Continued surveillance can assess both response to therapy and disease progression and may aid in assessing adherence to ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy. In addition, in clinical trials of ACE inhibitors or ARB therapy in type 2 diabetes, reducing albuminuria to levels <300 mg/g Cr or by >30% from their baseline has been associated with improved renal and cardiovascular outcomes, leading some to suggest that medications should be titrated to maximize reduction in UACR. Data from post hoc analyses demonstrate less benefit on cardiorenal outcomes at half doses of RAS blockade (43). In type 1 diabetes, remission of albuminuria may occur spontaneously, and cohort studies evaluating associations of change in albuminuria with clinical outcomes have reported inconsistent results (44,45).

The prevalence of CKD complications correlates with eGFR (41). When eGFR is <60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, screening for complications of CKD is indicated (**Table 11.1**). Early vaccination against hepatitis B virus is indicated in patients likely to progress to ESRD (see Section 4, "Comprehensive Medical Evaluation



**Table 11.1—Selected complications of chronic kidney disease**

Complication	Medical and laboratory evaluation
Elevated blood pressure >140/90 mmHg	Blood pressure, weight
Volume overload	History, physical examination, weight
Electrolyte abnormalities	Serum electrolyte
Metabolic acidosis	Serum electrolytes
Anemia	Hemoglobin; iron testing if indicated
Metabolic bone disease	Serum calcium, phosphate, PTH, vitamin 25(OH)D

Complications of chronic kidney disease (CKD) generally become prevalent when estimated glomerular filtration rate falls below 60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (stage 3 CKD or greater) and become more common and severe as CKD progresses. Evaluation of elevated blood pressure and volume overload should occur at every clinical contact possible; laboratory evaluations are generally indicated every 6–12 months for stage 3 CKD, every 3–5 months for stage 4 CKD, and every 1–3 months for stage 5 CKD, or as indicated to evaluate symptoms or changes in therapy. PTH, parathyroid hormone; 25(OH)D, 25-hydroxyvitamin D.

and Assessment of Comorbidities,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S004>, for further information on immunization).

## INTERVENTIONS

### Nutrition

For people with nondialysis-dependent CKD, dietary protein intake should be ~0.8 g/kg body weight per day (the recommended daily allowance) (1). Compared with higher levels of dietary protein intake, this level slowed GFR decline with evidence of a greater effect over time. Higher levels of dietary protein intake (>20% of daily calories from protein or >1.3 g/kg/day) have been associated with increased albuminuria, more rapid kidney function loss, and CVD mortality and therefore should be avoided. Reducing the amount of dietary protein below the recommended daily allowance of 0.8 g/kg/day is not recommended because it does not alter glycemic measures, cardiovascular risk measures, or the course of GFR decline (46).

Restriction of dietary sodium (to <2,300 mg/day) may be useful to control blood pressure and reduce cardiovascular risk (47,48), and restriction of dietary potassium may be necessary to control serum potassium concentration (26,39–41). These interventions may be most important for patients with reduced eGFR, for whom urinary excretion of sodium and potassium may be impaired. For patients on dialysis, higher levels of dietary protein intake should be considered, since malnutrition is a major problem in some dialysis patients (49).

Recommendations for dietary sodium and potassium intake should be individualized on the basis of comorbid conditions, medication use, blood pressure, and laboratory data.

### Glycemic Targets

Intensive glycemic control with the goal of achieving near-normoglycemia has been shown in large prospective randomized studies to delay the onset and progression of albuminuria and reduced eGFR in patients with type 1 diabetes (50,51) and type 2 diabetes (1,52–57). Insulin alone was used to lower blood glucose in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT)/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) study of type 1 diabetes, while a variety of agents were used in clinical trials of type 2 diabetes, supporting the conclusion that glycemic control itself helps prevent CKD and its progression. The effects of glucose-lowering therapies on CKD have helped define A1C targets (see **Table 6.2**).

The presence of CKD affects the risks and benefits of intensive glycemic control and a number of specific glucose-lowering medications. In the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) trial of type 2 diabetes, adverse effects of intensive glycemic control (hypoglycemia and mortality) were increased among patients with kidney disease at baseline (58,59). Moreover, there is a lag time of at least 2 years in type 2 diabetes to over 10 years in type 1 diabetes for the effects of intensive glucose control to manifest as improved eGFR outcomes (55,60,61).

Therefore, in some patients with prevalent CKD and substantial comorbidity, target A1C levels may be less intensive (1,62).

### Direct Renal Effects of Glucose-Lowering Medications

Some glucose-lowering medications also have effects on the kidney that are direct, i.e., not mediated through glycemia. For example, SGLT2 inhibitors reduce renal tubular glucose reabsorption, weight, systemic blood pressure, intraglomerular pressure, and albuminuria and slow GFR loss through mechanisms that appear independent of glycemia (29,63–66). Moreover, recent data support the notion that SGLT2 inhibitors reduce oxidative stress in the kidney by >50% and blunt increases in angiotensinogen as well as reduce NLRP3 inflammasome activity (67–69). Glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists (GLP-1 RAs) also have direct effects on the kidney and have been reported to improve renal outcomes compared with placebo (70–73). Renal effects should be considered when selecting antihyperglycemia agents (see Section 9, “Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>).

### Selection of Glucose-Lowering Medications for Patients With Chronic Kidney Disease

For patients with type 2 diabetes and established CKD, special considerations for the selection of glucose-lowering medications include limitations to available medications when eGFR is diminished and a desire to mitigate high risks of CKD progression, CVD, and hypoglycemia (74,75). Drug dosing may require modification with eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (1).

The FDA revised its guidance for the use of metformin in CKD in 2016 (76), recommending use of eGFR instead of serum creatinine to guide treatment and expanding the pool of patients with kidney disease for whom metformin treatment should be considered. The revised FDA guidance states that metformin is contraindicated in patients with an eGFR <30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>; eGFR should be monitored while taking metformin; the benefits and risks of continuing treatment should be reassessed when eGFR falls to <45 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (77,78); metformin should not

be initiated for patients with an eGFR  $<45$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>; and metformin should be temporarily discontinued at the time of or before iodinated contrast imaging procedures in patients with eGFR 30–60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. Within these constraints, metformin may be considered as initial treatment of glycaemic control for all patients with type 2 diabetes, including those with early CKD.

SGLT2 inhibitors should be given to all patients with stage 3 CKD or higher and type 2 diabetes regardless of glycaemic control, as they slow CKD progression and reduce heart failure risk independent of glycaemic control (79). GLP-1 RAs are suggested for cardiovascular risk reduction if such risk is a predominant problem, as they reduce risks of CVD events and hypoglycemia and appear to possibly slow CKD progression (80–82).

A number of large cardiovascular outcomes trials in patients with type 2 diabetes at high risk for CVD or with existing CVD examined kidney effects as secondary outcomes. These trials include EMPA-REG OUTCOME [BI 10773 (Empagliflozin) Cardiovascular Outcome Event Trial in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Patients], CANVAS (Canagliflozin Cardiovascular Assessment Study), LEADER (Liraglutide Effect and Action in Diabetes: Evaluation of Cardiovascular Outcome Results), and SUSTAIN-6 (Trial to Evaluate Cardiovascular and Other Long-term Outcomes With Semaglutide in Subjects With Type 2 Diabetes) (65,70,73,83). Specifically, compared with placebo, empagliflozin reduced the risk of incident or worsening nephropathy (a composite of progression to UACR  $>300$  mg/g Cr, doubling of serum creatinine, ESRD, or death from ESRD) by 39% and the risk of doubling of serum creatinine accompanied by eGFR  $\leq 45$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> by 44%; canagliflozin reduced the risk of progression of albuminuria by 27% and the risk of reduction in eGFR, ESRD, or death from ESRD by 40%; liraglutide reduced the risk of new or worsening nephropathy (a composite of persistent macroalbuminuria, doubling of serum creatinine, ESRD, or death from ESRD) by 22%; and semaglutide reduced the risk of new or worsening nephropathy (a composite of persistent UACR  $>300$  mg/g Cr, doubling of serum creatinine, or ESRD) by 36% (each  $P < 0.01$ ).

These analyses were limited by evaluation of study populations not selected primarily for CKD and examination of renal effects as secondary outcomes. However, all of these trials included large numbers of people with stage 3a (eGFR 45–59 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>) kidney disease. In addition, subgroup analyses of CANVAS and LEADER suggested that the renal benefits of canagliflozin and liraglutide were as great or greater for participants with CKD at baseline (30,72) and in CANVAS were similar for participants with or without atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) at baseline (84).

Some large clinical trials of SGLT2 inhibitors focused on patients with advanced CKD, and assessment of primary renal outcomes are completed or ongoing. Canagliflozin and Renal Events in Diabetes with Established Nephropathy Clinical Evaluation (CRENCE), a placebo-controlled trial of canagliflozin among 4,401 adults with type 2 diabetes, UACR  $\geq 300$  mg/g Cr, and mean eGFR 56 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> with a mean albuminuria level of over 900 mg/day, had a primary composite end point of ESRD, doubling of serum creatinine, or renal or cardiovascular death (27,85). It was stopped early due to positive efficacy and showed a 32% risk reduction for development of ESRD over control (27). Additionally, the development of the primary end point, which included chronic dialysis for  $\geq 30$  days, kidney transplantation or eGFR  $<15$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> sustained for  $\geq 30$  days by central laboratory assessment, doubling from the baseline serum creatinine average sustained for  $\geq 30$  days by central laboratory assessment, or renal death or cardiovascular death, was reduced by 30%. This benefit was on background ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy in  $>99\%$  of the patients (27). Moreover, in this advanced CKD group, there were clear benefits on cardiovascular outcomes demonstrating a 31% reduction in cardiovascular death or heart failure hospitalization and a 20% reduction in cardiovascular death, nonfatal myocardial infarction, or nonfatal stroke (27,86,87).

A second trial in advanced diabetic kidney disease was the Dapagliflozin and Prevention of Adverse Outcomes in Chronic Kidney Disease (DAPA-CKD) study (88). This trial examined a cohort similar to that in CRENCE; however,

the end points were a little different. The primary outcome was time to the first occurrence of any of the components of the composite including  $\geq 50\%$  sustained decline in eGFR or reaching ESRD or cardiovascular death or renal death. Secondary outcome measures included time to the first occurrence of any of the components of the composite kidney outcome ( $\geq 50\%$  sustained decline in eGFR or reaching ESRD or renal death), time to the first occurrence of either of the components of the cardiovascular composite (cardiovascular death or hospitalization for heart failure), and, lastly, time to death from any cause. The trial had 4,304 participants with a mean eGFR at baseline of  $43.1 \pm 12.4$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, the median UACR was 949 mg/g, and 67.5% of participants had type 2 diabetes. There was a significant benefit by dapagliflozin for the primary end point (hazard ratio 0.61 [95% CI 0.51–0.72];  $P < 0.001$ ) (88).

The hazard ratio for the kidney composite of a sustained decline in eGFR of  $\geq 50\%$ , ESRD, or death from renal causes was 0.56 (95% CI 0.45–0.68;  $P < 0.001$ ). The hazard ratio for the composite of death from cardiovascular causes or hospitalization for heart failure was 0.71 (95% CI 0.55–0.92;  $P = 0.009$ ). Finally, all-cause mortality was decreased in the dapagliflozin group compared with the placebo group ( $P < 0.004$ ).

In addition to renal effects, while SGLT2 inhibitors demonstrated reduced risk of heart failure hospitalizations, some also demonstrated cardiovascular risk reduction. GLP-1 RAs clearly demonstrated cardiovascular benefits. Namely, in EMPA-REG OUTCOME, CANVAS, DECLARE, LEADER, and SUSTAIN-6, empagliflozin, canagliflozin, dapagliflozin, liraglutide, and semaglutide, respectively, each reduced cardiovascular events, evaluated as primary outcomes, compared with placebo (see Section 10, “Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>, for further discussion). While the glucose-lowering effects of SGLT2 inhibitors are blunted with eGFR  $<45$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, the renal and cardiovascular benefits were still seen down to eGFR levels of 25 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> with no significant change in glucose (27,29,50,58,62,73,83,88,89). Most participants with CKD in these trials also had diagnosed ASCVD at baseline,

although ~28% of CANVAS participants with CKD did not have diagnosed ASCVD (30).

Based on evidence from the CRE-DENCE trial and secondary analyses of cardiovascular outcomes trials with SGLT2 inhibitors, cardiovascular and renal events are reduced with SGLT2 inhibitor use in patients down to an eGFR of 30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, independent of glucose-lowering effects (86,87).

While there is clear cardiovascular risk reduction associated with GLP-1 RA use in patients with type 2 diabetes and CKD, the proof of benefit on renal outcome will come with the results of the ongoing FLOW (A Research Study to See How Semaglutide Works Compared with Placebo in People With Type 2 Diabetes and Chronic Kidney Disease) trial with injectable semaglutide (90). As noted above, published data address a limited group of CKD patients, mostly with coexisting ASCVD. Renal events have been examined, however, as both primary and secondary outcomes in published large trials. Also, adverse event profiles of these agents must be considered. Please refer to **Table 9.2** for drug-specific factors, including adverse event information, for these agents. Additional clinical trials focusing on CKD and cardiovascular outcomes in CKD patients are ongoing and will be reported in the next few years.

For patients with type 2 diabetes and CKD, the selection of specific agents may depend on comorbidity and CKD stage. SGLT2 inhibitors may be more useful for patients at high risk of CKD progression (i.e., with albuminuria or a history of documented eGFR loss) (**Fig. 9.3**) because they appear to have large beneficial effects on CKD incidence. The SGLT2 inhibitors empagliflozin and dapagliflozin are approved by the FDA for use with eGFR 25–45 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> for kidney/heart failure outcomes. Empagliflozin can be started with eGFR >30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (though pivotal trials for each included participants with eGFR ≥30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> and demonstrated benefit in subgroups with low eGFR) (29,30,91). Canagliflozin is approved to be started down to eGFR levels of 30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. Some GLP-1 RAs require dose adjustment for reduced eGFR (the majority—liraglutide, dulaglutide, semaglutide—do not require it).

### Renal and Cardiovascular Outcomes of Mineralocorticoid Receptor Antagonists in Chronic Kidney Disease

MRAs historically have not been well studied in diabetic kidney disease because of the risk of hyperkalemia (92,93). However, data that do exist suggest benefit on albuminuria reduction that is sustained. There are two different classes of MRAs, steroidal and nonsteroidal, with one group not extrapolatable to the other (94). Late in 2020, the results of the first of two trials, the Finerenone in Reducing Kidney Failure and Disease Progression in Diabetic Kidney Disease (FIDELIO-DKD) trial, which examined the renal effects of finerenone, demonstrated a significant reduction in diabetic kidney disease progression and cardiovascular events in patients with advanced diabetic kidney disease (31,95). This trial had a primary end point of time to first occurrence of the composite end point of onset of kidney failure, a sustained decrease of eGFR >40% from baseline over at least 4 weeks, or renal death. A prespecified secondary outcome was time to first occurrence of the composite end point cardiovascular death or nonfatal cardiovascular events (myocardial infarction, stroke, hospitalization for heart failure). Other secondary outcomes included all-cause mortality, time to all-cause hospitalizations, and time to first occurrence of the following composite end point: onset of kidney failure, a sustained decrease in eGFR of ≥57% from baseline over at least 4 weeks or renal death and change in UACR from baseline to month 4.

The double-blind, placebo-controlled trial randomized 5,734 patients with CKD and type 2 diabetes to receive finerenone, a novel nonsteroidal MRA, or placebo. Eligible patients had a UACR of 30 to <300 mg/g, an eGFR of 25 to <60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, and diabetic retinopathy, or a UACR of 300–5,000 mg/g and an eGFR of 25 to <75 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. Mean age of the patients was 65.6 years, and 30% were female. The mean eGFR was 44.3 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. Mean albuminuria (interquartile range) was 852 (446–1,634) mg/g. The primary end point was reduced with finerenone compared with placebo (hazard ratio 0.82, 95% CI 0.73–0.93; *P* = 0.001), as was the key secondary composite of cardiovascular outcome (hazard ratio 0.86, 95% CI 0.75–0.99; *P* = 0.03). Hyperkalemia resulted in 2.3% discontinuation in the

study group compared with 0.9% in the placebo group. However, the study was completed and there were no deaths related to hyperkalemia. Of note, 4.5% of the total group were being treated with SGLT2 inhibitors.

### Cardiovascular Disease and Blood Pressure

Hypertension is a strong risk factor for the development and progression of CKD (96). Antihypertensive therapy reduces the risk of albuminuria (97–100), and among patients with type 1 or 2 diabetes with established CKD (eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> and UACR ≥300 mg/g Cr), ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy reduces the risk of progression to ESRD (101–103). Moreover, antihypertensive therapy reduces risks of cardiovascular events (97).

Blood pressure levels <140/90 mmHg are generally recommended to reduce CVD mortality and slow CKD progression among all people with diabetes (100). Lower blood pressure targets (e.g., <130/80 mmHg) should be considered for patients based on individual anticipated benefits and risks. Patients with CKD are at increased risk of CKD progression (particularly those with albuminuria) and CVD and therefore lower blood pressure targets may be suitable in some cases, especially in those with ≥300 mg/g Cr albuminuria.

ACE inhibitors or ARBs are the preferred first-line agent for blood pressure treatment among patients with diabetes, hypertension, eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, and UACR ≥300 mg/g Cr because of their proven benefits for prevention of CKD progression (101–104). In general, ACE inhibitors and ARBs are considered to have similar benefits (105,106) and risks. In the setting of lower levels of albuminuria (30–299 mg/g Cr), ACE inhibitor or ARB therapy at maximally tolerated doses in trials has reduced progression to more advanced albuminuria (≥300 mg/g Cr), slowed CKD progression, and reduced cardiovascular events but has not reduced progression to ESRD (104,107). While ACE inhibitors or ARBs are often prescribed for high albuminuria without hypertension, outcome trials have not been performed in this setting to determine whether they improve renal outcomes. Moreover, two long-term, double-blind studies demonstrated no renoprotective effect of either ACE inhibitors or ARBs in type 1 and type 2



diabetes among those who were normotensive with or without high albuminuria (formerly microalbuminuria) (108,109).

Absent kidney disease, ACE inhibitors or ARBs are useful to control blood pressure but have not proven superior to alternative classes of antihypertensive therapy, including thiazide-like diuretics and dihydropyridine calcium channel blockers (110). In a trial of people with type 2 diabetes and normal urine albumin excretion, an ARB reduced or suppressed the development of albuminuria but increased the rate of cardiovascular events (111). In a trial of people with type 1 diabetes exhibiting neither albuminuria nor hypertension, ACE inhibitors or ARBs did not prevent the development of diabetic glomerulopathy assessed by kidney biopsy (108). This was further supported by a similar trial in patients with type 2 diabetes (109). *Therefore, ACE inhibitors or ARBs are not recommended for patients without hypertension to prevent the development of CKD.*

Two clinical trials studied the combinations of ACE inhibitors and ARBs and found no benefits on CVD or CKD, and the drug combination had higher adverse event rates (hyperkalemia and/or AKI) (112,113). *Therefore, the combined use of ACE inhibitors and ARBs should be avoided.*

### Referral to a Nephrologist

Consider referral to a nephrologist when there is uncertainty about the etiology of kidney disease, for difficult management issues (anemia, secondary hyperparathyroidism, significant increases in albuminuria in spite of good blood pressure control, metabolic bone disease, resistant hypertension, or electrolyte disturbances), or when there is advanced kidney disease (eGFR <30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>) requiring discussion of renal replacement therapy for ESRD (2). The threshold for referral may vary depending on the frequency with which a provider encounters patients with diabetes and kidney disease. Consultation with a nephrologist when stage 4 CKD develops (eGFR <30 mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>) has been found to reduce cost, improve quality of care, and delay dialysis (114). However, other specialists and providers should also educate their patients about the progressive nature of CKD, the kidney preservation benefits of proactive treatment of blood pressure

and blood glucose, and the potential need for renal replacement therapy.

### References

- Tuttle KR, Bakris GL, Bilous RW, et al. Diabetic kidney disease: a report from an ADA Consensus Conference. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2864–2883
- National Kidney Foundation. KDIGO 2012 clinical practice guideline for the evaluation and management of chronic kidney disease. *Kidney Int Suppl* 2013;3:1–150
- Afkarian M, Zelnick LR, Hall YN, et al. Clinical manifestations of kidney disease among US adults with diabetes, 1988–2014. *JAMA* 2016;316:602–610
- de Boer IH, Rue TC, Hall YN, Heagerty PJ, Weiss NS, Himmelfarb J. Temporal trends in the prevalence of diabetic kidney disease in the United States. *JAMA* 2011;305:2532–2539
- de Boer IH; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Kidney disease and related findings in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications study. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:24–30
- Johansen KL, Chertow GM, Foley RN, et al. US Renal Data System 2020 annual data report: epidemiology of kidney disease in the United States. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2021;77(Suppl. 1):A7–A8
- Fox CS, Matsushita K, Woodward M, et al.; Chronic Kidney Disease Prognosis Consortium. Associations of kidney disease measures with mortality and end-stage renal disease in individuals with and without diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2012;380:1662–1673
- Yarnoff BO, Hoerger TJ, Simpson SK, et al.; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention CKD Initiative. The cost-effectiveness of using chronic kidney disease risk scores to screen for early-stage chronic kidney disease. *BMC Nephrol* 2017;18:85
- Coresh J, Heerspink HJL, Sang Y, et al.; Chronic Kidney Disease Prognosis Consortium and Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration. Change in albuminuria and subsequent risk of end-stage kidney disease: an individual participant-level consortium meta-analysis of observational studies. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2019;7:115–127
- Levey AS, Gansevoort RT, Coresh J, et al. Change in albuminuria and GFR as end points for clinical trials in early stages of CKD: a scientific workshop sponsored by the National Kidney Foundation in collaboration with the US Food and Drug Administration and European Medicines Agency. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2020;75:84–104
- Afkarian M, Sachs MC, Kestenbaum B, et al. Kidney disease and increased mortality risk in type 2 diabetes. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2013;24:302–308
- Groop P-H, Thomas MC, Moran JL, et al.; FinnDiane Study Group. The presence and severity of chronic kidney disease predicts all-cause mortality in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes* 2009;58:1651–1658
- Gomes MB, Gonçalves MF. Is there a physiological variability for albumin excretion rate? Study in patients with diabetes type 1 and non-diabetic individuals. *Clin Chim Acta* 2001; 304:117–123
- Naresh CN, Hayen A, Weening A, Craig JC, Chadban SJ. Day-to-day variability in spot urine albumin-creatinine ratio. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2013;62:1095–1101
- Tankeu AT, Kaze FF, Noubiap JJ, Chelo D, Dehayem MY, Sobngwi E. Exercise-induced albuminuria and circadian blood pressure abnormalities in type 2 diabetes. *World J Nephrol* 2017;6:209–216
- Delanaye P, Glasscock RJ, Pottel H, Rule AD. An age-calibrated definition of chronic kidney disease: rationale and benefits. *Clin Biochem Rev* 2016;37:17–26
- Kramer HJ, Nguyen QD, Curhan G, Hsu C-Y. Renal insufficiency in the absence of albuminuria and retinopathy among adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *JAMA* 2003;289:3273–3277
- Molitch ME, Steffes M, Sun W, et al.; Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications Study Group. Development and progression of renal insufficiency with and without albuminuria in adults with type 1 diabetes in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial and the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33: 1536–1543
- He F, Xia X, Wu XF, Yu XQ, Huang FX. Diabetic retinopathy in predicting diabetic nephropathy in patients with type 2 diabetes and renal disease: a meta-analysis. *Diabetologia* 2013;56:457–466
- Levey AS, Coresh J, Balk E, et al.; National Kidney Foundation. National Kidney Foundation practice guidelines for chronic kidney disease: evaluation, classification, and stratification. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;139:137–147
- Flynn C, Bakris GL. Noninsulin glucose-lowering agents for the treatment of patients on dialysis. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 2013;9:147–153
- Matzke GR, Aronoff GR, Atkinson AJ Jr, et al. Drug dosing consideration in patients with acute and chronic kidney disease—a clinical update from Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO). *Kidney Int* 2011;80:1122–1137
- Coresh J, Turin TC, Matsushita K, et al. Decline in estimated glomerular filtration rate and subsequent risk of end-stage renal disease and mortality. *JAMA* 2014;311:2518–2531
- Zhou J, Liu Y, Tang Y, et al. A comparison of RIFLE, AKIN, KDIGO, and Cys-C criteria for the definition of acute kidney injury in critically ill patients. *Int Urol Nephrol* 2016;48:125–132
- Hoste EAJ, Kellum JA, Selby NM, et al. Global epidemiology and outcomes of acute kidney injury. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 2018;14:607–625
- James MT, Grams ME, Woodward M, et al.; CKD Prognosis Consortium. A meta-analysis of the association of estimated GFR, albuminuria, diabetes mellitus, and hypertension with acute kidney injury. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2015;66:602–612
- Perkovic V, Jardine MJ, Neal B, et al. Canagliflozin and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. *N Engl J Med* 2019; 380:2295–2306
- Nadkarni GN, Ferrandino R, Chang A, et al. Acute kidney injury in patients on SGLT2 inhibitors: a propensity-matched analysis. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1479–1485
- Wanner C, Inzucchi SE, Lachin JM, et al.; EMPA-REG OUTCOME Investigators. Empagliflozin and progression of kidney disease in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:323–334
- Neuen BL, Ohkuma T, Neal B, et al. Cardiovascular and renal outcomes with canagliflozin according to baseline kidney function: data from the CANVAS Program. *Circulation* 2018;138: 1537–1550
- Bakris GL, Agarwal R, Anker SD, et al.; FIDELIO-DKD Investigators. Effect of finerenone



- on chronic kidney disease outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:2219–2229
32. Thakar CV, Christianson A, Himmelfarb J, Leonard AC. Acute kidney injury episodes and chronic kidney disease risk in diabetes mellitus. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2011;6:2567–2572
33. Bakris GL, Weir MR. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor-associated elevations in serum creatinine: is this a cause for concern? *Arch Intern Med* 2000;160:685–693
34. Beddhu S, Greene T, Boucher R, et al. Intensive systolic blood pressure control and incident chronic kidney disease in people with and without diabetes mellitus: secondary analyses of two randomised controlled trials. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2018;6:555–563
35. Collard D, Brouwer TF, Peters RJG, Vogt L, van den Born BH. Creatinine rise during blood pressure therapy and the risk of adverse clinical outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Hypertension* 2018;72:1337–1344
36. Malhotra R, Craven T, Ambrosius WT, et al.; SPRINT Research Group. Effects of intensive blood pressure lowering on kidney tubule injury in CKD: a longitudinal subgroup analysis in SPRINT. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2019;73:21–30
37. Qiao Y, Shin J-I, Chen TK, et al. Association between renin-angiotensin system blockade discontinuation and all-cause mortality among persons with low estimated glomerular filtration rate. *JAMA Intern Med* 2020;180:718–726
38. Ohkuma T, Jun M, Rodgers A, et al.; ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Acute increases in serum creatinine after starting angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor-based therapy and effects of its continuation on major clinical outcomes in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Hypertension* 2019;73:84–91
39. Hughes-Austin JM, Rifkin DE, Beben T, et al. The relation of serum potassium concentration with cardiovascular events and mortality in community-living individuals. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2017;12:245–252
40. Bandak G, Sang Y, Gasparini A, et al. Hyperkalemia after initiating renin-angiotensin system blockade: the Stockholm Creatinine Measurements (SCREAM) project. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2017;6:e005428
41. Nilsson E, Gasparini A, Ärnlöv J, et al. Incidence and determinants of hyperkalemia and hypokalemia in a large healthcare system. *Int J Cardiol* 2017;245:277–284
42. Zelniker TA, Raz I, Mosenzon O, et al. Effect of dapagliflozin on cardiovascular outcomes according to baseline kidney function and albuminuria status in patients with type 2 diabetes: a prespecified secondary analysis of a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Cardiol* 2021;6:801–810
43. Epstein M, Reaven NL, Funk SE, McGaughey KJ, Oestreicher N, Knispel J. Evaluation of the treatment gap between clinical guidelines and the utilization of renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system inhibitors. *Am J Manag Care* 2015;21(Suppl.):S212–S220
44. de Boer IH, Gao X, Cleary PA, et al.; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) Research Group. Albuminuria changes and cardiovascular and renal outcomes in type 1 diabetes: the DCCT/EDIC study. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2016;11:1969–1977
45. Sumida K, Molnar MZ, Potukuchi PK, et al. Changes in albuminuria and subsequent risk of incident kidney disease. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2017;12:1941–1949
46. Klahr S, Levey AS, Beck GJ, et al.; Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study Group. The effects of dietary protein restriction and blood-pressure control on the progression of chronic renal disease. *N Engl J Med* 1994;330:877–884
47. Mills KT, Chen J, Yang W, et al.; Chronic Renal Insufficiency Cohort (CRIC) Study Investigators. Sodium excretion and the risk of cardiovascular disease in patients with chronic kidney disease. *JAMA* 2016;315:2200–2210
48. Whelton PK, Carey RM, Aronow WS, et al. 2017 ACC/AHA/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/AGS/APHA/ASH/ASPC/NMA/PCNA guideline for the prevention, detection, evaluation, and management of high blood pressure in adults: executive summary: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Hypertension* 2018;71:1269–1324
49. Murray DP, Young L, Waller J, et al. Is dietary protein intake predictive of 1-year mortality in dialysis patients? *Am J Med Sci* 2018;356:234–243
50. DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Effect of intensive diabetes treatment on albuminuria in type 1 diabetes: long-term follow-up of the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial and Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2014;2:793–800
51. de Boer IH, Sun W, Cleary PA, et al.; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Intensive diabetes therapy and glomerular filtration rate in type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2011;365:2366–2376
52. UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). *Lancet* 1998;352:837–853
53. Patel A, MacMahon S, Chalmers J, et al.; ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Intensive blood glucose control and vascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:2560–2572
54. Ismail-Beigi F, Craven T, Banerji MA, et al.; ACCORD trial group. Effect of intensive treatment of hyperglycaemia on microvascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes: an analysis of the ACCORD randomised trial. *Lancet* 2010;376:419–430
55. Zoungas S, Chalmers J, Neal B, et al.; ADVANCE-ON Collaborative Group. Follow-up of blood-pressure lowering and glucose control in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2014;371:1392–1406
56. Zoungas S, Arima H, Gerstein HC, et al.; Collaborators on Trials of Lowering Glucose (CONTROL) group. Effects of intensive glucose control on microvascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes: a meta-analysis of individual participant data from randomised controlled trials. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;5:431–437
57. Agrawal L, Azad N, Bahn GD, et al.; VADT Study Group. Long-term follow-up of intensive glycaemic control on renal outcomes in the Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial (VADT). *Diabetologia* 2018;61:295–299
58. Miller ME, Bonds DE, Gerstein HC, et al.; ACCORD Investigators. The effects of baseline characteristics, glycaemia treatment approach, and glycated haemoglobin concentration on the risk of severe hypoglycaemia: post hoc epidemiological analysis of the ACCORD study. *BMJ* 2010;340:b5444
59. Papademetriou V, Lovato L, Doumas M, et al.; ACCORD Study Group. Chronic kidney disease and intensive glycemic control increase cardiovascular risk in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Kidney Int* 2015;87:649–659
60. Perkovic V, Heerspink HL, Chalmers J, et al.; ADVANCE Collaborative Group. Intensive glucose control improves kidney outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Kidney Int* 2013;83:517–523
61. Wong MG, Perkovic V, Chalmers J, et al.; ADVANCE-ON Collaborative Group. Long-term benefits of intensive glucose control for preventing end-stage kidney disease: ADVANCE-ON. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:694–700
62. National Kidney Foundation. KDOQI clinical practice guideline for diabetes and CKD: 2012 update. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2012;60:850–886
63. Cherney DZI, Perkins BA, Soleymanlou N, et al. Renal hemodynamic effect of sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibition in patients with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Circulation* 2014;129:587–597
64. Heerspink HJL, Desai M, Jardine M, Balis D, Meininger G, Perkovic V. Canagliflozin slows progression of renal function decline independently of glycemic effects. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2017;28:368–375
65. Neal B, Perkovic V, Mahaffey KW, et al.; CANVAS Program Collaborative Group. Canagliflozin and cardiovascular and renal events in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:644–657
66. Zelniker TA, Braunwald E. Cardiac and renal effects of sodium-glucose co-transporter 2 inhibitors in diabetes: JACC state-of-the-art review. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;72:1845–1855
67. Woods TC, Satou R, Miyata K, et al. Canagliflozin prevents intrarenal angiotensinogen augmentation and mitigates kidney injury and hypertension in mouse model of type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Am J Nephrol* 2019;49:331–342
68. Heerspink HJL, Perco P, Mulder S, et al. Canagliflozin reduces inflammation and fibrosis biomarkers: a potential mechanism of action for beneficial effects of SGLT2 inhibitors in diabetic kidney disease. *Diabetologia* 2019;62:1154–1166
69. Yarbeygi H, Butler AE, Atkin SL, Katsiki N, Sahebkar A. Sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors and inflammation in chronic kidney disease: possible molecular pathways. *J Cell Physiol* 2018;234:223–230
70. Marso SP, Daniels GH, Brown-Frandsen K, et al.; LEADER Steering Committee; LEADER Trial Investigators. Liraglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:311–322
71. Cooper ME, Perkovic V, McGill JB, et al. Kidney disease end points in a pooled analysis of individual patient-level data from a large clinical trials program of the dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitor linagliptin in type 2 diabetes. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2015;66:441–449
72. Mann JFE, Ørsted DD, Brown-Frandsen K, et al.; LEADER Steering Committee and Investigators. Liraglutide and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:839–848

73. Marso SP, Bain SC, Consoli A, et al.; SUSTAIN-6 Investigators. Semaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2016;375:1834–1844
74. Karter AJ, Warton EM, Lipska KJ, et al. Development and validation of a tool to identify patients with type 2 diabetes at high risk of hypoglycemia-related emergency department or hospital use. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017;177:1461–1470
75. Moen MF, Zhan M, Hsu VD, et al. Frequency of hypoglycemia and its significance in chronic kidney disease. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2009;4:1121–1127
76. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA drug safety communication: FDA revises warnings regarding use of the diabetes medicine metformin in certain patients with reduced kidney function, 2017. Accessed 13 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-drug-safety-communication-fda-revises-warnings-regarding-use-diabetes-medicine-metformin-certain>
77. Lalau J-D, Kajbaf F, Bennis Y, Hurtel-Lemaire A-S, Belpaire F, De Broe ME. Metformin treatment in patients with type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease stages 3A, 3B, or 4. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:547–553
78. Chu PY, Hackstadt AJ, Chipman J, et al. Hospitalization for lactic acidosis among patients with reduced kidney function treated with metformin or sulfonylureas. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1462–1470
79. McGuire DK, Shih WJ, Cosentino F, et al. Association of SGLT2 Inhibitors With Cardiovascular and Kidney Outcomes in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA Cardiol* 2021;6:148–158
80. Zelniker TA, Wiviott SD, Raz I, et al. Comparison of the effects of glucagon-like peptide receptor agonists and sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors for prevention of major adverse cardiovascular and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Circulation* 2019;139:2022–2031
81. Mann JFE, Hansen T, Idorn T, et al. Effects of once-weekly subcutaneous semaglutide on kidney function and safety in patients with type 2 diabetes: a post-hoc analysis of the SUSTAIN 1-7 randomised controlled trials. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2020;8:880–893
82. Mann JFE, Muskiet MHA. Incretin-based drugs and the kidney in type 2 diabetes: choosing between DPP-4 inhibitors and GLP-1 receptor agonists. *Kidney Int* 2021;99:314–318
83. Zinman B, Wanner C, Lachin JM, et al.; EMPA-REG OUTCOME Investigators. Empagliflozin, cardiovascular outcomes, and mortality in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:2117–2128
84. Mahaffey KW, Neal B, Perkovic V, et al.; CANVAS Program Collaborative Group. Canagliflozin for primary and secondary prevention of cardiovascular events: results from the CANVAS Program (Canagliflozin Cardiovascular Assessment Study). *Circulation* 2018;137:323–334
85. Jardine MJ, Mahaffey KW, Neal B, et al.; CREDESCENCE study investigators. The Canagliflozin and Renal Endpoints in Diabetes with Established Nephropathy Clinical Evaluation (CREDESCENCE) study rationale, design, and baseline characteristics. *Am J Nephrol* 2017;46:462–472
86. Mahaffey KW, Jardine MJ, Bompont S, et al. Canagliflozin and cardiovascular and renal outcomes in type 2 diabetes mellitus and chronic kidney disease in primary and secondary cardiovascular prevention groups. *Circulation* 2019;140:739–750
87. Bakris GL. Major advancements in slowing diabetic kidney disease progression: focus on SGLT2 inhibitors. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2019;74:573–575
88. Heerspink HJL, Stefánsson BV, Correa-Rotter R, et al.; DAPA-CKD Trial Committees and Investigators. Dapagliflozin in patients with chronic kidney disease. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:1436–1446
89. Wiviott SD, Raz I, Bonaca MP, et al.; DECLARE-TIMI 58 Investigators. Dapagliflozin and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380:347–357
90. Novo Nordisk A/S. A research study to see how semaglutide works compared to placebo in people with type 2 diabetes and chronic kidney disease (FLOW). In: *ClinicalTrials.gov*. Bethesda, MD, National Library of Medicine, 2019. Accessed 13 October 2021. Available from <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03819153>
91. Franki L. FDA approves label extension for dapagliflozin. Accessed 13 October 2021. Available from <https://www.mdedge.com/endocrinology/article/195314/diabetes/fda-approves-label-extension-dapagliflozin>
92. Bombardieri AS, Kshirsagar AV, Amamoo MA, Klemmer PJ. Change in proteinuria after adding aldosterone blockers to ACE inhibitors or angiotensin receptor blockers in CKD: a systematic review. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2008;51:199–211
93. Sarafidis P, Papadopoulos CE, Kamperidis V, Giannakoulas G, Doumas M. Cardiovascular protection with sodium-glucose cotransporter-2 inhibitors and mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists in chronic kidney disease: a milestone achieved. *Hypertension* 2021;77:1442–1455
94. Agarwal R, Kolkhof P, Bakris G, et al. Steroidal and non-steroidal mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists in cardiorenal medicine. *Eur Heart J* 2021;42:152–161
95. Filippatos G, Anker SD, Agarwal R, et al.; FIDELIO-DKD Investigators. Finerenone and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with chronic kidney disease and type 2 diabetes. *Circulation* 2021;143:540–552
96. Leehey DJ, Zhang JH, Emanuele NV, et al.; VA NEPHRON-D Study Group. BP and renal outcomes in diabetic kidney disease: the Veterans Affairs Nephropathy in Diabetes trial. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2015;10:2159–2169
97. Emdin CA, Rahimi K, Neal B, Callender T, Perkovic V, Patel A. Blood pressure lowering in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2015;313:603–615
98. Cushman WC, Evans GW, Byington RP, et al.; ACCORD Study Group. Effects of intensive blood-pressure control in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1575–1585
99. UK Prospective Diabetes Study Group. Tight blood pressure control and risk of macrovascular and microvascular complications in type 2 diabetes: UKPDS 38. *BMJ* 1998;317:703–713
100. de Boer IH, Bangalore S, Benetos A, et al. Diabetes and hypertension: a position statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1273–1284
101. Brenner BM, Cooper ME, de Zeeuw D, et al.; RENAAL Study Investigators. Effects of losartan on renal and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:861–869
102. Lewis EJ, Hunsicker LG, Bain RP; The Collaborative Study Group. The effect of angiotensin-converting-enzyme inhibition on diabetic nephropathy. *N Engl J Med* 1993;329:1456–1462
103. Lewis EJ, Hunsicker LG, Clarke WR, et al.; Collaborative Study Group. Renoprotective effect of the angiotensin-receptor antagonist irbesartan in patients with nephropathy due to type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:851–860
104. Heart Outcomes Prevention Evaluation Study Investigators. Effects of ramipril on cardiovascular and microvascular outcomes in people with diabetes mellitus: results of the HOPE study and MICRO-HOPE substudy. *Lancet* 2000;355:253–259
105. Barnett AH, Bain SC, Bouter P, et al.; Diabetics Exposed to Telmisartan and Enalapril Study Group. Angiotensin-receptor blockade versus converting-enzyme inhibition in type 2 diabetes and nephropathy. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:1952–1961
106. Wu H-Y, Peng C-L, Chen P-C, et al. Comparative effectiveness of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors versus angiotensin II receptor blockers for major renal outcomes in patients with diabetes: a 15-year cohort study. *PLoS One* 2017;12:e0177654
107. Parving HH, Lehnert H, Bröchner-Mortensen J, Gomis R, Andersen S; Irbesartan in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes and Microalbuminuria Study Group. The effect of irbesartan on the development of diabetic nephropathy in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:870–878
108. Mauer M, Zinman B, Gardiner R, et al. Renal and retinal effects of enalapril and losartan in type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2009;361:40–51
109. Weil EJ, Fufaa G, Jones LI, et al. Effect of losartan on prevention and progression of early diabetic nephropathy in American Indians with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes* 2013;62:3224–3231
110. Bangalore S, Fakheri R, Toklu B, Messerli FH. Diabetes mellitus as a compelling indication for use of renin angiotensin system blockers: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *BMJ* 2016;352:i438
111. Haller H, Ito S, Izzo JL Jr, et al.; ROADMAP Trial Investigators. Olmesartan for the delay or prevention of microalbuminuria in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2011;364:907–917
112. Yusuf S, Teo KK, Pogue J, et al.; ONTARGET Investigators. Telmisartan, ramipril, or both in patients at high risk for vascular events. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:1547–1559
113. Fried LF, Emanuele N, Zhang JH, et al.; VA NEPHRON-D Investigators. Combined angiotensin inhibition for the treatment of diabetic nephropathy. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1892–1903
114. Smart NA, Dieberg G, Ladhani M, Titus T. Early referral to specialist nephrology services for preventing the progression to end-stage kidney disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014;6:CD007333
115. Vassalotti JA, Centor R, Turner BJ, Greer RC, Choi M; National Kidney Foundation Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative. Practical approach to detection and management of chronic kidney disease for the primary care clinician. *Am J Med* 2016;129:153–162.e7



## 12. Retinopathy, Neuropathy, and Foot Care: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S185–S194 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S012>

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).

For prevention and management of diabetes complications in children and adolescents, please refer to Section 14, “Children and Adolescents” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>).

### DIABETIC RETINOPATHY

#### Recommendations

- 12.1 Optimize glycemic control to reduce the risk or slow the progression of diabetic retinopathy. **A**
- 12.2 Optimize blood pressure and serum lipid control to reduce the risk or slow the progression of diabetic retinopathy. **A**

Diabetic retinopathy is a highly specific vascular complication of both type 1 and type 2 diabetes, with prevalence strongly related to both the duration of diabetes and the level of glycemic control (1). Diabetic retinopathy is the most frequent cause of new cases of blindness among adults aged 20–74 years in developed countries. Glaucoma, cataracts, and other disorders of the eye occur earlier and more frequently in people with diabetes.

In addition to diabetes duration, factors that increase the risk of, or are associated with, retinopathy include chronic hyperglycemia (2,3), nephropathy (4), hypertension (5), and dyslipidemia (6). Intensive diabetes management with the goal of achieving near-normoglycemia has been shown in large prospective randomized studies to prevent and/or delay the onset and progression of diabetic retinopathy, reduce the need for future ocular surgical procedures, and potentially improve patient reported visual function (2,7–10). A meta-analysis of data from cardiovascular outcomes studies showed no association between glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor

\*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. 12. Retinopathy, neuropathy, and foot care: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022; 45(Suppl. 1):S185–S194

© 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>.

agonist (GLP-1 RA) treatment and retinopathy per se, except through the association between retinopathy and average A1C reduction at the 3-month and 1-year follow-up. Long-term impact of improved glycemic control on retinopathy was not studied in these trials. Retinopathy status should be assessed when intensifying glucose-lowering therapies such as those using GLP-1 RAs (11).

Several case series and a controlled prospective study suggest that pregnancy in patients with type 1 diabetes may aggravate retinopathy and threaten vision, especially when glycemic control is poor or retinopathy severity is advanced at the time of conception (12,13). Laser photocoagulation surgery can minimize the risk of vision loss during pregnancy for patients with high-risk proliferative diabetic retinopathy (PDR) or center-involved diabetic macular edema (13). Anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (anti-VEGF) medications should not be used in pregnant patients with diabetes because of theoretical risks to the vasculature of the developing fetus.

## Screening

### Recommendations

- 12.3** Adults with type 1 diabetes should have an initial dilated and comprehensive eye examination by an ophthalmologist or optometrist within 5 years after the onset of diabetes. **B**
- 12.4** Patients with type 2 diabetes should have an initial dilated and comprehensive eye examination by an ophthalmologist or optometrist at the time of the diabetes diagnosis. **B**
- 12.5** If there is no evidence of retinopathy for one or more annual eye exams and glycemia is well controlled, then screening every 1–2 years may be considered. If any level of diabetic retinopathy is present, subsequent dilated retinal examinations should be repeated at least annually by an ophthalmologist or optometrist. If retinopathy is progressing or sight-threatening, then examinations will be required more frequently. **B**
- 12.6** Programs that use retinal photography (with remote reading

or use of a validated assessment tool) to improve access to diabetic retinopathy screening can be appropriate screening strategies for diabetic retinopathy. Such programs need to provide pathways for timely referral for a comprehensive eye examination when indicated. **B**

- 12.7** Women with preexisting type 1 or type 2 diabetes who are planning pregnancy or who are pregnant should be counseled on the risk of development and/or progression of diabetic retinopathy. **B**
- 12.8** Eye examinations should occur before pregnancy or in the first trimester in patients with preexisting type 1 or type 2 diabetes, and then patients should be monitored every trimester and for 1 year postpartum as indicated by the degree of retinopathy. **B**

The preventive effects of therapy and the fact that patients with PDR or macular edema may be asymptomatic provide strong support for screening to detect diabetic retinopathy. Prompt diagnosis allows triage of patients and timely intervention that may prevent vision loss in patients who are asymptomatic despite advanced diabetic eye disease.

Diabetic retinopathy screening should be performed using validated approaches and methodologies. Youth with type 1 or type 2 diabetes are also at risk for complications and need to be screened for diabetic retinopathy (14) (see Section 14, “Children and Adolescents,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>). If diabetic retinopathy is evident on screening, prompt referral to an ophthalmologist is recommended. Subsequent examinations for patients with type 1 or type 2 diabetes are generally repeated annually for patients with minimal to no retinopathy. Exams every 1–2 years may be cost-effective after one or more normal eye exams. In a population with well-controlled type 2 diabetes, there was little risk of development of significant retinopathy with a 3-year interval after a normal examination (15), and less frequent intervals have been found in simulated modeling to be

potentially effective in screening for diabetic retinopathy in patients without diabetic retinopathy (16). However, it is important to adjust screening intervals based on the presence of specific risk factors for retinopathy onset and worsening retinopathy. More frequent examinations by the ophthalmologist will be required if retinopathy is progressing or risk factors such as uncontrolled hyperglycemia or advanced baseline retinopathy or diabetic macular edema are present.

Retinal photography with remote reading by experts has great potential to provide screening services in areas where qualified eye care professionals are not readily available (17–19). High-quality fundus photographs can detect most clinically significant diabetic retinopathy. Interpretation of the images should be performed by a trained eye care provider. Retinal photography may also enhance efficiency and reduce costs when the expertise of ophthalmologists can be used for more complex examinations and for therapy (17,20,21). In-person exams are still necessary when the retinal photos are of unacceptable quality and for follow-up if abnormalities are detected. Retinal photos are not a substitute for dilated comprehensive eye exams, which should be performed at least initially and at intervals thereafter as recommended by an eye care professional. Artificial intelligence systems that detect more than mild diabetic retinopathy and diabetic macular edema, authorized for use by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), represent an alternative to traditional screening approaches (22). However, the benefits and optimal utilization of this type of screening have yet to be fully determined. Results of all screening eye examinations should be documented and transmitted to the referring health care professional.

### Type 1 Diabetes

Because retinopathy is estimated to take at least 5 years to develop after the onset of hyperglycemia, patients with type 1 diabetes should have an initial dilated and comprehensive eye examination within 5 years after the diagnosis of diabetes (23).

### Type 2 Diabetes

Patients with type 2 diabetes who may have had years of undiagnosed diabetes and have a significant risk of prevalent



diabetic retinopathy at the time of diagnosis should have an initial dilated and comprehensive eye examination at the time of diagnosis.

### Pregnancy

Pregnancy is associated with a rapid progression of diabetic retinopathy (24,25). Women with preexisting type 1 or type 2 diabetes who are planning pregnancy or who have become pregnant should be counseled on the risk of development and/or progression of diabetic retinopathy. In addition, rapid implementation of intensive glycemic management in the setting of retinopathy is associated with early worsening of retinopathy (13). Women who develop gestational diabetes mellitus do not require eye examinations during pregnancy and do not appear to be at increased risk of developing diabetic retinopathy during pregnancy (26).

### Treatment

#### Recommendations

- 12.9** Promptly refer patients with any level of diabetic macular edema, moderate or worse nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy (a precursor of proliferative diabetic retinopathy), or any proliferative diabetic retinopathy to an ophthalmologist who is knowledgeable and experienced in the management of diabetic retinopathy. **A**
- 12.10** Panretinal laser photocoagulation therapy is indicated to reduce the risk of vision loss in patients with high-risk proliferative diabetic retinopathy and, in some cases, severe nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy. **A**
- 12.11** Intravitreal injections of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor are a reasonable alternative to traditional panretinal laser photocoagulation for some patients with proliferative diabetic retinopathy and also reduce the risk of vision loss in these patients. **A**
- 12.12** Intravitreal injections of anti-vascular endothelial growth factor are indicated as first-line treatment for most eyes with

diabetic macular edema that involves the foveal center and impairs vision acuity. **A**

**12.13** Macular focal/grid photocoagulation and intravitreal injections of corticosteroid are reasonable treatments in eyes with persistent diabetic macular edema despite previous anti-vascular endothelial growth factor therapy or eyes that are not candidates for this first-line approach. **A**

**12.14** The presence of retinopathy is not a contraindication to aspirin therapy for cardioprotection, as aspirin does not increase the risk of retinal hemorrhage. **A**

Two of the main motivations for screening for diabetic retinopathy are to prevent loss of vision and to intervene with treatment when vision loss can be prevented or reversed.

#### Photocoagulation Surgery

Two large trials, the Diabetic Retinopathy Study (DRS) in patients with PDR and the Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study (ETDRS) in patients with macular edema, provide the strongest support for the therapeutic benefits of photocoagulation surgery. The DRS (27) showed in 1978 that panretinal photocoagulation surgery reduced the risk of severe vision loss from PDR from 15.9% in untreated eyes to 6.4% in treated eyes with the greatest benefit ratio in those with more advanced baseline disease (disc neovascularization or vitreous hemorrhage). In 1985, the ETDRS also verified the benefits of panretinal photocoagulation for high-risk PDR and in older-onset patients with severe nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy or less-than-high-risk PDR. Panretinal laser photocoagulation is still commonly used to manage complications of diabetic retinopathy that involve retinal neovascularization and its complications. A more gentle, macular focal/grid laser photocoagulation technique was shown in the ETDRS to be effective in treating eyes with clinically significant macular edema from diabetes (28), but this is now largely considered to be second-line treatment for diabetic macular edema.

#### Anti-Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Treatment

Data from the DRCR Retina Network (formerly the Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Research Network) and others demonstrate that intravitreal injections of anti-VEGF agents are effective at regressing proliferative disease and lead to noninferior or superior visual acuity outcomes compared with panretinal laser over 2 years of follow-up (29,30). In addition, it was observed that patients treated with ranibizumab tended to have less peripheral visual field loss, fewer vitrectomy surgeries for secondary complications from their proliferative disease, and a lower risk of developing diabetic macular edema. However, a potential drawback in using anti-VEGF therapy to manage proliferative disease is that patients were required to have a greater number of visits and received a greater number of treatments than is typically required for management with panretinal laser, which may not be optimal for some patients. Other emerging therapies for retinopathy that may use sustained intravitreal delivery of pharmacologic agents are currently under investigation. The FDA has approved aflibercept and ranibizumab for the treatment of eyes with diabetic retinopathy. Anti-VEGF treatment of eyes with nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy has been demonstrated to reduce subsequent development of retinal neovascularization and diabetic macular edema but has not been shown to improve visual outcomes over 2 years of therapy and therefore is not routinely recommended for this indication (31).

While the ETDRS (28) established the benefit of focal laser photocoagulation surgery in eyes with clinically significant macular edema (defined as retinal edema located at or threatening the macular center), current data from well-designed clinical trials demonstrate that intravitreal anti-VEGF agents provide a more effective treatment regimen for center-involved diabetic macular edema than monotherapy with laser (32,33). Most patients require near-monthly administration of intravitreal therapy with anti-VEGF agents during the first 12 months of treatment, with fewer injections needed in subsequent years to maintain remission from central-involved diabetic macular edema. There are currently three anti-VEGF agents commonly used to treat eyes with central-involved

diabetic macular edema—bevacizumab, ranibizumab, and aflibercept (1)—and a comparative effectiveness study demonstrated that aflibercept provides vision outcomes superior to those of bevacizumab when eyes have moderate visual impairment (vision of 20/50 or worse) from diabetic macular edema (34). For eyes that have good vision (20/25 or better) despite diabetic macular edema, close monitoring with initiation of anti-VEGF therapy if vision worsens provides similar 2-year vision outcomes compared with immediate initiation of anti-VEGF therapy (35).

Eyes that have persistent diabetic macular edema despite anti-VEGF treatment may benefit from macular laser photocoagulation or intravitreal therapy with corticosteroids. Both of these therapies are also reasonable first-line approaches for patients who are not candidates for anti-VEGF treatment due to systemic considerations such as pregnancy.

#### Adjunctive Therapy

Lowering blood pressure has been shown to decrease retinopathy progression, although tight targets (systolic blood pressure <120 mmHg) do not impart additional benefit (8). In patients with dyslipidemia, retinopathy progression may be slowed by the addition of fenofibrate, particularly with very mild nonproliferative diabetic retinopathy at baseline (36,37).

## NEUROPATHY

### Screening

#### Recommendations

**12.15** All patients should be assessed for diabetic peripheral neuropathy starting at diagnosis of type 2 diabetes and 5 years after the diagnosis of type 1 diabetes and at least annually thereafter. **B**

**12.16** Assessment for distal symmetric polyneuropathy should include a careful history and assessment of either temperature or pinprick sensation (small fiber function) and vibration sensation using a 128-Hz tuning fork (for large-fiber function). All patients should have annual 10-g monofilament testing to identify feet at risk

for ulceration and amputation. **B**

**12.17** Symptoms and signs of autonomic neuropathy should be assessed in patients with microvascular complications. **E**

The diabetic neuropathies are a heterogeneous group of disorders with diverse clinical manifestations. The early recognition and appropriate management of neuropathy in the patient with diabetes is important.

1. Diabetic neuropathy is a diagnosis of exclusion. Nondiabetic neuropathies may be present in patients with diabetes and may be treatable.
2. Up to 50% of diabetic peripheral neuropathy may be asymptomatic. If not recognized and if preventive foot care is not implemented, patients are at risk for injuries to their insensate feet.
3. Recognition and treatment of autonomic neuropathy may improve symptoms, reduce sequelae, and improve quality of life.

Specific treatment for the underlying nerve damage, other than improved glycemic control, is currently not available. Glycemic control can effectively prevent diabetic peripheral neuropathy (DPN) and cardiac autonomic neuropathy (CAN) in type 1 diabetes (38,39) and may modestly slow their progression in type 2 diabetes (40), but it does not reverse neuronal loss. Therapeutic strategies (pharmacologic and nonpharmacologic) for the relief of painful DPN and symptoms of autonomic neuropathy can potentially reduce pain (41) and improve quality of life.

### Diagnosis

#### Diabetic Peripheral Neuropathy

Patients with type 1 diabetes for 5 or more years and all patients with type 2 diabetes should be assessed annually for DPN using the medical history and simple clinical tests (41). Symptoms vary according to the class of sensory fibers involved. The most common early symptoms are induced by the involvement of small fibers and include pain and dysesthesia (unpleasant sensations of burning and tingling). The involvement of large fibers may cause numbness and loss of

protective sensation (LOPS). LOPS indicates the presence of distal sensorimotor polyneuropathy and is a risk factor for diabetic foot ulceration. The following clinical tests may be used to assess small- and large-fiber function and protective sensation:

1. Small-fiber function: pinprick and temperature sensation.
2. Large-fiber function: vibration perception and 10-g monofilament.
3. Protective sensation: 10-g monofilament.

These tests not only screen for the presence of dysfunction but also predict future risk of complications. Electrophysiological testing or referral to a neurologist is rarely needed, except in situations where the clinical features are atypical or the diagnosis is unclear.

In all patients with diabetes and DPN, causes of neuropathy other than diabetes should be considered, including toxins (e.g., alcohol), neurotoxic medications (e.g., chemotherapy), vitamin B12 deficiency, hypothyroidism, renal disease, malignancies (e.g., multiple myeloma, bronchogenic carcinoma), infections (e.g., HIV), chronic inflammatory demyelinating neuropathy, inherited neuropathies, and vasculitis (42). See the American Diabetes Association position statement “Diabetic Neuropathy” for more details (41).

#### Diabetic Autonomic Neuropathy

The symptoms and signs of autonomic neuropathy should be elicited carefully during the history and physical examination. Major clinical manifestations of diabetic autonomic neuropathy include hypoglycemia unawareness, resting tachycardia, orthostatic hypotension, gastroparesis, constipation, diarrhea, fecal incontinence, erectile dysfunction, neurogenic bladder, and sudomotor dysfunction with either increased or decreased sweating.

**Cardiac Autonomic Neuropathy.** CAN is associated with mortality independently of other cardiovascular risk factors (43,44). In its early stages, CAN may be completely asymptomatic and detected only by decreased heart rate variability with deep breathing. Advanced disease may be associated with resting tachycardia (>100 bpm) and orthostatic hypotension (a fall in systolic or diastolic

blood pressure by  $>20$  mmHg or  $>10$  mmHg, respectively, upon standing without an appropriate increase in heart rate). CAN treatment is generally focused on alleviating symptoms.

**Gastrointestinal Neuropathies.** Gastrointestinal neuropathies may involve any portion of the gastrointestinal tract, with manifestations including esophageal dysmotility, gastroparesis, constipation, diarrhea, and fecal incontinence. Gastroparesis should be suspected in individuals with erratic glycemic control or with upper gastrointestinal symptoms without another identified cause. Exclusion of organic causes of gastric outlet obstruction or peptic ulcer disease (with esophagogastroduodenoscopy or a barium study of the stomach) is needed before considering a diagnosis of or specialized testing for gastroparesis. The diagnostic gold standard for gastroparesis is the measurement of gastric emptying with scintigraphy of digestible solids at 15-min intervals for 4 h after food intake. The use of  $^{13}\text{C}$  octanoic acid breath test is emerging as a viable alternative.

**Genitourinary Disturbances.** Diabetic autonomic neuropathy may also cause genitourinary disturbances, including sexual dysfunction and bladder dysfunction. In men, diabetic autonomic neuropathy may cause erectile dysfunction and/or retrograde ejaculation (41). Female sexual dysfunction occurs more frequently in those with diabetes and presents as decreased sexual desire, increased pain during intercourse, decreased sexual arousal, and inadequate lubrication (45). Lower urinary tract symptoms manifest as urinary incontinence and bladder dysfunction (nocturia, frequent urination, urination urgency, and weak urinary stream). Evaluation of bladder function should be performed for individuals with diabetes who have recurrent urinary tract infections, pyelonephritis, incontinence, or a palpable bladder.

## Treatment

### Recommendations

**12.18** Optimize glucose control to prevent or delay the development of neuropathy in patients with type 1 diabetes **A** and to slow the progression

of neuropathy in patients with type 2 diabetes. **B**

**12.19** Assess and treat patients to reduce pain related to diabetic peripheral neuropathy **B** and symptoms of autonomic neuropathy and to improve quality of life. **E**

**12.20** Pregabalin, duloxetine, or gabapentin are recommended as initial pharmacologic treatments for neuropathic pain in diabetes. **A**

### Glycemic Control

Near-normal glycemic control, implemented early in the course of diabetes, has been shown to effectively delay or prevent the development of DPN and CAN in patients with type 1 diabetes (46–49). Although the evidence for the benefit of near-normal glycemic control is not as strong for type 2 diabetes, some studies have demonstrated a modest slowing of progression without reversal of neuronal loss (40,50). Specific glucose-lowering strategies may have different effects. In a post hoc analysis, participants, particularly men, in the Bypass Angioplasty Revascularization Investigation in Type 2 Diabetes (BARI 2D) trial treated with insulin sensitizers had a lower incidence of distal symmetric polyneuropathy over 4 years than those treated with insulin/sulfonylurea (51).

### Neuropathic Pain

Neuropathic pain can be severe and can impact quality of life, limit mobility, and contribute to depression and social dysfunction (52). No compelling evidence exists in support of glycemic control or lifestyle management as therapies for neuropathic pain in diabetes or prediabetes, which leaves only pharmaceutical interventions (53).

Pregabalin and duloxetine have received regulatory approval by the FDA, Health Canada, and the European Medicines Agency for the treatment of neuropathic pain in diabetes. The opioid tapentadol has regulatory approval in the U.S. and Canada, but the evidence of its use is weaker (54). Comparative effectiveness studies and trials that include quality-of-life outcomes are rare, so treatment decisions must consider each patient's presentation and comorbidities and often

follow a trial-and-error approach. Given the range of partially effective treatment options, a tailored and stepwise pharmacologic strategy with careful attention to relative symptom improvement, medication adherence, and medication side effects is recommended to achieve pain reduction and improve quality of life (55–57).

*Pregabalin*, a calcium channel  $\alpha 2\text{-}\delta$  subunit ligand, is the most extensively studied drug for DPN. The majority of studies testing pregabalin have reported favorable effects on the proportion of participants with at least 30–50% improvement in pain (54,56, 58–61). However, not all trials with pregabalin have been positive (54,56,62,63), especially when treating patients with advanced refractory DPN (60). Adverse effects may be more severe in older patients (64) and may be attenuated by lower starting doses and more gradual titration. The related drug, *gabapentin*, has also shown efficacy for pain control in diabetic neuropathy and may be less expensive, although it is not FDA approved for this indication (65).

*Duloxetine* is a selective norepinephrine and serotonin reuptake inhibitor. Doses of 60 and 120 mg/day showed efficacy in the treatment of pain associated with DPN in multicenter randomized trials, although some of these had high drop-out rates (54,56,61,63). Duloxetine also appeared to improve neuropathy-related quality of life (66). In longer-term studies, a small increase in A1C was reported in people with diabetes treated with duloxetine compared with placebo (67). Adverse events may be more severe in older people but may be attenuated with lower doses and slower titration of duloxetine.

*Tapentadol* is a centrally acting opioid analgesic that exerts its analgesic effects through both  $\mu$ -opioid receptor agonism and noradrenergic reuptake inhibition. Extended-release tapentadol was approved by the FDA for the treatment of neuropathic pain associated with diabetes based on data from two multicenter clinical trials in which participants titrated to an optimal dose of tapentadol were randomly assigned to continue that dose or switch to placebo (68,69). However, both used a design enriched for patients who responded to tapentadol, and therefore their results are not generalizable. A recent systematic review and meta-analysis by the Special Interest Group on



Neuropathic Pain of the International Association for the Study of Pain found the evidence supporting the effectiveness of tapentadol in reducing neuropathic pain to be inconclusive (54). Therefore, given the high risk for addiction and safety concerns compared with the relatively modest pain reduction, the use of extended-release tapentadol is not generally recommended as a first- or second-line therapy. The use of any opioids for management of chronic neuropathic pain carries the risk of addiction and should be avoided.

Tricyclic antidepressants, venlafaxine, carbamazepine, and topical capsaicin, although not approved for the treatment of painful DPN, may be effective and considered for the treatment of painful DPN (41,54,56).

#### **Orthostatic Hypotension**

Treating orthostatic hypotension is challenging. The therapeutic goal is to minimize postural symptoms rather than to restore normotension. Most patients require both nonpharmacologic measures (e.g., ensuring adequate salt intake, avoiding medications that aggravate hypotension, or using compressive garments over the legs and abdomen) and pharmacologic measures. Physical activity and exercise should be encouraged to avoid deconditioning, which is known to exacerbate orthostatic intolerance, and volume repletion with fluids and salt is critical. There have been clinical studies that assessed the impact of an approach incorporating the aforementioned nonpharmacologic measures. Additionally, supine blood pressure tends to be much higher in these patients, often requiring treatment of blood pressure at bedtime with shorter-acting drugs that also affect baroreceptor activity such as guanfacine or clonidine, shorter-acting calcium blockers (e.g., isradipine), or shorter-acting  $\beta$ -blockers such as atenolol or metoprolol tartrate. Alternatives can include enalapril if patients are unable to tolerate preferred agents (70–72). Midodrine and droxidopa are approved by the FDA for the treatment of orthostatic hypotension.

#### **Gastroparesis**

Treatment for diabetic gastroparesis may be very challenging. A low-fiber, low-fat eating plan provided in small frequent meals with a greater proportion of liquid calories may be useful (73–75). In

addition, foods with small particle size may improve key symptoms (76). Withdrawing drugs with adverse effects on gastrointestinal motility, including opioids, anticholinergics, tricyclic antidepressants, GLP-1 RAs, pramlintide, and possibly dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitors, may also improve intestinal motility (73,77). In cases of severe gastroparesis, pharmacologic interventions are needed. Only metoclopramide, a prokinetic agent, is approved by the FDA for the treatment of gastroparesis. However, the level of evidence regarding the benefits of metoclopramide for the management of gastroparesis is weak, and given the risk for serious adverse effects (extrapyramidal signs such as acute dystonic reactions, drug-induced parkinsonism, akathisia, and tardive dyskinesia), its use in the treatment of gastroparesis beyond 12 weeks is no longer recommended by the FDA or the European Medicines Agency. It should be reserved for severe cases that are unresponsive to other therapies (77). Other treatment options include domperidone (available outside of the U.S.) and erythromycin, which is only effective for short-term use due to tachyphylaxis (78,79). Gastric electrical stimulation using a surgically implantable device has received approval from the FDA, although its efficacy is variable and use is limited to patients with severe symptoms that are refractory to other treatments (80).

#### **Erectile Dysfunction**

In addition to treatment of hypogonadism if present, treatments for erectile dysfunction may include phosphodiesterase type 5 inhibitors, intracorporeal or intraurethral prostaglandins, vacuum devices, or penile prostheses. As with DPN treatments, these interventions do not change the underlying pathology and natural history of the disease process but may improve the patient's quality of life.

### **FOOT CARE**

#### **Recommendations**

- 12.21** Perform a comprehensive foot evaluation at least annually to identify risk factors for ulcers and amputations. **B**
- 12.22** Patients with evidence of sensory loss or prior ulceration or amputation should have

their feet inspected at every visit. **B**

- 12.23** Obtain a prior history of ulceration, amputation, Charcot foot, angioplasty or vascular surgery, cigarette smoking, retinopathy, and renal disease and assess current symptoms of neuropathy (pain, burning, numbness) and vascular disease (leg fatigue, claudication). **B**
- 12.24** The examination should include inspection of the skin, assessment of foot deformities, neurological assessment (10-g monofilament testing with at least one other assessment: pinprick, temperature, vibration), and vascular assessment, including pulses in the legs and feet. **B**
- 12.25** Patients with symptoms of claudication or decreased or absent pedal pulses should be referred for ankle-brachial index and for further vascular assessment as appropriate. **C**
- 12.26** A multidisciplinary approach is recommended for individuals with foot ulcers and high-risk feet (e.g., dialysis patients and those with Charcot foot or prior ulcers or amputation). **B**
- 12.27** Refer patients who smoke or who have histories of prior lower-extremity complications, loss of protective sensation, structural abnormalities, or peripheral arterial disease to foot care specialists for ongoing preventive care and life-long surveillance. **C**
- 12.28** Provide general preventive foot self-care education to all patients with diabetes. **B**
- 12.29** The use of specialized therapeutic footwear is recommended for high-risk patients with diabetes, including those with severe neuropathy, foot deformities, ulcers, callous formation, poor peripheral circulation, or history of amputation. **B**

Foot ulcers and amputation, which are consequences of diabetic neuropathy



and/or peripheral arterial disease (PAD), are common and represent major causes of morbidity and mortality in people with diabetes.

Early recognition and treatment of patients with diabetes and feet at risk for ulcers and amputations can delay or prevent adverse outcomes.

The risk of ulcers or amputations is increased in people who have the following risk factors:

- Poor glycemic control
- Peripheral neuropathy with LOPS
- Cigarette smoking
- Foot deformities
- Preulcerative callus or corn
- PAD
- History of foot ulcer
- Amputation
- Visual impairment
- Chronic kidney disease (especially patients on dialysis)

Moreover, there is good-quality evidence to support use of appropriate therapeutic footwear with demonstrated pressure relief that is worn by the patient to prevent plantar foot ulcer recurrence or worsening. However, there is very little evidence for the use of interventions to prevent a first foot ulcer or heal ischemic, infected, non-plantar, or proximal foot ulcers (81). Studies on specific types of footwear demonstrated that shape and barefoot plantar pressure-based orthoses were more effective in reducing submetatarsal head plantar ulcer recurrence than current standard-of-care orthoses (82).

Clinicians are encouraged to review ADA screening recommendations for further details and practical descriptions of how to perform components of the comprehensive foot examination (83).

### Evaluation for Loss of Protective Sensation

All adults with diabetes should undergo a comprehensive foot evaluation at least annually. Detailed foot assessments may occur more frequently in patients with histories of ulcers or amputations, foot deformities, insensate feet, and PAD (84,85). To assess risk, clinicians should ask about history of foot ulcers or amputation, neuropathic and peripheral vascular symptoms, impaired vision, renal disease, tobacco use, and foot care

practices. A general inspection of skin integrity and musculoskeletal deformities should be performed. Vascular assessment should include inspection and palpation of pedal pulses.

The neurological exam performed as part of the foot examination is designed to identify LOPS rather than early neuropathy. The 10-g monofilament is the most useful test to diagnose LOPS. Ideally, the 10-g monofilament test should be performed with at least one other assessment (pinprick, temperature or vibration sensation using a 128-Hz tuning fork, or ankle reflexes). Absent monofilament sensation suggests LOPS, while at least two normal tests (and no abnormal test) rules out LOPS.

### Evaluation for Peripheral Arterial Disease

Initial screening for PAD should include a history of decreased walking speed, leg fatigue, claudication, and an assessment of the pedal pulses. Ankle-brachial index testing should be performed in patients with symptoms or signs of PAD. Additionally, at least one of the following tests in a patient with a diabetic foot ulcer and PAD should be performed: skin perfusion pressure ( $\geq 40$  mmHg), toe pressure ( $\geq 30$  mmHg), or transcutaneous oxygen pressure ( $TcPO_2 \geq 25$  mmHg). Urgent vascular imaging and revascularization should be considered in a patient with a diabetic foot ulcer and an ankle pressure (ankle-brachial index)  $< 50$  mmHg, toe pressure  $< 30$  mmHg, or a  $TcPO_2 < 25$  mmHg (41,86).

### Patient Education

All patients with diabetes and particularly those with high-risk foot conditions (history of ulcer or amputation, deformity, LOPS, or PAD) and their families should be provided general education about risk factors and appropriate management (87). Patients at risk should understand the implications of foot deformities, LOPS, and PAD; the proper care of the foot, including nail and skin care; and the importance of foot monitoring on a daily basis. Patients with LOPS should be educated on ways to substitute other sensory modalities (palpation or visual inspection using an unbreakable mirror) for surveillance of early foot problems.

The selection of appropriate footwear and footwear behaviors at home should also be discussed. Patients' understanding of these issues and their physical ability to conduct proper foot surveillance and care should be assessed. Patients with visual difficulties, physical constraints preventing movement, or cognitive problems that impair their ability to assess the condition of the foot and to institute appropriate responses will need other people, such as family members, to assist with their care.

### Treatment

People with neuropathy or evidence of increased plantar pressures (e.g., erythema, warmth, or calluses) may be adequately managed with well-fitted walking shoes or athletic shoes that cushion the feet and redistribute pressure. People with bony deformities (e.g., hammertoes, prominent metatarsal heads, bunions) may need extra wide or deep shoes. People with bony deformities, including Charcot foot, who cannot be accommodated with commercial therapeutic footwear, will require custom-molded shoes. Special consideration and a thorough workup should be performed when patients with neuropathy present with the acute onset of a red, hot, swollen foot or ankle, and Charcot neuroarthropathy should be excluded. Early diagnosis and treatment of Charcot neuroarthropathy is the best way to prevent deformities that increase the risk of ulceration and amputation. The routine prescription of therapeutic footwear is not generally recommended. However, patients should be provided adequate information to aid in selection of appropriate footwear. General footwear recommendations include a broad and square toe box, laces with three or four eyes per side, padded tongue, quality lightweight materials, and sufficient size to accommodate a cushioned insole. Use of custom therapeutic footwear can help reduce the risk of future foot ulcers in high-risk patients (84,87).

Most diabetic foot infections are polymicrobial, with aerobic gram-positive cocci. Staphylococci and streptococci are the most common causative organisms. Wounds without evidence of soft tissue or bone infection do not require antibiotic therapy. Empiric antibiotic therapy can be narrowly targeted at gram-positive cocci in many patients

with acute infections, but those at risk for infection with antibiotic-resistant organisms or with chronic, previously treated, or severe infections require broader-spectrum regimens and should be referred to specialized care centers (88). Foot ulcers and wound care may require care by a podiatrist, orthopedic or vascular surgeon, or rehabilitation specialist experienced in the management of individuals with diabetes (88).

Hyperbaric oxygen therapy (HBOT) in patients with diabetic foot ulcers has mixed evidence supporting its use as an adjunctive treatment to enhance wound healing and prevent amputation (89–92). A well-conducted randomized controlled study performed in 103 patients found that HBOT did not reduce the indication for amputation or facilitate wound healing compared with comprehensive wound care in patients with chronic diabetic foot ulcers (93). Moreover, a systematic review by the International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot of interventions to improve the healing of chronic diabetic foot ulcers concluded that analysis of the evidence continues to present methodological challenges as randomized controlled studies remain few, with a majority being of poor quality (90). Thus, HBOT does not have a significant effect on health-related quality of life in patients with diabetic foot ulcers (94,95). A recent review concluded that the evidence to date remains inconclusive regarding the clinical and cost-effectiveness of HBOT as an adjunctive treatment to standard wound care for diabetic foot ulcers (96). Results from the Dutch DAMOCLES (Does Applying More Oxygen Cure Lower Extremity Sores?) trial demonstrated that HBOT in patients with diabetes and ischemic wounds did not significantly improve complete wound healing and limb salvage (97). While the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services currently covers HBOT for diabetic foot ulcers that have failed a standard course of wound therapy when there are no measurable signs of healing for at least 30 consecutive days (98), given the data not supporting an effect, such an approach is not currently warranted. HBOT should be a topic of shared decision-making before treatment is considered for selected patients with diabetic foot ulcers (98).

## References

- Solomon SD, Chew E, Duh EJ, et al. Diabetic retinopathy: a position statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:412–418
- 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
- Stratton IM, Kohner EM, Aldington SJ, et al. UKPDS 50: risk factors for incidence and progression of retinopathy in type II diabetes over 6 years from diagnosis. *Diabetologia* 2001;44:156–163
- Estacio RO, McFarling E, Biggerstaff S, Jeffers BW, Johnson D, Schrier RW. Overt albuminuria predicts diabetic retinopathy in Hispanics with NIDDM. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1998;31:947–953
- Yau JWY, Rogers SL, Kawasaki R, et al.; Meta-Analysis for Eye Disease (META-EYE) Study Group. Global prevalence and major risk factors of diabetic retinopathy. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:556–564
- Eid S, Sas KM, Abcouwer SF, et al. New insights into the mechanisms of diabetic complications: role of lipids and lipid metabolism. *Diabetologia* 2019;62:1539–1549
- UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS) Group. Intensive blood-glucose control with sulphonylureas or insulin compared with conventional treatment and risk of complications in patients with type 2 diabetes (UKPDS 33). *Lancet* 1998;352:837–853
- Chew EY, Ambrosius WT, Davis MD, et al.; ACCORD Study Group; ACCORD Eye Study Group. Effects of medical therapies on retinopathy progression in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2010;363:233–244
- Writing Team for the DCCT/EDIC Research Group; Gubitosi-Klug RA, Sun W, Cleary PA, et al. Effects of prior intensive insulin therapy and risk factors on patient-reported visual function outcomes in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) cohort. *JAMA Ophthalmol* 2016;134:137–145
- Aiello LP, Sun W, Das A, et al.; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Intensive diabetes therapy and ocular surgery in type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:1722–1733
- Bethel MA, Diaz R, Castellana N, Bhattacharya I, Gerstein HC, Lakshmanan MC. HbA<sub>1c</sub> change and diabetic retinopathy during GLP-1 receptor agonist cardiovascular outcome trials: a meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:290–296
- Fong DS, Aiello LP, Ferris FL 3rd, Klein R. Diabetic retinopathy. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:2540–2553
- Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group. Effect of pregnancy on microvascular complications in the diabetes control and complications trial. *Diabetes Care* 2000;23:1084–1091
- Dabelea D, Stafford JM, Mayer-Davis EJ, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Research Group. Association of type 1 diabetes vs type 2 diabetes diagnosed during childhood and adolescence with complications during teenage years and young adulthood. *JAMA* 2017;317:825–835
- Agardh E, Tababat-Khani P. Adopting 3-year screening intervals for sight-threatening retinal vascular lesions in type 2 diabetic subjects without retinopathy. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1318–1319
- Nathan DM, Bebu I, Hainsworth D, et al.; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Frequency of evidence-based screening for retinopathy in type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:1507–1516
- Silva PS, Horton MB, Clary D, et al. Identification of diabetic retinopathy and ungradable image rate with ultrawide field imaging in a national teleophthalmology program. *Ophthalmology* 2016;123:1360–1367
- Bragge P, Gruen RL, Chau M, Forbes A, Taylor HR. Screening for presence or absence of diabetic retinopathy: a meta-analysis. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2011;129:435–444
- Walton OB 4th, Garoon RB, Weng CY, et al. Evaluation of automated teleretinal screening program for diabetic retinopathy. *JAMA Ophthalmol* 2016;134:204–209
- Daskivich LP, Vasquez C, Martinez C Jr, Tseng C-H, Mangione CM. Implementation and evaluation of a large-scale teleretinal diabetic retinopathy screening program in the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017;177:642–649
- Sim DA, Mitty D, Alexander P, et al. The evolution of teleophthalmology programs in the United Kingdom: beyond diabetic retinopathy screening. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2016;10:308–317
- Abràmoff MD, Lavin PT, Birch M, Shah N, Folk JC. Pivotal trial of an autonomous AI-based diagnostic system for detection of diabetic retinopathy in primary care offices. *npj Digit Med* 2018;1:39
- Hooper P, Boucher MC, Cruess A, et al. Canadian Ophthalmological Society evidence-based clinical practice guidelines for the management of diabetic retinopathy. *Can J Ophthalmol* 2012;47(Suppl.):S1–S30
- Axer-Siegel R, Hod M, Fink-Cohen S, et al. Diabetic retinopathy during pregnancy. *Ophthalmology* 1996;103:1815–1819
- Best RM, Chakravarthy U. Diabetic retinopathy in pregnancy. *Br J Ophthalmol* 1997;81:249–251
- Gunderson EP, Lewis CE, Tsai A-L, et al. A 20-year prospective study of childbearing and incidence of diabetes in young women, controlling for glycemia before conception: the Coronary Artery Risk Development in Young Adults (CARDIA) Study. *Diabetes* 2007;56:2990–2996
- The Diabetic Retinopathy Study Research Group. Preliminary report on effects of photocoagulation therapy. *Am J Ophthalmol* 1976;81:383–396
- Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study research group. Photocoagulation for diabetic macular edema. Early Treatment Diabetic Retinopathy Study report number 1. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1985;103:1796–1806
- Gross JG, Glassman AR, Jampol LM, et al.; Writing Committee for the Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Research Network. Panretinal photocoagulation vs intravitreal ranibizumab for proliferative diabetic retinopathy: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2015;314:2137–2146
- Sivaprasad S, Prevost AT, Vasconcelos JC, et al.; CLARITY Study Group. Clinical efficacy of

- intravitreal aflibercept versus panretinal photocoagulation for best corrected visual acuity in patients with proliferative diabetic retinopathy at 52 weeks (CLARITY): a multicentre, single-blinded, randomised, controlled, phase 2b, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet* 2017;389:2193–2203
31. Maturi RK, Glassman AR, Josic K, et al.; DRCR Retina Network. Effect of intravitreal anti-vascular endothelial growth factor vs sham treatment for prevention of vision-threatening complications of diabetic retinopathy: the Protocol W randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Ophthalmol* 2021;139:701–712
32. Elman MJ, Bressler NM, Qin H, et al.; Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Research Network. Expanded 2-year follow-up of ranibizumab plus prompt or deferred laser or triamcinolone plus prompt laser for diabetic macular edema. *Ophthalmology* 2011;118:609–614
33. Mitchell P, Bandello F, Schmidt-Erfurth U, et al.; RESTORE study group. The RESTORE study: ranibizumab monotherapy or combined with laser versus laser monotherapy for diabetic macular edema. *Ophthalmology* 2011;118:615–625
34. Wells JA, Glassman AR, Ayala AR, et al.; Diabetic Retinopathy Clinical Research Network. Aflibercept, bevacizumab, or ranibizumab for diabetic macular edema. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:1193–1203
35. Baker CW, Glassman AR, Beaulieu WT, et al.; DRCR Retina Network. Effect of initial management with aflibercept vs laser photocoagulation vs observation on vision loss among patients with diabetic macular edema involving the center of the macula and good visual acuity: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2019;321:1880–1894
36. Chew EY, Davis MD, Danis RP, et al.; Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Eye Study Research Group. The effects of medical management on the progression of diabetic retinopathy in persons with type 2 diabetes: the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) Eye study. *Ophthalmology* 2014;121:2443–2451
37. Shi R, Zhao L, Wang F, et al. Effects of lipid-lowering agents on diabetic retinopathy: a meta-analysis and systematic review. *Int J Ophthalmol* 2018;11:287–295
38. Ang L, Jaiswal M, Martin C, Pop-Busui R. Glucose control and diabetic neuropathy: lessons from recent large clinical trials. *Curr Diab Rep* 2014;14:528
39. Martin CL, Albers JW; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Neuropathy and related findings in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications study. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:31–38
40. Ismail-Beigi F, Craven T, Banerji MA, et al.; ACCORD trial group. Effect of intensive treatment of hyperglycaemia on microvascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes: an analysis of the ACCORD randomised trial. *Lancet* 2010;376:419–430
41. Pop-Busui R, Boulton AJM, Feldman EL, et al. Diabetic neuropathy: a position statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:136–154
42. Freeman R. Not all neuropathy in diabetes is of diabetic etiology: differential diagnosis of diabetic neuropathy. *Curr Diab Rep* 2009;9:423–431
43. Pop-Busui R, Evans GW, Gerstein HC, et al.; Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Study Group. Effects of cardiac autonomic dysfunction on mortality risk in the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) trial. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1578–1584
44. Pop-Busui R, Cleary PA, Braffett BH, et al.; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Association between cardiovascular autonomic neuropathy and left ventricular dysfunction: DCCT/EDIC study (Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications). *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;61:447–454
45. Smith AG, Lessard M, Reyna S, Doudova M, Singleton JR. The diagnostic utility of Sudoscan for distal symmetric peripheral neuropathy. *J Diabetes Complications* 2014;28:511–516
46. Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) Research Group. Effect of intensive diabetes treatment on nerve conduction in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial. *Ann Neurol* 1995;38:869–880
47. CDC Study Group. The effect of intensive diabetes therapy on measures of autonomic nervous system function in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT). *Diabetologia* 1998;41:416–423
48. Albers JW, Herman WH, Pop-Busui R, et al.; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications Research Group. Effect of prior intensive insulin treatment during the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT) on peripheral neuropathy in type 1 diabetes during the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) Study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1090–1096
49. Pop-Busui R, Low PA, Waberski BH, et al.; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Effects of prior intensive insulin therapy on cardiac autonomic nervous system function in type 1 diabetes mellitus: the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications study (DCCT/EDIC). *Circulation* 2009;119:2886–2893
50. Callaghan BC, Little AA, Feldman EL, Hughes RAC. Enhanced glucose control for preventing and treating diabetic neuropathy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012;6:CD007543
51. Pop-Busui R, Lu J, Brooks MM, et al.; BARI 2D Study Group. Impact of glycemic control strategies on the progression of diabetic peripheral neuropathy in the Bypass Angioplasty Revascularization Investigation 2 Diabetes (BARI 2D) cohort. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:3208–3215
52. Sadosky A, Schaefer C, Mann R, et al. Burden of illness associated with painful diabetic peripheral neuropathy among adults seeking treatment in the US: results from a retrospective chart review and cross-sectional survey. *Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes* 2013;6:79–92
53. Waldfogel JM, Nesbit SA, Dy SM, et al. Pharmacotherapy for diabetic peripheral neuropathy pain and quality of life: a systematic review. *Neurology* 2017;88:1958–1967
54. Finnerup NB, Attal N, Haroutounian S, et al. Pharmacotherapy for neuropathic pain in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Neurol* 2015;14:162–173
55. Brill V, England J, Franklin GM, et al.; American Academy of Neurology; American Association of Neuromuscular and Electrodiagnostic Medicine; American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. Evidence-based guideline: Treatment of painful diabetic neuropathy: report of the American Academy of Neurology, the American Association of Neuromuscular and Electrodiagnostic Medicine, and the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation [published correction appears in *Neurology* 2011;77:603]. *Neurology* 2011;76:1758–1765
56. Griebeler ML, Morey-Vargas OL, Brito JP, et al. Pharmacologic interventions for painful diabetic neuropathy: an umbrella systematic review and comparative effectiveness network meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2014;161:639–649
57. Ziegler D, Fonseca V. From guideline to patient: a review of recent recommendations for pharmacotherapy of painful diabetic neuropathy. *J Diabetes Complications* 2015;29:146–156
58. Freeman R, Durso-Decruz E, Emir B. Efficacy, safety, and tolerability of pregabalin treatment for painful diabetic peripheral neuropathy: findings from seven randomized, controlled trials across a range of doses. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:1448–1454
59. Moore RA, Straube S, Wiffen PJ, Derry S, McQuay HJ. Pregabalin for acute and chronic pain in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009;3:CD007076
60. Raskin P, Huffman C, Toth C, et al. Pregabalin in patients with inadequately treated painful diabetic peripheral neuropathy: a randomized withdrawal trial. *Clin J Pain* 2014;30:379–390
61. Tesfaye S, Wilhelm S, Lledo A, et al. Duloxetine and pregabalin: high-dose monotherapy or their combination? The “COMBO-DN study”—a multinational, randomized, double-blind, parallel-group study in patients with diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. *Pain* 2013;154:2616–2625
62. Ziegler D, Duan WR, An G, Thomas JW, Nothaft W. A randomized double-blind, placebo-, and active-controlled study of T-type calcium channel blocker ABT-639 in patients with diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. *Pain* 2015;156:2013–2020
63. Quilici S, Chancellor J, Löthgren M, et al. Meta-analysis of duloxetine vs. pregabalin and gabapentin in the treatment of diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. *BMC Neurol* 2009;9:6
64. Dworkin RH, Jensen MP, Gammaitoni AR, Olaleye DO, Galer BS. Symptom profiles differ in patients with neuropathic versus non-neuropathic pain. *J Pain* 2007;8:118–126
65. Wiffen PJ, Derry S, Bell RF, et al. Gabapentin for chronic neuropathic pain in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017;6:CD007938
66. Wernicke JF, Pritchett YL, D’Souza DN, et al. A randomized controlled trial of duloxetine in diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. *Neurology* 2006;67:1411–1420
67. Hardy T, Sachson R, Shen S, Armbruster M, Boulton AJM. Does treatment with duloxetine for neuropathic pain impact glycemic control? *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:21–26
68. Schwartz S, Etropolski M, Shapiro DY, et al. Safety and efficacy of tapentadol ER in patients with painful diabetic peripheral neuropathy: results of a randomized-withdrawal, placebo-controlled trial. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2011;27:151–162
69. Vinik AI, Shapiro DY, Rauschkolb C, et al. A randomized withdrawal, placebo-controlled study evaluating the efficacy and tolerability of



- tapentadol extended release in patients with chronic painful diabetic peripheral neuropathy. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2302–2309
70. Briasoulis A, Silver A, Yano Y, Bakris GL. Orthostatic hypotension associated with baroreceptor dysfunction: treatment approaches. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)* 2014;16:141–148
71. Figueroa JJ, Basford JR, Low PA. Preventing and treating orthostatic hypotension: as easy as A, B, C. *Cleve Clin J Med* 2010;77:298–306
72. Jordan J, Fanciulli A, Tank J, et al. Management of supine hypertension in patients with neurogenic orthostatic hypotension: scientific statement of the American Autonomic Society, European Federation of Autonomic Societies, and the European Society of Hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2019;37:1541–1546
73. Camilleri M, Parkman HP, Shafi MA, Abell TL; American College of Gastroenterology. Clinical guideline: management of gastroparesis. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:18–37; quiz 38
74. Parrish CR, Pastors JG. Nutritional management of gastroparesis in people with diabetes. *Diabetes Spectr* 2007;20:231–234
75. Parkman HP, Yates KP, Hasler WL, et al.; NIDDK Gastroparesis Clinical Research Consortium. Dietary intake and nutritional deficiencies in patients with diabetic or idiopathic gastroparesis. *Gastroenterology* 2011;141:486–498, 498.e1–498.e7
76. Olausson EA, Störsrud S, Grundin H, Isaksson M, Attvall S, Simrén M. A small particle size diet reduces upper gastrointestinal symptoms in patients with diabetic gastroparesis: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2014;109:375–385
77. Umpierrez GE, Ed. *Therapy for Diabetes Mellitus and Related Disorders*. 6th ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2014
78. Sugumar A, Singh A, Pasricha PJ. A systematic review of the efficacy of domperidone for the treatment of diabetic gastroparesis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2008;6:726–733
79. Maganti K, Onyemere K, Jones MP. Oral erythromycin and symptomatic relief of gastroparesis: a systematic review. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2003;98:259–263
80. McCallum RW, Snape W, Brody F, Wo J, Parkman HP, Nowak T. Gastric electrical stimulation with Enterra therapy improves symptoms from diabetic gastroparesis in a prospective study. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2010;8:947–954; quiz e116
81. Bus SA, van Deursen RW, Armstrong DG, Lewis JE, Caravaggi CF; International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot. Footwear and offloading interventions to prevent and heal foot ulcers and reduce plantar pressure in patients with diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2016;32(Suppl. 1):99–118
82. Ulbrecht JS, Hurley T, Mauger DT, Cavanagh PR. Prevention of recurrent foot ulcers with plantar pressure-based in-shoe orthoses: the CareFUL prevention multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:1982–1989
83. Boulton AJM, Armstrong DG, Albert SF, et al.; American Diabetes Association; American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists. Comprehensive foot examination and risk assessment: a report of the task force of the foot care interest group of the American Diabetes Association, with endorsement by the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:1679–1685
84. Hingorani A, LaMuraglia GM, Henke P, et al. The management of diabetic foot: a clinical practice guideline by the Society for Vascular Surgery in collaboration with the American Podiatric Medical Association and the Society for Vascular Medicine. *J Vasc Surg* 2016;63(Suppl.):35–215
85. Litzelman DK, Slemenda CW, Langefeld CD, et al. Reduction of lower extremity clinical abnormalities in patients with non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. A randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med* 1993;119:36–41
86. International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot. IWGDF guidelines on the prevention and management of diabetic foot disease. IWGDF Guidelines, 2019. Accessed 12 October 2021. Available from <https://iwgdfguidelines.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/IWGDF-Guidelines-2019.pdf>
87. Bonner T, Foster M, Spears-Lanoix E. Type 2 diabetes-related foot care knowledge and foot self-care practice interventions in the United States: a systematic review of the literature. *Diabet Foot Ankle* 2016;7:29758
88. Lipsky BA, Berendt AR, Cornia PB, et al.; Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2012 Infectious Diseases Society of America clinical practice guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of diabetic foot infections. *Clin Infect Dis* 2012;54:e132–e173
89. Elraiyah T, Tsapas A, Prutsky G, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of adjunctive therapies in diabetic foot ulcers. *J Vasc Surg* 2016;63(Suppl):465–585.E2
90. Game FL, Apelqvist J, Attinger C, et al.; International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot. Effectiveness of interventions to enhance healing of chronic ulcers of the foot in diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2016;32(Suppl. 1):154–168
91. Kranke P, Bennett MH, Martyn-St James M, Schnabel A, Debus SE, Weibel S. Hyperbaric oxygen therapy for chronic wounds. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;6:CD004123
92. Löndahl M, Katzman P, Nilsson A, Hammarlund C. Hyperbaric oxygen therapy facilitates healing of chronic foot ulcers in patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:998–1003
93. Fedorko L, Bowen JM, Jones W, et al. hyperbaric oxygen therapy does not reduce indications for amputation in patients with diabetes with nonhealing ulcers of the lower limb: a prospective, double-blind, randomized controlled clinical trial. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:392–399
94. Li G, Hopkins RB, Levine MAH, et al. Relationship between hyperbaric oxygen therapy and quality of life in participants with chronic diabetic foot ulcers: data from a randomized controlled trial. *Acta Diabetol* 2017;54:823–831
95. Boulton AJM, Whitehouse RW. The diabetic foot. In *Endotext*. Feingold KR, Anawalt B, Boyce A, et al., Eds. South Dartmouth, MA, MDText.com, Inc., 2000–2021. Accessed 12 October 2021. Available from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK409609/>
96. Health Quality Ontario. Hyperbaric oxygen therapy for the treatment of diabetic foot ulcers: a health technology assessment. *Ont Health Technol Assess Ser* 2017;17:1–142
97. Stoekenbroek RM, Santema TB, Koelemay MJ, et al. Is additional hyperbaric oxygen therapy cost-effective for treating ischemic diabetic ulcers? Study protocol for the Dutch DAMOCLES multicenter randomized clinical trial? *J Diabetes* 2015;7:125–132
98. Huang ET, Mansouri J, Murad MH, et al.; UHMS CPG Oversight Committee. A clinical practice guideline for the use of hyperbaric oxygen therapy in the treatment of diabetic foot ulcers. *Undersea Hyperb Med* 2015;42:205–247





# 13. Older Adults: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S195–S207 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>

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).

## Recommendations

- 13.1** Consider the assessment of medical, psychological, functional (self-management abilities), and social domains in older adults to provide a framework to determine targets and therapeutic approaches for diabetes management. **B**
- 13.2** Screen for geriatric syndromes (i.e., polypharmacy, cognitive impairment, depression, urinary incontinence, falls, persistent pain, and frailty) in older adults, as they may affect diabetes self-management and diminish quality of life. **B**

Diabetes is a highly prevalent health condition in the aging population. Over one-quarter of people over the age of 65 years have diabetes, and one-half of older adults have prediabetes (1,2), and the number of older adults living with these conditions is expected to increase rapidly in the coming decades. Diabetes management in older adults requires regular assessment of medical, psychological, functional, and social domains. Older adults with diabetes have higher rates of premature death, functional disability, accelerated muscle loss, and coexisting illnesses, such as hypertension, coronary heart disease, and stroke, than those without diabetes. Screening for diabetes complications in older adults should be individualized and periodically revisited, as the results of screening tests may impact targets and therapeutic approaches (3–5). At the same time, older adults with diabetes are also at greater risk than other older adults for several common geriatric syndromes, such as polypharmacy, cognitive impairment, depression, urinary incontinence, injurious falls, persistent pain, and frailty (1). These conditions may impact older adults’ diabetes self-management abilities and quality of life if left unaddressed (2,6,7). See Section 4, “Comprehensive Medical Evaluation and

\*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. 13. Older adults: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S195–S207

© 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>.

Assessment of Comorbidities” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S004>), for the full range of issues to consider when caring for older adults with diabetes.

The comprehensive assessment described above may provide a framework to determine targets and therapeutic approaches (8–10), including whether referral for diabetes self-management education is appropriate (when complicating factors arise or when transitions in care occur) or whether the current regimen is too complex for the patient’s self-management ability or the caregivers providing care (11). Particular attention should be paid to complications that can develop over short periods of time and/or would significantly impair functional status, such as visual and lower-extremity complications. Please refer to the American Diabetes Association (ADA) consensus report “Diabetes in Older Adults” for details (3).

## NEUROCOGNITIVE FUNCTION

### Recommendation

**13.3** Screening for early detection of mild cognitive impairment or dementia should be performed for adults 65 years of age or older at the initial visit, annually, and as appropriate. **B**

Older adults with diabetes are at higher risk of cognitive decline and institutionalization (12,13). The presentation of cognitive impairment ranges from subtle executive dysfunction to memory loss and overt dementia. People with diabetes have higher incidences of all-cause dementia, Alzheimer disease, and vascular dementia than people with normal glucose tolerance (14). The effects of hyperglycemia and hyperinsulinemia on the brain are areas of intense research. Poor glycemic control is associated with a decline in cognitive function (15,16), and longer duration of diabetes is associated with worsening cognitive function. There are ongoing studies evaluating whether preventing or delaying diabetes onset may help to maintain cognitive function in older adults. However, studies examining the effects of intensive glycemic and blood pressure control to achieve specific

targets have not demonstrated a reduction in brain function decline (17,18).

Clinical trials of specific interventions—including cholinesterase inhibitors and glutamatergic antagonists—have not shown positive therapeutic benefit in maintaining or significantly improving cognitive function or in preventing cognitive decline (19). Pilot studies in patients with mild cognitive impairment evaluating the potential benefits of intranasal insulin therapy and metformin therapy provide insights for future clinical trials and mechanistic studies (20–23).

Despite the paucity of therapies to prevent or remedy cognitive decline, identifying cognitive impairment early has important implications for diabetes care. The presence of cognitive impairment can make it challenging for clinicians to help their patients reach individualized glycemic, blood pressure, and lipid targets. Cognitive dysfunction makes it difficult for patients to perform complex self-care tasks (24), such as monitoring glucose and adjusting insulin doses. It also hinders their ability to appropriately maintain the timing of meals and content of the diet. When clinicians are managing patients with cognitive dysfunction, it is critical to simplify drug regimens and to facilitate and engage the appropriate support structure to assist the patient in all aspects of care.

Older adults with diabetes should be carefully screened and monitored for cognitive impairment (2). Several simple assessment tools are available to screen for cognitive impairment (24,25), such as the Mini Mental State Examination (26), Mini-Cog (27), and the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (28), which may help to identify patients requiring neuropsychological evaluation, particularly those in whom dementia is suspected (i.e., experiencing memory loss and decline in their basic and instrumental activities of daily living). Annual screening is indicated for adults 65 years of age or older for early detection of mild cognitive impairment or dementia (4,29). Screening for cognitive impairment should additionally be considered when a patient presents with a significant decline in clinical status due to increased problems with self-care activities, such as errors in calculating insulin dose, difficulty counting carbohydrates, skipped meals, skipped insulin doses, and difficulty

recognizing, preventing, or treating hypoglycemia. People who screen positive for cognitive impairment should receive diagnostic assessment as appropriate, including referral to a behavioral health provider for formal cognitive/neuropsychological evaluation (30).

## HYPOGLYCEMIA

### Recommendations

- 13.4** Because older adults with diabetes have a greater risk of hypoglycemia than younger adults, episodes of hypoglycemia should be ascertained and addressed at routine visits. **B**
- 13.5** For older adults with type 1 diabetes, continuous glucose monitoring should be considered to reduce hypoglycemia. **A**

Older adults are at higher risk of hypoglycemia for many reasons, including insulin deficiency necessitating insulin therapy and progressive renal insufficiency (31). As described above, older adults have higher rates of unidentified cognitive impairment and dementia, leading to difficulties in adhering to complex self-care activities (e.g., glucose monitoring, insulin dose adjustment, etc.). Cognitive decline has been associated with increased risk of hypoglycemia, and conversely, severe hypoglycemia has been linked to increased risk of dementia (32,33). Therefore, as discussed in Recommendation 13.3, it is important to routinely screen older adults for cognitive impairment and dementia and discuss findings with the patients and their caregivers.

Patients and their caregivers should be routinely queried about hypoglycemia (e.g., selected questions from the Diabetes Care Profile) (34) and hypoglycemia unawareness (35). Older patients can also be stratified for future risk for hypoglycemia with validated risk calculators (e.g., Kaiser Hypoglycemia Model) (36). An important step to mitigate hypoglycemia risk is to determine whether the patient is skipping meals or inadvertently repeating doses of their medications. Glycemic targets and pharmacologic regimens may need to be adjusted to minimize the occurrence of hypoglycemic events (2). This recommendation is supported by observations

from multiple randomized controlled trials, such as the Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes (ACCORD) study and the Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial (VADT), which showed that intensive treatment protocols targeting A1C <6.0% with complex drug regimens significantly increased the risk for hypoglycemia requiring assistance compared with standard treatment (37,38). However, these intensive treatment regimens included extensive use of insulin and minimal use of glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists, and they preceded the availability of sodium-glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors.

For older patients with type 1 diabetes, continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) may be another approach to predicting and reducing the risk of hypoglycemia (39). In the Wireless Innovation in Seniors with Diabetes Mellitus (WISDM) trial, patients over 60 years of age with type 1 diabetes were randomized to CGM or standard blood glucose monitoring. Over 6 months, use of CGM resulted in a small but statistically significant reduction in time spent with hypoglycemia (glucose level <70 mg/dL) compared with standard blood glucose monitoring (adjusted treatment difference -1.9% [-27 min/day]; 95% CI -2.8% to -1.1% [-40 to -16 min/day];  $P < 0.001$ ) (40,41). Among secondary outcomes, glycemic variability was reduced with CGM, as reflected by an 8% (95% CI 6.0–11.5) increase in time spent in range between 70 and 180 mg/dL. While the current evidence base for older adults is primarily in type 1 diabetes, the evidence demonstrating the clinical benefits of CGM for patients with type 2 diabetes using insulin is growing (42) (see Section 7, “Diabetes Technology,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>). Another population for which CGM may also play an increasing role is older adults with physical or cognitive limitations who require monitoring of blood glucose by a surrogate.

## TREATMENT GOALS

### Recommendations

**13.6** Older adults who are otherwise healthy with few coexisting chronic illnesses and intact cognitive function and functional status should have lower

glycemic goals (such as A1C less than 7.0–7.5% [53–58 mmol/mol]), while those with multiple coexisting chronic illnesses, cognitive impairment, or functional dependence should have less stringent glycemic goals (such as A1C less than 8.0% [64 mmol/mol]). **C**

**13.7** Glycemic goals for some older adults might reasonably be relaxed as part of individualized care, but hyperglycemia leading to symptoms or risk of acute hyperglycemia complications should be avoided in all patients. **C**

**13.8** Screening for diabetes complications should be individualized in older adults. Particular attention should be paid to complications that would lead to functional impairment. **C**

**13.9** Treatment of hypertension to individualized target levels is indicated in most older adults. **C**

**13.10** Treatment of other cardiovascular risk factors should be individualized in older adults considering the time frame of benefit. Lipid-lowering therapy and aspirin therapy may benefit those with life expectancies at least equal to the time frame of primary prevention or secondary intervention trials. **E**

The care of older adults with diabetes is complicated by their clinical, cognitive, and functional heterogeneity. Some older individuals may have developed diabetes years earlier and have significant complications, others are newly diagnosed and may have had years of undiagnosed diabetes with resultant complications, and still other older adults may have truly recent-onset disease with few or no complications (43). Some older adults with diabetes have other underlying chronic conditions, substantial diabetes-related comorbidity, limited cognitive or physical functioning, or frailty (44,45). Other older individuals with diabetes have little comorbidity and are active. Life expectancies are highly variable but are often

longer than clinicians realize. Multiple prognostic tools for life expectancy for older adults are available (46), including tools specifically designed for older adults with diabetes (47). Older patients also vary in their preferences for the intensity and mode of glucose control (48). Providers caring for older adults with diabetes must take this heterogeneity into consideration when setting and prioritizing treatment goals (9,10) (**Table 13.1**). In addition, older adults with diabetes should be assessed for disease treatment and self-management knowledge, health literacy, and mathematical literacy (numeracy) at the onset of treatment. See **Fig. 6.2** for patient- and disease-related factors to consider when determining individualized glycemic targets.

A1C is used as the standard biomarker for glycemic control in all patients with diabetes but may have limitations in patients who have medical conditions that impact red blood cell turnover (see Section 2, “Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>, for additional details on the limitations of A1C) (49). Many conditions associated with increased red blood cell turnover, such as hemodialysis, recent blood loss or transfusion, or erythropoietin therapy, are commonly seen in older adults and can falsely increase or decrease A1C. In these instances, plasma blood glucose fingerstick and sensor glucose readings should be used for goal setting (**Table 13.1**).

### Healthy Patients With Good Functional Status

There are few long-term studies in older adults demonstrating the benefits of intensive glycemic, blood pressure, and lipid control. Patients who can be expected to live long enough to realize the benefits of long-term intensive diabetes management, who have good cognitive and physical function, and who choose to do so via shared decision-making may be treated using therapeutic interventions and goals similar to those for younger adults with diabetes (**Table 13.1**).

As with all patients with diabetes, diabetes self-management education and ongoing diabetes self-management support are vital components of diabetes care for older adults and their

caregivers. Self-management knowledge and skills should be reassessed when regimen changes are made or an individual's functional abilities diminish. In addition, declining or impaired ability to perform diabetes self-care behaviors may be an indication that a patient needs a referral for cognitive and physical functional assessment, using age-normalized evaluation tools, as well as help establishing a support structure for diabetes care (3,30).

### Patients With Complications and Reduced Functionality

For patients with advanced diabetes complications, life-limiting comorbid illnesses, or substantial cognitive or functional impairments, it is reasonable to set less-intensive glycemic goals (**Table 13.1**). Factors to consider in individualizing glycemic goals are outlined in **Fig. 6.2**. Based on concepts of competing mortality and time to benefit, these patients are less likely to benefit from reducing the risk of microvascular complications (50). In addition, these patients are more likely to suffer serious adverse effects of therapeutics, such as hypoglycemia (51). However, patients with poorly controlled diabetes may be subject to acute complications of diabetes, including dehydration, poor wound healing, and hyperglycemic hyperosmolar coma. Glycemic goals should, at a minimum, avoid these consequences.

While **Table 13.1** provides overall guidance for identifying complex and very complex patients, there is not yet global consensus on geriatric patient classification. Ongoing empiric research on the classification of older adults with diabetes based on comorbid illness has repeatedly found three major classes of patients: a healthy, a geriatric, and a cardiovascular class (9,52). The geriatric class has the highest prevalence of obesity, hypertension, arthritis, and incontinence, and the cardiovascular class has the highest prevalence of myocardial infarctions, heart failure, and stroke. Compared with the healthy class, the cardiovascular class has the highest risk of frailty and subsequent mortality. Additional research is needed to develop a reproducible classification scheme to distinguish the natural history of disease as well as differential response to glucose control and specific glucose-lowering agents (53).

### Vulnerable Patients at the End of Life

For patients receiving palliative care and end-of-life care, the focus should be to avoid hypoglycemia and symptomatic hyperglycemia while reducing the burdens of glycemic management. Thus, as organ failure develops, several agents will have to be deintensified or discontinued. For the dying patient, most agents for type 2 diabetes may be removed (54). There is, however, no consensus for the management of type 1 diabetes in this scenario (55). See the section **END-OF-LIFE CARE**, below, for additional information.

### Beyond Glycemic Control

Although hyperglycemia control may be important in older individuals with diabetes, greater reductions in morbidity and mortality are likely to result from a clinical focus on comprehensive cardiovascular risk factor modification. There is strong evidence from clinical trials of the value of treating hypertension in older adults (56,57), with treatment of hypertension to individualized target levels indicated in most. There is less evidence for lipid-lowering therapy and aspirin therapy, although the benefits of these interventions for primary and secondary prevention are likely to apply to older adults whose life expectancies equal or exceed the time frames of the clinical trials (58). In the case of statins, the follow-up time of clinical trials ranged from 2 to 6 years. While the time frame of trials can be used to inform treatment decisions, a more specific concept is the time to benefit for a therapy. For statins, a meta-analysis of the previously mentioned trials showed that the time to benefit is 2.5 years (59).

## LIFESTYLE MANAGEMENT

### Recommendations

- 13.11** Optimal nutrition and protein intake is recommended for older adults; regular exercise, including aerobic activity, weight-bearing exercise, and/or resistance training, should be encouraged in all older adults who can safely engage in such activities. **B**
- 13.12** For older adults with type 2 diabetes, overweight/obesity, and capacity to safely exercise, an intensive lifestyle

intervention focused on dietary changes, physical activity, and modest weight loss (e.g., 5–7%) should be considered for its benefits on quality of life, mobility and physical functioning, and cardiometabolic risk factor control. **A**

Lifestyle management in older adults should be tailored to frailty status. Diabetes in the aging population is associated with reduced muscle strength, poor muscle quality, and accelerated loss of muscle mass, which may result in sarcopenia and/or osteopenia (60,61). Diabetes is also recognized as an independent risk factor for frailty. Frailty is characterized by decline in physical performance and an increased risk of poor health outcomes due to physiologic vulnerability and functional or psychosocial stressors. Inadequate nutritional intake, particularly inadequate protein intake, can increase the risk of sarcopenia and frailty in older adults. Management of frailty in diabetes includes optimal nutrition with adequate protein intake combined with an exercise program that includes aerobic, weight-bearing, and resistance training. The benefits of a structured exercise program (as in the Lifestyle Interventions and Independence for Elders [LIFE] study) in frail older adults include reducing sedentary time, preventing mobility disability, and reducing frailty (62,63). The goal of these programs is not weight loss but enhanced functional status.

For nonfrail older adults with type 2 diabetes and overweight or obesity, an intensive lifestyle intervention designed to reduce weight is beneficial across multiple outcomes. The Look AHEAD (Action for Health in Diabetes) trial is described in Section 8, "Obesity and Weight Management for the Prevention and Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S008>). Look AHEAD specifically excluded individuals with a low functional status. It enrolled people between 45 and 74 years of age and required that they be able perform a maximal exercise test (64,65). While the Look AHEAD trial did not achieve its primary outcome of reducing cardiovascular events, the intensive lifestyle intervention



**Table 13.1—Framework for considering treatment goals for glycemia, blood pressure, and dyslipidemia in older adults with diabetes**

Patient characteristics/ health status	Rationale	Reasonable A1C goal‡	Fasting or preprandial glucose	Bedtime glucose	Blood pressure	Lipids
Healthy (few coexisting chronic illnesses, intact cognitive and functional status)	Longer remaining life expectancy	<7.0–7.5% (53–58 mmol/mol)	80–130 mg/dL (4.4–7.2 mmol/L)	80–180 mg/dL (4.4–10.0 mmol/L)	<140/90 mmHg	Statin unless contraindicated or not tolerated
Complex/ intermediate (multiple coexisting chronic illnesses* or 2+ instrumental ADL impairments or mild-to-moderate cognitive impairment)	Intermediate remaining life expectancy, high treatment burden, hypoglycemia vulnerability, fall risk	<8.0% (64 mmol/mol)	90–150 mg/dL (5.0–8.3 mmol/L)	100–180 mg/dL (5.6–10.0 mmol/L)	<140/90 mmHg	Statin unless contraindicated or not tolerated
Very complex/poor health (LTC or end- stage chronic illnesses** or moderate-to-severe cognitive impairment or 2+ ADL impairments)	Limited remaining life expectancy makes benefit uncertain	Avoid reliance on A1C; glucose control decisions should be based on avoiding hypoglycemia and symptomatic hyperglycemia	100–180 mg/dL (5.6–10.0 mmol/L)	110–200 mg/dL (6.1–11.1 mmol/L)	<150/90 mmHg	Consider likelihood of benefit with statin

This table represents a consensus framework for considering treatment goals for glycemia, blood pressure, and dyslipidemia in older adults with diabetes. The patient characteristic categories are general concepts. Not every patient will clearly fall into a particular category. Consideration of patient and caregiver preferences is an important aspect of treatment individualization. Additionally, a patient's health status and preferences may change over time. ADL, activities of daily living; LTC, long-term care. ‡A lower A1C goal may be set for an individual if achievable without recurrent or severe hypoglycemia or undue treatment burden. \*Coexisting chronic illnesses are conditions serious enough to require medications or lifestyle management and may include arthritis, cancer, heart failure, depression, emphysema, falls, hypertension, incontinence, stage 3 or worse chronic kidney disease, myocardial infarction, and stroke. "Multiple" means at least three, but many patients may have five or more (60). \*\*The presence of a single end-stage chronic illness, such as stage 3–4 heart failure or oxygen-dependent lung disease, chronic kidney disease requiring dialysis, or uncontrolled metastatic cancer, may cause significant symptoms or impairment of functional status and significantly reduce life expectancy. Adapted from Kirkman et al. (3).

had multiple clinical benefits that are important to the quality of life of older adults. Benefits included weight loss, improved physical fitness, increased HDL cholesterol, lowered systolic blood pressure, reduced A1C levels, reduced waist circumference, and reduced need for medications (66). Additionally, several subgroups, including participants who lost at least 10% of baseline body weight at year 1, had improved cardiovascular outcomes (67). Risk factor control was improved with reduced utilization of antihypertensive medications, statins, and insulin (68). In age-stratified analyses, older patients in the trial (60 to early 70s) had similar benefits compared with younger patients (69,70). In addition, lifestyle intervention produced benefits on aging-relevant outcomes such as reductions in multimorbidity and improvements in physical function and quality of life (71–74).

## PHARMACOLOGIC THERAPY

### Recommendations

- 13.13** In older adults with type 2 diabetes at increased risk of hypoglycemia, medication classes with low risk of hypoglycemia are preferred. **B**
- 13.14** Overtreatment of diabetes is common in older adults and should be avoided. **B**
- 13.15** Deintensification (or simplification) of complex regimens is recommended to reduce the risk of hypoglycemia and polypharmacy, if it can be achieved within the individualized A1C target. **B**
- 13.16** Consider costs of care and insurance coverage rules when developing treatment plans in order to reduce risk of cost-related nonadherence. **B**

Special care is required in prescribing and monitoring pharmacologic therapies in older adults (75). See **Fig. 9.3** for general recommendations regarding glucose-lowering treatment for adults with type 2 diabetes and **Table 9.2** for patient- and drug-specific factors to consider when selecting glucose-lowering agents. Cost may be an important consideration, especially as older adults tend to be on many medications and live on fixed incomes (76). Accordingly, the costs of care and insurance coverage rules should be considered when developing treatment plans to reduce the risk of cost-related nonadherence (77,78). See **Table 9.3** and **Table 9.4** for median monthly cost in the U.S. of noninsulin glucose-lowering agents and insulin, respectively. It is important to match complexity of the treatment regimen to the self-management ability of older patients and their

available social and medical support. Many older adults with diabetes struggle to maintain the frequent blood glucose monitoring and insulin injection regimens they previously followed, perhaps for many decades, as they develop medical conditions that may impair their ability to follow their regimen safely. Individualized glycemic goals should be established (Fig. 6.2) and periodically adjusted based on coexisting chronic illnesses, cognitive function, and functional status (2). Intensive glycemic control with regimens including insulin and sulfonylureas in older adults with complex or very complex medical conditions has been identified as overtreatment and found to be very common in clinical practice (79–83). Ultimately, the determination of whether or not a patient is considered overtreated requires an elicitation of the patient's perceptions of the current medication burden and preferences for treatments. For those seeking to simplify their diabetes regimen, deintensification of regimens in patients taking noninsulin glucose-lowering medications can be achieved by either lowering the dose or discontinuing some medications, as long as the individualized glycemic targets are maintained. When patients are found to have an insulin regimen with complexity beyond their self-management abilities, lowering the dose of insulin may not be adequate (84). Simplification of the insulin regimen to match an individual's self-management abilities and their available social and medical support in these situations has been shown to reduce hypoglycemia and disease-related distress without worsening glycemic control (85–87). Fig. 13.1 depicts an algorithm that can be used to simplify the insulin regimen (85). There are now multiple studies evaluating deintensification protocols in diabetes as well as hypertension, demonstrating that deintensification is safe and possibly beneficial for older adults (88). Table 13.2 provides examples of and rationale for situations where deintensification and/or insulin regimen simplification may be appropriate in older adults.

### Metformin

Metformin is the first-line agent for older adults with type 2 diabetes. Recent

studies have indicated that it may be used safely in patients with estimated glomerular filtration rate  $\geq 30$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup> (89). However, it is contraindicated in patients with advanced renal insufficiency and should be used with caution in patients with impaired hepatic function or heart failure because of the increased risk of lactic acidosis. Metformin may be temporarily discontinued before procedures, during hospitalizations, and when acute illness may compromise renal or liver function. Additionally, metformin can cause gastrointestinal side effects and a reduction in appetite that can be problematic for some older adults. Reduction or elimination of metformin may be necessary for patients experiencing persistent gastrointestinal side effects. For those taking metformin long-term, monitoring for vitamin B12 deficiency should be considered (90).

### Thiazolidinediones

Thiazolidinediones, if used at all, should be used very cautiously in those patients on insulin therapy as well as those patients with or at risk for heart failure, osteoporosis, falls or fractures, and/or macular edema (91,92). Lower doses of a thiazolidinedione in combination therapy may mitigate these side effects.

### Insulin Secretagogues

Sulfonylureas and other insulin secretagogues are associated with hypoglycemia and should be used with caution. If used, sulfonylureas with a shorter duration of action, such as glipizide or glimepiride, are preferred. Glyburide is a longer-acting sulfonylurea and should be avoided in older adults (93).

### Incretin-Based Therapies

Oral dipeptidyl peptidase 4 (DPP-4) inhibitors have few side effects and minimal risk of hypoglycemia, but their cost may be a barrier to some older patients. DPP-4 inhibitors do not reduce or increase major adverse cardiovascular outcomes (94). Across the trials of this drug class, there appears to be no interaction by age-group (95–97). A challenge of interpreting the age-stratified analyses of this drug class and other cardiovascular outcomes trials is that while most of these analyses were


prespecified, they were not powered to detect differences.

GLP-1 receptor agonists have demonstrated cardiovascular benefits among patients with established atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) and those at higher ASCVD risk, and newer trials are expanding our understanding of their benefits in other populations (94). See Section 9, "Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>), and Section 10, "Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>), for a more extensive discussion regarding the specific indications for this class. In a systematic review and meta-analysis of GLP-1 receptor agonist trials, these agents have been found to reduce major adverse cardiovascular events, cardiovascular deaths, stroke, and myocardial infarction to the same degree for patients above and below 65 years of age (98). While the evidence for this class for older patients continues to grow, there are a number of practical issues that should be considered for older patients. These drugs are injectable agents (with the exception of oral semaglutide) (99), which require visual, motor, and cognitive skills for appropriate administration. Agents with a weekly dosing schedule may reduce the burden of administration. GLP-1 receptor agonists may also be associated with nausea, vomiting, and diarrhea. Given the gastrointestinal side effects of this class, GLP-1 receptor agonists may not be preferred in older patients who are experiencing unexplained weight loss.

### Sodium–Glucose Cotransporter 2 Inhibitors

SGLT2 inhibitors are administered orally, which may be convenient for older adults with diabetes. In patients with established ASCVD, these agents have shown cardiovascular benefits (94). This class of agents has also been found to be beneficial for patients with heart failure and to slow the progression of chronic kidney disease. See Section 9, "Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>), and Section 10, "Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>), for a more extensive discussion regarding the indications for this class of agents. The stratified analyses of the trials of this drug class indicate that older patients have similar or greater

## Simplification of Complex Insulin Therapy



**Figure 13.1**—Algorithm to simplify insulin regimen for older patients with type 2 diabetes. eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate. \*Basal insulins: glargine U-100 and U-300, detemir, degludec, and human NPH. \*\*See Table 13.1. ¥Prandial insulins: short-acting (regular human insulin) or rapid-acting (lispro, aspart, and glulisine). §Premixed insulins: 70/30, 75/25, and 50/50 products. Adapted with permission from Munshi and colleagues (85,123,124).

benefits than younger patients (100–102). While understanding of the clinical benefits of this class is evolving, side effects such as volume depletion, urinary tract infections, and worsening urinary incontinence may be more common among older patients.

### Insulin Therapy

The use of insulin therapy requires that patients or their caregivers have good visual and motor skills and cognitive ability. Insulin therapy relies on the ability of the older patient to administer insulin on their own or with the assistance of a caregiver. Insulin doses should be titrated to meet individualized glycemic targets and to avoid hypoglycemia.

Once-daily basal insulin injection therapy is associated with minimal side effects and may be a reasonable option in many

older patients (103). When choosing a basal insulin, long-acting insulin analogs have been found to be associated with a lower risk of hypoglycemia compared with NPH insulin in the Medicare population. Multiple daily injections of insulin may be too complex for the older patient with advanced diabetes complications, life-limiting coexisting chronic illnesses, or limited functional status. Fig. 13.1 provides a potential approach to insulin regimen simplification.

### Other Factors to Consider

The needs of older adults with diabetes and their caregivers should be evaluated to construct a tailored care plan. Impaired social functioning may reduce these patients' quality of life and increase the risk of functional dependency (7). The patient's living situation

must be considered as it may affect diabetes management and support needs. Social and instrumental support networks (e.g., adult children, caretakers) that provide instrumental or emotional support for older adults with diabetes should be included in diabetes management discussions and shared decision-making.

The need for ongoing support of older adults becomes even greater when transitions to acute care and long-term care (LTC) become necessary. Unfortunately, these transitions can lead to discontinuity in goals of care, errors in dosing, and changes in diet and activity (104). Older adults in assisted living facilities may not have support to administer their own medications, whereas those living in a nursing home (community living centers)

**Table 13.2—Considerations for treatment regimen simplification and deintensification/deprescribing in older adults with diabetes (85,123)**

Patient characteristics/ health status	Reasonable A1C/ treatment goal	Rationale/considerations	When may regimen simplification be required?	When may treatment deintensification/ deprescribing be required?
Healthy (few coexisting chronic illnesses, intact cognitive and functional status)	A1C <7.0–7.5% (53–58 mmol/mol)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patients can generally perform complex tasks to maintain good glycemic control when health is stable</li> <li>• During acute illness, patients may be more at risk for administration or dosing errors that can result in hypoglycemia, falls, fractures, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If severe or recurrent hypoglycemia occurs in patients on insulin therapy (regardless of A1C)</li> <li>• If wide glucose excursions are observed</li> <li>• If cognitive or functional decline occurs following acute illness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If severe or recurrent hypoglycemia occurs in patients on noninsulin therapies with high risk of hypoglycemia (regardless of A1C)</li> <li>• If wide glucose excursions are observed</li> <li>• In the presence of polypharmacy</li> </ul>
Complex/intermediate (multiple coexisting chronic illnesses or 2+ instrumental ADL impairments or mild-to-moderate cognitive impairment)	A1C <8.0% (64 mmol/mol)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comorbidities may affect self-management abilities and capacity to avoid hypoglycemia</li> <li>• Long-acting medication formulations may decrease pill burden and complexity of medication regimen</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If severe or recurrent hypoglycemia occurs in patients on insulin therapy (even if A1C is appropriate)</li> <li>• If unable to manage complexity of an insulin regimen</li> <li>• If there is a significant change in social circumstances, such as loss of caregiver, change in living situation, or financial difficulties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If severe or recurrent hypoglycemia occurs in patients on noninsulin therapies with high risk of hypoglycemia (even if A1C is appropriate)</li> <li>• If wide glucose excursions are observed</li> <li>• In the presence of polypharmacy</li> </ul>
Community-dwelling patients receiving care in a skilled nursing facility for short-term rehabilitation	Avoid reliance on A1C Glucose target: 100–200 mg/dL (5.55–11.1 mmol/L)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glycemic control is important for recovery, wound healing, hydration, and avoidance of infections</li> <li>• Patients recovering from illness may not have returned to baseline cognitive function at the time of discharge</li> <li>• Consider the type of support the patient will receive at home</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If treatment regimen increased in complexity during hospitalization, it is reasonable, in many cases, to reinstate the prehospitalization medication regimen during the rehabilitation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the hospitalization for acute illness resulted in weight loss, anorexia, short-term cognitive decline, and/or loss of physical functioning</li> </ul>
Very complex/poor health (LTC or end-stage chronic illnesses or moderate-to-severe cognitive impairment or 2+ ADL impairments)	Avoid reliance on A1C. Avoid hypoglycemia and symptomatic hyperglycemia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No benefits of tight glycemic control in this population</li> <li>• Hypoglycemia should be avoided</li> <li>• Most important outcomes are maintenance of cognitive and functional status</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If on an insulin regimen and the patient would like to decrease the number of injections and fingerstick blood glucose monitoring events each day</li> <li>• If the patient has an inconsistent eating pattern</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If on noninsulin agents with a high hypoglycemia risk in the context of cognitive dysfunction, depression, anorexia, or inconsistent eating pattern</li> <li>• If taking any medications without clear benefits</li> </ul>
At the end of life	Avoid hypoglycemia and symptomatic hyperglycemia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal is to provide comfort and avoid tasks or interventions that cause pain or discomfort</li> <li>• Caregivers are important in providing medical care and maintaining quality of life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is pain or discomfort caused by treatment (e.g., injections or fingersticks)</li> <li>• If there is excessive caregiver stress due to treatment complexity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If taking any medications without clear benefits in improving symptoms and/or comfort</li> </ul>

Treatment regimen simplification refers to changing strategy to decrease the complexity of a medication regimen (e.g., fewer administration times, fewer blood glucose checks) and decreasing the need for calculations (such as sliding-scale insulin calculations or insulin-carbohydrate ratio calculations). Deintensification/deprescribing refers to decreasing the dose or frequency of administration of a treatment or discontinuing a treatment altogether. ADL, activities of daily living; LTC, long-term care.



may rely completely on the care plan and nursing support. Those receiving palliative care (with or without hospice) may require an approach that emphasizes comfort and symptom management, while de-emphasizing strict metabolic and blood pressure control.

### SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR OLDER ADULTS WITH TYPE 1 DIABETES

Due in part to the success of modern diabetes management, patients with type 1 diabetes are living longer, and the population of these patients over 65 years of age is growing (105–107). Many of the recommendations in this section regarding a comprehensive geriatric assessment and personalization of goals and treatments are directly applicable to older adults with type 1 diabetes; however, this population has unique challenges and requires distinct treatment considerations (108). Insulin is an essential life-preserving therapy for patients with type 1 diabetes, unlike for those with type 2 diabetes. To avoid diabetic ketoacidosis, older adults with type 1 diabetes need some form of basal insulin even when they are unable to ingest meals. Insulin may be delivered through an insulin pump or injections. CGM is approved for use by Medicare and can play a critical role in improving A1C, reducing glycemic variability, and reducing risk of hypoglycemia (109) (see Section 7, “Diabetes Technology,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>, and Section 9, “Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>). In the older patient with type 1 diabetes, administration of insulin may become more difficult as complications, cognitive impairment, and functional impairment arise. This increases the importance of caregivers in the lives of these patients. Many older patients with type 1 diabetes require placement in LTC settings (i.e., nursing homes and skilled nursing facilities), and unfortunately, these patients can encounter staff that are less familiar with insulin pumps or CGM. Some staff may be less knowledgeable about the differences between type 1 and type 2 diabetes. In these instances, the patient or the patient’s family may be more familiar with their diabetes management plan than the staff or providers. Education of relevant support staff and providers in rehabilitation and LTC

settings regarding insulin dosing and use of pumps and CGM is recommended as part of general diabetes education (see Recommendations 13.17 and 13.18).

### TREATMENT IN SKILLED NURSING FACILITIES AND NURSING HOMES

#### Recommendations

**13.17** Consider diabetes education for the staff of long-term care and rehabilitation facilities to improve the management of older adults with diabetes. **E**

**13.18** Patients with diabetes residing in long-term care facilities need careful assessment to establish individualized glycemic goals and to make appropriate choices of glucose-lowering agents based on their clinical and functional status. **E**

Management of diabetes in the LTC setting is unique. Individualization of health care is important in all patients; however, practical guidance is needed for medical providers as well as the LTC staff and caregivers (110). Training should include diabetes detection and institutional quality assessment. LTC facilities should develop their own policies and procedures for prevention and management of hypoglycemia. With the increased longevity of populations, the care of people with diabetes and its complications in LTC is an area that warrants greater study.

#### Resources

Staff of LTC facilities should receive appropriate diabetes education to improve the management of older adults with diabetes. Treatments for each patient should be individualized. Special management considerations include the need to avoid both hypoglycemia and the complications of hyperglycemia (2,111). For more information, see the ADA position statement “Management of Diabetes in Long-term Care and Skilled Nursing Facilities” (110).

#### Nutritional Considerations

An older adult residing in an LTC facility may have irregular and unpredictable meal consumption, undernutrition, anorexia, and impaired swallowing. Furthermore, therapeutic diets may

inadvertently lead to decreased food intake and contribute to unintentional weight loss and undernutrition. Diets tailored to a patient’s culture, preferences, and personal goals may increase quality of life, satisfaction with meals, and nutrition status (112). It may be helpful to give insulin after meals to ensure that the dose is appropriate for the amount of carbohydrate the patient consumed in the meal.

#### Hypoglycemia

Older adults with diabetes in LTC are especially vulnerable to hypoglycemia. They have a disproportionately high number of clinical complications and comorbidities that can increase hypoglycemia risk: impaired cognitive and renal function, slowed hormonal regulation and counterregulation, suboptimal hydration, variable appetite and nutritional intake, polypharmacy, and slowed intestinal absorption (113). Oral agents may achieve glycemic outcomes similar to basal insulin in LTC populations (80,114).

Another consideration for the LTC setting is that, unlike in the hospital setting, medical providers are not required to evaluate the patients daily. According to federal guidelines, assessments should be done at least every 30 days for the first 90 days after admission and then at least once every 60 days. Although in practice, the patients may actually be seen more frequently, the concern is that patients may have uncontrolled glucose levels or wide excursions without the practitioner being notified. Providers may make adjustments to treatment regimens by telephone, fax, or in person directly at the LTC facilities provided they are given timely notification of blood glucose management issues from a standardized alert system.

The following alert strategy could be considered:

- 1. Call provider immediately** in cases of low blood glucose levels (<70 mg/dL [3.9 mmol/L]).
- 2. Call as soon as possible when**
  - a) glucose values are 70–100 mg/dL (3.9–5.6 mmol/L) (regimen may need to be adjusted),
  - b) glucose values are consistently >250 mg/dL (13.9 mmol/L) within a 24-h period,

- c) glucose values are consistently >300 mg/dL (16.7 mmol/L) over 2 consecutive days,
- d) any reading is too high for the glucose monitoring device, or
- e) the patient is sick, with vomiting, symptomatic hyperglycemia, or poor oral intake.

## END-OF-LIFE CARE

### Recommendations

**13.19** When palliative care is needed in older adults with diabetes, providers should initiate conversations regarding the goals and intensity of care. Strict glucose and blood pressure control are not necessary **E**, and simplification of regimens can be considered. Similarly, the intensity of lipid management can be relaxed, and withdrawal of lipid-lowering therapy may be appropriate. **A**

**13.20** Overall comfort, prevention of distressing symptoms, and preservation of quality of life and dignity are primary goals for diabetes management at the end of life. **C**

The management of the older adult at the end of life receiving palliative medicine or hospice care is a unique situation. Overall, palliative medicine promotes comfort, symptom control and prevention (pain, hypoglycemia, hyperglycemia, and dehydration), and preservation of dignity and quality of life in patients with limited life expectancy (111,115). In the setting of palliative care, providers should initiate conversations regarding the goals and intensity of diabetes care; strict glucose and blood pressure control may not be consistent with achieving comfort and quality of life. Avoidance of severe hypertension and hyperglycemia aligns with the goals of palliative care. In a multicenter trial, withdrawal of statins among patients in palliative care was found to improve quality of life (116–118). The evidence for the safety and efficacy of deintensification protocols in older adults is growing for both glucose and blood pressure control (88,119) and is clearly relevant for palliative care. A patient has the right to refuse testing and treatment,

whereas providers may consider withdrawing treatment and limiting diagnostic testing, including a reduction in the frequency of blood glucose monitoring (120,121). Glucose targets should aim to prevent hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia. Treatment interventions need to be mindful of quality of life. Careful monitoring of oral intake is warranted. The decision process may need to involve the patient, family, and caregivers, leading to a care plan that is both convenient and effective for the goals of care (122). The pharmacologic therapy may include oral agents as first line, followed by a simplified insulin regimen. If needed, basal insulin can be implemented, accompanied by oral agents and without rapid-acting insulin. Agents that can cause gastrointestinal symptoms such as nausea or excess weight loss may not be good choices in this setting. As symptoms progress, some agents may be slowly tapered and discontinued.

Different patient categories have been proposed for diabetes management in those with advanced disease (55).

1. A stable patient: Continue with the patient's previous regimen, with a focus on 1) the prevention of hypoglycemia and 2) the management of hyperglycemia using blood glucose testing, keeping levels below the renal threshold of glucose, and hyperglycemia-mediated dehydration. There is no role for A1C monitoring.
2. A patient with organ failure: Preventing hypoglycemia is of greatest significance. Dehydration must be prevented and treated. In people with type 1 diabetes, insulin administration may be reduced as the oral intake of food decreases but should not be stopped. For those with type 2 diabetes, agents that may cause hypoglycemia should be reduced in dose. The main goal is to avoid hypoglycemia, allowing for glucose values in the upper level of the desired target range.
3. A dying patient: For patients with type 2 diabetes, the discontinuation of all medications may be a reasonable approach, as patients are unlikely to have any oral intake. In patients with type 1 diabetes, there is no consensus, but a small amount of basal

insulin may maintain glucose levels and prevent acute hyperglycemic complications.

## References

1. Laiteerapong N, Huang ES. Diabetes in older adults. In *Diabetes in America*. 3rd ed. Cowie CC, Casagrande SS, Menke A, et al., Eds. Bethesda, MD, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (US), 2018. PMID: 33651542
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Diabetes Statistics Report, 2020: Estimates of Diabetes and its Burden in the United States. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/pdfs/data/statistics/national-diabetes-statistics-report.pdf>
3. Kirkman MS, Briscoe VJ, Clark N, et al. Diabetes in older adults. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:2650–2664
4. Young-Hyman D, de Groot M, Hill-Briggs F, Gonzalez JS, Hood K, Peyrot M. Psychosocial care for people with diabetes: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2126–2140
5. Institute of Medicine of the National Academies. *Cognitive Aging: Progress in Understanding and Opportunities for Action*, 2015. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://nationalacademies.org/hmd/Reports/2015/Cognitive-Aging.aspx>
6. Sudore RL, Karter AJ, Huang ES, et al. Symptom burden of adults with type 2 diabetes across the disease course: diabetes & aging study. *J Gen Intern Med* 2012;27:1674–1681
7. Laiteerapong N, Karter AJ, Liu JY, et al. Correlates of quality of life in older adults with diabetes: the diabetes & aging study. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1749–1753
8. McClintock MK, Dale W, Laumann EO, Waite L. Empirical redefinition of comprehensive health and well-being in the older adults of the United States. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2016;113:E3071–E3080
9. Laiteerapong N, Iveniuk J, John PM, Laumann EO, Huang ES. Classification of older adults who have diabetes by comorbid conditions, United States, 2005–2006. *Prev Chronic Dis* 2012;9:E100
10. Blaum C, Cigolle CT, Boyd C, et al. Clinical complexity in middle-aged and older adults with diabetes: the Health and Retirement Study. *Med Care* 2010;48:327–334
11. Tinetti ME, Costello DM, Naik AD, et al. Outcome goals and health care preferences of older adults with multiple chronic conditions. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;4:e211271
12. Cukierman T, Gerstein HC, Williamson JD. Cognitive decline and dementia in diabetes—systematic overview of prospective observational studies. *Diabetologia* 2005;48:2460–2469
13. Roberts RO, Knopman DS, Przybelski SA, et al. Association of type 2 diabetes with brain atrophy and cognitive impairment. *Neurology* 2014;82:1132–1141
14. Xu WL, von Strauss E, Qiu CX, Winblad B, Fratiglioni L. Uncontrolled diabetes increases the risk of Alzheimer's disease: a population-based cohort study. *Diabetologia* 2009;52:1031–1039
15. Yaffe K, Falvey C, Hamilton N, et al. Diabetes, glucose control, and 9-year cognitive decline among older adults without dementia. *Arch Neurol* 2012;69:1170–1175

16. Rawlings AM, Sharrett AR, Schneider AL, et al. Diabetes in midlife and cognitive change over 20 years: a cohort study. *Ann Intern Med* 2014;161:785–793
17. Launer LJ, Miller ME, Williamson JD, et al.; ACCORD MIND investigators. Effects of intensive glucose lowering on brain structure and function in people with type 2 diabetes (ACCORD MIND): a randomised open-label substudy. *Lancet Neurol* 2011;10:969–977
18. Murray AM, Hsu F-C, Williamson JD, et al.; Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Follow-On Memory in Diabetes (ACCORDION MIND) Investigators. ACCORDION MIND: results of the observational extension of the ACCORD MIND randomised trial. *Diabetologia* 2017;60:69–80
19. Ghezzi L, Scarpini E, Galimberti D. Disease-modifying drugs in Alzheimer's disease. *Drug Des Devel Ther* 2013;7:1471–1478
20. Craft S, Baker LD, Montine TJ, et al. Intranasal insulin therapy for Alzheimer disease and amnesic mild cognitive impairment: a pilot clinical trial. *Arch Neurol* 2012;69:29–38
21. Freiherr J, Hallschmid M, Frey WH 2nd, et al. Intranasal insulin as a treatment for Alzheimer's disease: a review of basic research and clinical evidence. *CNS Drugs* 2013;27:505–514
22. Alagiakrishnan K, Sankaralingam S, Ghosh M, Mereu L, Senior P. Antidiabetic drugs and their potential role in treating mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease. *Discov Med* 2013;16:277–286
23. Tomlin A, Sinclair A. The influence of cognition on self-management of type 2 diabetes in older people. *Psychol Res Behav Manag* 2016;9:7–20
24. National Institute on Aging. Assessing Cognitive Impairment in Older Patients. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://www.nia.nih.gov/health/assessing-cognitive-impairment-older-patients>
25. Alzheimer's Association. Cognitive Assessment. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://alz.org/professionals/healthcare-professionals/cognitive-assessment>
26. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Minimal state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res* 1975;12:189–198
27. Borson S, Scanlan JM, Chen P, Ganguli M. The Mini-Cog as a screen for dementia: validation in a population-based sample. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2003;51:1451–1454
28. Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bédirian V, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2005;53:695–699
29. Moreno G, Mangione CM, Kimbro L; American Geriatrics Society Expert Panel on Care of Older Adults with Diabetes Mellitus. Guidelines abstracted from the American Geriatrics Society Guidelines for Improving the Care of Older Adults with Diabetes Mellitus: 2013 update. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2013;61:2020–2026
30. American Psychological Association. APA Guidelines for the Evaluation of Dementia and Age-Related Cognitive Change, 2021. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://www.apa.org/practice/guidelines/dementia.aspx>
31. Lee AK, Lee CJ, Huang ES, Sharrett AR, Coresh J, Selvin E. Risk factors for severe hypoglycemia in black and white adults with diabetes: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) study. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1661–1667
32. Feinkohl I, Aung PP, Keller M, et al.; Edinburgh Type 2 Diabetes Study (ET2DS) Investigators. Severe hypoglycemia and cognitive decline in older people with type 2 diabetes: the Edinburgh Type 2 Diabetes Study. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:507–515
33. Lee AK, Rawlings AM, Lee CJ, et al. Severe hypoglycaemia, mild cognitive impairment, dementia and brain volumes in older adults with type 2 diabetes: the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) cohort study. *Diabetologia* 2018;61:1956–1965
34. Fitzgerald JT, Davis WK, Connell CM, Hess GE, Funnell MM, Hiss RG. Development and validation of the Diabetes Care Profile. *Eval Health Prof* 1996;19:208–230
35. Clarke WL, Cox DJ, Gonder-Frederick LA, Julian D, Schlundt D, Polonsky W. Reduced awareness of hypoglycemia in adults with IDDM. A prospective study of hypoglycemic frequency and associated symptoms. *Diabetes Care* 1995;18:517–522
36. Karter AJ, Warton EM, Lipska KJ, et al. Development and validation of a tool to identify patients with type 2 diabetes at high risk of hypoglycemia-related emergency department or hospital use. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017;177:1461–1470
37. Gerstein HC, Miller ME, Byington RP, et al.; Action to Control Cardiovascular Risk in Diabetes Study Group. Effects of intensive glucose lowering in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:2545–2559
38. Duckworth W, Abraira C, Moritz T, et al.; VADT Investigators. Glucose control and vascular complications in veterans with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:129–139
39. Toschi E, Slyne C, Sifre K, et al. The relationship between CGM-derived metrics, A1C, and risk of hypoglycemia in older adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:2349–2354
40. Carlson AL, Kanapka LG, Miller KM, et al. Hypoglycemia and glycemic control in older adults with type 1 diabetes: baseline results from the WISDM study. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2021;15:582–592
41. Pratley RE, Kanapka LG, Rickels MR, Ahmann A, Aleppo G, Beck R, 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
42. 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
43. Selvin E, Coresh J, Brancati FL. The burden and treatment of diabetes in elderly individuals in the U.S. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:2415–2419
44. Bandeen-Roche K, Seplaki CL, Huang J, et al. Frailty in older adults: a nationally representative profile in the United States. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2015;70:1427–1434
45. Kalyani RR, Tian J, Xue Q-L, et al. Hyperglycemia and incidence of frailty and lower extremity mobility limitations in older women. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2012;60:1701–1707
46. Pilla SJ, Schoenborn NL, Maruthur NM, Huang ES. Approaches to risk assessment among older patients with diabetes. *Curr Diab Rep* 2019;19:59
47. Griffith KN, Prentice JC, Mohr DC, Conlin PR. Predicting 5- and 10-year mortality risk in older adults with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2020;43:1724–1731
48. Brown SES, Meltzer DO, Chin MH, Huang ES. Perceptions of quality-of-life effects of treatments for diabetes mellitus in vulnerable and nonvulnerable older patients. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2008;56:1183–1190
49. NGSP. Factors that interfere with HbA1c test results. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <http://www.ngsp.org/factors.asp>
50. Huang ES, Zhang Q, Gandra N, Chin MH, Meltzer DO. The effect of comorbid illness and functional status on the expected benefits of intensive glucose control in older patients with type 2 diabetes: a decision analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2008;149:11–19
51. Huang ES, Laiteerapong N, Liu JY, John PM, Moffet HH, Karter AJ. Rates of complications and mortality in older patients with diabetes mellitus: the diabetes and aging study. *JAMA Intern Med* 2014;174:251–258
52. Leung V, Wroblewski K, Schumm LP, Huisingh-Scheetz M, Huang ES. Re-examining the classification of older adults with diabetes by comorbidities and exploring relationship with frailty, disability, and 5-year mortality. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2021;76:2071–2079
53. Rooney MR, Tang O, Echouffo Tcheugui JB, et al. American Diabetes Association framework for glycemic control in older adults: implications for risk of hospitalization and mortality. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:1524–1531dc203045
54. Sinclair A, Dunning T, Colagiuri S. IDF Global Guideline For Managing Older People With Type 2 Diabetes. Brussels, Belgium, International Diabetes Federation, 2013
55. Angelo M, Ruchalski C, Spröge BJ. An approach to diabetes mellitus in hospice and palliative medicine. *J Palliat Med* 2011;14:83–87
56. Beckett NS, Peters R, Fletcher AE, et al.; HYVET Study Group. Treatment of hypertension in patients 80 years of age or older. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:1887–1898
57. de Boer IH, Bangalore S, Benetos A, et al. Diabetes and hypertension: a position statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1273–1284
58. Gencer B, Marston NA, Im K, et al. Efficacy and safety of lowering LDL cholesterol in older patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Lancet* 2020;396:1637–1643
59. Yourman LC, Cenzler IS, Boscardin WJ, et al. Evaluation of time to benefit of statins for the primary prevention of cardiovascular events in adults aged 50 to 75 years: a meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern Med* 2021;181:179–185
60. Park SW, Goodpaster BH, Strotmeyer ES, et al. Decreased muscle strength and quality in older adults with type 2 diabetes: the Health, Aging, and Body Composition study. *Diabetes* 2006;55:1813–1818
61. Park SW, Goodpaster BH, Strotmeyer ES, et al.; Health, Aging, and Body Composition Study. Accelerated loss of skeletal muscle strength in older adults with type 2 diabetes: the



- Health, Aging, and Body Composition study. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:1507–1512
62. Pahor M, Guralnik JM, Ambrosius WT, et al.; LIFE study investigators. Effect of structured physical activity on prevention of major mobility disability in older adults: the LIFE study randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2014;311:2387–2396
63. Gill TM, Baker DI, Gottschalk M, Peduzzi PN, Allore H, Byers A. A program to prevent functional decline in physically frail, elderly persons who live at home. *N Engl J Med* 2002;347:1068–1074
64. Curtis JM, Horton ES, Bahnson J, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Prevalence and predictors of abnormal cardiovascular responses to exercise testing among individuals with type 2 diabetes: the Look AHEAD (Action for Health in Diabetes) study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:901–907
65. Bray G, Gregg E, Haffner S, et al.; Look Ahead Research Group. Baseline characteristics of the randomised cohort from the Look AHEAD (Action for Health in Diabetes) study. *Diab Vasc Dis Res* 2006;3:202–215
66. Wing RR, Bolin P, Brancati FL, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Cardiovascular effects of intensive lifestyle intervention in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:145–154
67. Gregg EW, Jakicic JM, Blackburn G, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Association of the magnitude of weight loss and changes in physical fitness with long-term cardiovascular disease outcomes in overweight or obese people with type 2 diabetes: a post-hoc analysis of the Look AHEAD randomised clinical trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2016;4:913–921
68. Gregg EW, Chen H, Wagenknecht LE, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Association of an intensive lifestyle intervention with remission of type 2 diabetes. *JAMA* 2012;308:2489–2496
69. Rejeski WJ, Bray GA, Chen S-H, et al.; Look AHEAD Research Group. Aging and physical function in type 2 diabetes: 8 years of an intensive lifestyle intervention. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2015;70:345–353
70. Espeland MA, Rejeski WJ, West DS, et al.; Action for Health in Diabetes Research Group. Intensive weight loss intervention in older individuals: results from the Action for Health in Diabetes type 2 diabetes mellitus trial. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2013;61:912–922
71. Houston DK, Neiberg RH, Miller ME, et al. Physical function following a long-term lifestyle intervention among middle aged and older adults with type 2 diabetes: the Look AHEAD study. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2018;73:1552–1559
72. Simpson FR, Pajewski NM, Nicklas B, et al.; Indices for Accelerated Aging in Obesity and Diabetes Ancillary Study of the Action for Health in Diabetes (Look AHEAD) Trial. Impact of multidomain lifestyle intervention on frailty through the lens of deficit accumulation in adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2020;75:1921–1927
73. Espeland MA, Gaussoin SA, Bahnson J, et al. Impact of an 8-year intensive lifestyle intervention on an index of multimorbidity. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2020;68:2249–2256
74. Gregg EW, Lin J, Bardenheier B, et al.; Look AHEAD Study Group. Impact of intensive lifestyle intervention on disability-free life expectancy: the Look AHEAD study. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1040–1048
75. Valencia WM, Florez H. Pharmacological treatment of diabetes in older people. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2014;16:1192–1203
76. Zhang JX, Bhaumik D, Huang ES, Meltzer DO. Change in insurance status and cost-related medication non-adherence among older U.S. adults with diabetes from 2010 to 2014. *J Health Econ* 2018;4:7
77. Schmittiel JA, Steers N, Duru OK, et al. Patient-provider communication regarding drug costs in Medicare Part D beneficiaries with diabetes: a TRIAD Study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2010;10:164
78. Patel MR, Resnicow K, Lang I, Kraus K, Heisler M. Solutions to address diabetes-related financial burden and cost-related nonadherence: results from a pilot study. *Health Educ Behav* 2018;45:101–111
79. Arnold SV, Lipska KJ, Wang J, Seman L, Mehta SN, Kosiborod M. Use of intensive glycemic management in older adults with diabetes mellitus. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2018;66:1190–1194
80. Andreassen LM, Sandberg S, Kristensen GBB, Sølvik UØ, Kjøme RLS. Nursing home patients with diabetes: prevalence, drug treatment and glycemic control. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2014;105:102–109
81. Lipska KJ, Ross JS, Miao Y, Shah ND, Lee SJ, Steinman MA. Potential overtreatment of diabetes mellitus in older adults with tight glycemic control. *JAMA Intern Med* 2015;175:356–362
82. Thorpe CT, Gellad WF, Good CB, et al. Tight glycemic control and use of hypoglycemic medications in older veterans with type 2 diabetes and comorbid dementia. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:588–595
83. McAlister FA, Youngson E, Eurich DT. Treatment deintensification is uncommon in adults with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a retrospective cohort study. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2017;10:e003514
84. Weiner JZ, Gopalan A, Mishra P, et al. Use and discontinuation of insulin treatment among adults aged 75 to 79 years with type 2 diabetes. *JAMA Intern Med* 2019;179:1633–1641
85. Munshi MN, Slyne C, Segal AR, Saul N, Lyons C, Weinger K. Simplification of insulin regimen in older adults and risk of hypoglycemia. *JAMA Intern Med* 2016;176:1023–1025
86. Sussman JB, Kerr EA, Saini SD, et al. Rates of deintensification of blood pressure and glycemic medication treatment based on levels of control and life expectancy in older patients with diabetes mellitus. *JAMA Intern Med* 2015;175:1942–1949
87. Abdelhafiz AH, Sinclair AJ. Deintensification of hypoglycaemic medications—use of a systematic review approach to highlight safety concerns in older people with type 2 diabetes. *J Diabetes Complications* 2018;32:444–450
88. Seidu S, Kunutsor SK, Topsever P, Hambling CE, Cos FX, Khunti K. Deintensification in older patients with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review of approaches, rates and outcomes. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2019;21:1668–1679
89. Inzucchi SE, Lipska KJ, Mayo H, Bailey CJ, McGuire DK. Metformin in patients with type 2 diabetes and kidney disease: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2014;312:2668–2675
90. Aroda VR, Edelstein SL, Goldberg RB, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Long-term metformin use and vitamin B12 deficiency in the Diabetes Prevention Program Outcomes Study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2016;101:1754–1761
91. Schwartz AV, Chen H, Ambrosius WT, et al. Effects of TZD use and discontinuation on fracture rates in ACCORD Bone Study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2015;100:4059–4066
92. Billington EO, Grey A, Bolland MJ. The effect of thiazolidinediones on bone mineral density and bone turnover: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetologia* 2015;58:2238–2246
93. American Geriatrics Society 2015 Beers Criteria Update Expert Panel. American Geriatrics Society 2015 updated Beers criteria for potentially inappropriate medication use in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2015;63:2227–2246
94. Davies MJ, D'Alessio DA, Fradkin J, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2018. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2669–2701
95. Leiter LA, Teoh H, Braunwald E, et al.; SAVOR-TIMI 53 Steering Committee and Investigators. Efficacy and safety of saxagliptin in older participants in the SAVOR-TIMI 53 trial. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1145–1153
96. Green JB, Bethel MA, Armstrong PW, et al.; TECOS Study Group. Effect of sitagliptin on cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:232–242
97. White WB, Cannon CP, Heller SR, et al.; EXAMINE Investigators. Alogliptin after acute coronary syndrome in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:1327–1335
98. Karagiannis T, Tsapas A, Athanasiadou E, et al. GLP-1 receptor agonists and SGLT2 inhibitors for older people with type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2021;174:108737
99. Husain M, Birkenfeld AL, Donsmark M, et al. Oral semaglutide and cardiovascular outcomes in patients with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:841–851
100. Zinman B, Wanner C, Lachin JM, et al.; EMPA-REG OUTCOME Investigators. Empagliflozin, cardiovascular outcomes, and mortality in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:2117–2128
101. Neal B, Perkovic V, Mahaffey KW, et al.; CANVAS Program Collaborative Group. Canagliflozin and cardiovascular and renal events in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:644–657
102. Wiviott SD, Raz I, Bonaca MP, et al.; DECLARE-TIMI 58 Investigators. Dapagliflozin and cardiovascular outcomes in type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;380:347–357
103. Bradley MC, Chillarige Y, Lee H, et al. Severe hypoglycemia risk with long-acting insulin analogs vs neutral protamine hagedorn insulin. *JAMA Intern Med* 2021;181:598–607
104. Pandya N, Hames E, Sandhu S. Challenges and strategies for managing diabetes in the elderly in long-term care settings. *Diabetes Spectr* 2020;33:236–245
105. Livingstone SJ, Levin D, Looker HC, et al.; Scottish Diabetes Research Network epidemiology



- group; Scottish Renal Registry. Estimated life expectancy in a Scottish cohort with type 1 diabetes, 2008-2010. *JAMA* 2015;313:37-44
106. Miller RG, Secrest AM, Sharma RK, Songer TJ, Orchard TJ. Improvements in the life expectancy of type 1 diabetes: the Pittsburgh Epidemiology of Diabetes Complications study cohort. *Diabetes* 2012;61:2987-2992
107. Bullard KM, Cowie CC, Lessem SE, et al. Prevalence of diagnosed diabetes in adults by diabetes type—United States, 2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2018;67:359-361
108. Heise T, Nosek L, Rønne BB, et al. Lower within-subject variability of insulin detemir in comparison to NPH insulin and insulin glargine in people with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes* 2004;53:1614-1620
109. Ruedy KJ, Parkin CG, Riddlesworth TD; DIAMOND Study Group. Continuous glucose monitoring in older adults with type 1 and type 2 diabetes using multiple daily injections of insulin: results from the DIAMOND trial. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2017;11:1138-1146
110. Munshi MN, Florez H, Huang ES, et al. Management of diabetes in long-term care and skilled nursing facilities: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:308-318
111. Sinclair A, Morley JE, Rodriguez-Mañas L, et al. Diabetes mellitus in older people: position statement on behalf of the International Association of Gerontology and Geriatrics (IAGG), the European Diabetes Working Party for Older People (EDWPOP), and the International Task Force of Experts in Diabetes. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2012;13:497-502
112. Dorner B, Friedrich EK, Posthauer ME. Practice paper of the American Dietetic Association: individualized nutrition approaches for older adults in health care communities. *J Am Diet Assoc* 2010;110:1554-1563
113. Migdal A, Yarandi SS, Smiley D, Umpierrez GE. Update on diabetes in the elderly and in nursing home residents. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2011;12:627-632.e2
114. Pasquel FJ, Powell W, Peng L, et al. A randomized controlled trial comparing treatment with oral agents and basal insulin in elderly patients with type 2 diabetes in long-term care facilities. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2015;3:e000104
115. Quinn K, Hudson P, Dunning T. Diabetes management in patients receiving palliative care. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2006;32:275-286
116. Kutner JS, Blatchford PJ, Taylor DH Jr, et al. Safety and benefit of discontinuing statin therapy in the setting of advanced, life-limiting illness: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Intern Med* 2015;175:691-700
117. Dunning T, Martin P. Palliative and end of life care of people with diabetes: issues, challenges and strategies. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2018;143:454-463
118. Bouça-Machado R, Rosário M, Alarcão J, Correia-Guedes L, Abreu D, Ferreira JJ. Clinical trials in palliative care: a systematic review of their methodological characteristics and of the quality of their reporting. *BMC Palliat Care* 2017;16:10
119. Sheppard JP, Burt J, Lown M, et al.; OPTIMISE Investigators. Effect of antihypertensive medication reduction vs usual care on short-term blood pressure control in patients with hypertension aged 80 years and older: the OPTIMISE randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2020;323:2039-2051
120. Ford-Dunn S, Smith A, Quin J. Management of diabetes during the last days of life: attitudes of consultant diabetologists and consultant palliative care physicians in the UK. *Palliat Med* 2006;20:197-203
121. Petrillo LA, Gan S, Jing B, Lang-Brown S, Boscardin WJ, Lee SJ. Hypoglycemia in hospice patients with type 2 diabetes in a national sample of nursing homes. *JAMA Intern Med* 2018;178:713-715
122. Mallery LH, Ransom T, Steeves B, Cook B, Dunbar P, Moorhouse P. Evidence-informed guidelines for treating frail older adults with type 2 diabetes: from the Diabetes Care Program of Nova Scotia (DCPNS) and the Palliative and Therapeutic Harmonization (PATH) program. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2013;14:801-808
123. Munshi MN, Slyne C, Segal AR, Saul N, Lyons C, Weinger K. Liberating A1C goals in older adults may not protect against the risk of hypoglycemia. *J Diabetes Complications* 2017;31:1197-1199
124. Leung E, Wongrakpanich S, Munshi MN. Diabetes management in the elderly. *Diabetes Spectr* 2018;31:245-253



# 14. Children and Adolescents: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S208–S231 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S014>

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).

The management of diabetes in children and adolescents cannot simply be derived from care routinely provided to adults with diabetes. The epidemiology, pathophysiology, developmental considerations, and response to therapy in pediatric diabetes are often different from adult diabetes. There are also differences in recommended care for children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes, type 2 diabetes, and other forms of pediatric diabetes. This section is divided into two major parts: the first part addresses care for children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes, and the second part addresses care for children and adolescents with type 2 diabetes. Monogenic diabetes (neonatal diabetes and maturity-onset diabetes in the young [MODY]) and cystic fibrosis–related diabetes, which are often present in youth, are discussed in Section 2, “Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>). **Table 14.1A** and **Table 14.1B** provide an overview of the recommendations for screening and treatment of complications and related conditions in pediatric type 1 diabetes and type 2 diabetes, respectively. In addition to comprehensive diabetes care, youth with diabetes should receive age- and developmentally appropriate pediatric care, including vaccines and immunizations as recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (1). To ensure continuity of care as an adolescent with diabetes becomes an adult, guidance is provided at the end of this section on the transition from pediatric to adult diabetes care.

Due to the nature of pediatric clinical research, the recommendations for children and adolescents with diabetes are less likely to be based on clinical trial evidence. However, expert opinion and a review of available and relevant experimental data are summarized in the American Diabetes Association (ADA) position statements “Type 1 Diabetes in Children and Adolescents” (2) and “Evaluation and Management of Youth-Onset Type 2 Diabetes” (3). Finally, other sections in the Standards of Care may have recommendations that apply to youth with diabetes and are referenced in the narrative of this section.

\*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. 14. Children and adolescents: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45 (Suppl. 1):S208–S231

© 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>.

**Table 14.14—Recommendations for screening and treatment of complications and related conditions in pediatric type 1 diabetes**

Corresponding recommendations	Thyroid disease 14.29 and 14.30	Celiac disease 14.31–14.33	Hypertension 14.34–14.37	Dyslipidemia 14.38–14.42	Nephropathy 14.45 and 14.46	Retinopathy 14.47–14.49	Neuropathy 14.50
<b>Method</b>	Thyroid-stimulating hormone; consider antithyroglobulin and antithyroid peroxidase antibodies	IgA tTG if total IgA normal; IgG tTG and deamidated gliadin antibodies if IgA deficient	Blood pressure monitoring	Lipid profile, nonfasting acceptable initially	Albumin-to-creatinine ratio; random sample acceptable initially	Dilated funduscopy or retinal photography	Foot exam with foot pulses, pinprick, 10-g monofilament sensation tests, vibration, and ankle reflexes
<b>When to start</b>	Soon after diagnosis	Soon after diagnosis	At diagnosis	Soon after diagnosis; preferably after glycemia has improved and $\geq 2$ years old	Puberty or $>10$ years old, whichever is earlier, and diabetes duration of 5 years	Puberty or $\geq 11$ years old, whichever is earlier, and diabetes duration of 3–5 years	Puberty or $\geq 10$ years old, whichever is earlier, and diabetes duration of 5 years
<b>Follow-up frequency</b>	Every 1–2 years if thyroid antibodies negative; more often if symptoms develop or presence of thyroid antibodies	Within 2 years and then at 5 years after diagnosis; sooner if symptoms develop	Every visit	If LDL $\leq 100$ mg/dL, repeat at 9–11 years old; then, if $<100$ mg/dL, every 3 years	If normal, annually; if abnormal, repeat with confirmation in two of three samples over 6 months	If normal, every 2 years; consider less frequently (every 4 years) if A1C $<8\%$ and eye professional agrees	If normal, annually
<b>Target</b>	NA	NA	$<90$ th percentile for age, sex, and height; if $\geq 13$ years old, $<120/80$ mmHg	LDL $<100$ mg/dL	Albumin-to-creatinine ratio $<30$ mg/g	No retinopathy	No neuropathy
<b>Treatment</b>	Appropriate treatment of underlying thyroid disorder	After confirmation, start gluten-free diet	Lifestyle modification for elevated blood pressure (90th to $<95$ th percentile for age, sex, and height or if $\geq 13$ years old, 120–129/ $<80$ mmHg); lifestyle modification and ACE inhibitor or ARB* for hypertension ( $\geq 95$ th percentile for age, sex, and height or, if $\geq 13$ years old, $\geq 130/80$ mmHg)	If abnormal, optimize glucose control and medical nutrition therapy; if after 6 months LDL $>160$ mg/dL or $>130$ mg/dL with cardiovascular risk factor(s), initiate statin therapy (for those aged $>10$ years)*	Optimize glucose and blood pressure control; ACE inhibitor* if albumin-to-creatinine ratio is elevated in two of three samples over 6 months	Optimize glucose control; treatment per ophthalmology	Optimize glucose control; referral to neurology

ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; NA, not applicable; tTG, tissue transglutaminase. \*Due to the potential teratogenic effects, females should receive reproductive counseling and medication should be avoided in females of childbearing age who are not using reliable contraception.

**Table 14.1B—Recommendations for screening and treatment of complications and related conditions in pediatric type 2 diabetes**

	Hypertension	Nephropathy	Neuropathy	Retinopathy	Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease	Obstructive sleep apnea	Polycystic ovarian syndrome (for adolescent females)	Dyslipidemia
Corresponding recommendations	14.77–14.80	14.81–14.86	14.87 and 14.88	14.89–14.92	14.93 and 14.94	14.95	14.96–14.98	14.100–14.104
Method	Blood pressure monitoring	Albumin-to-creatinine ratio; random sample acceptable initially	Foot exam with foot pulses, pinprick, 10-g monofilament sensation tests, vibration, and ankle reflexes	Dilated funduscopy	AST and ALT measurement	Screening for symptoms	Screening for symptoms; laboratory evaluation if positive symptoms	Lipid profile
When to start	At diagnosis	At diagnosis	At diagnosis	At/soon after diagnosis	At diagnosis	At diagnosis	At diagnosis	Soon after diagnosis, preferably after glycemia has improved
Follow-up frequency	Every visit	if normal, annually; if abnormal, repeat with confirmation in two of three samples over 6 months	if normal, annually	if normal, annually	Annually	Every visit	Every visit	Annually
Target	<90th percentile for age, sex, and height; if $\geq 13$ years old, <130/80 mmHg	<30 mg/g	No neuropathy	No retinopathy	NA	NA	NA	LDL <100 mg/dL, HDL >35 mg/dL, triglycerides <150 mg/dL
Treatment	Lifestyle modification for elevated blood pressure (90th to <95th percentile for age, sex, and height or, if $\geq 13$ years old, 120–129/<80 mmHg); lifestyle modification and ACE inhibitor or ARB* for hypertension ( $\geq 95$ th percentile for age, sex, and height or, if $\geq 13$ years, $\geq 130/80$ mmHg)	Optimize glucose and blood pressure control; ACE inhibitor* if albumin-to-creatinine ratio is elevated in two of three samples over 6 months	Optimize glucose control; referral to neurology	Optimize glucose control; treatment per ophthalmology	Refer to gastroenterology for persistently elevated or worsening transaminases	if positive symptoms, refer to sleep specialist and polysomnogram	if no contraindications, oral contraceptive pills; medical nutrition therapy; metformin	if abnormal, optimize glucose control and medical nutrition therapy; if after 6 months, LDL >130 mg/dL, initiate statin therapy (for those aged >10 years)*; if triglycerides >400 mg/dL fasting or >1,000 mg/dL nonfasting, begin fibrate

ARB, angiotensin receptor blocker; NA, not applicable. \*Due to the potential teratogenic effects, females should receive reproductive counseling and medication should be avoided in females of childbearing age who are not using reliable contraception.



## TYPE 1 DIABETES

Type 1 diabetes is the most common form of diabetes in youth (4), although data suggest that it may account for a large proportion of cases diagnosed in adult life (5). The provider must consider the unique aspects of care and management of children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes, such as changes in insulin sensitivity related to physical growth and sexual maturation, ability to provide self-care, supervision in the childcare and school environment, neurological vulnerability to hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia in young children, and possible adverse neurocognitive effects of diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) (6,7). Attention to family dynamics, developmental stages, and physiologic differences related to sexual maturity is essential in developing and implementing an optimal diabetes treatment plan (8).

A multidisciplinary team trained in pediatric diabetes management and sensitive to the challenges of children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes and their families should provide diabetes-specific care for this population. It is essential that diabetes self-management education and support, medical nutrition therapy, and psychosocial support be provided at diagnosis and regularly thereafter in a developmentally appropriate format that builds on prior knowledge by a team of health care professionals experienced with the biological, educational, nutritional, behavioral, and emotional needs of the growing child and family. The diabetes team, taking into consideration the youth's developmental and psychosocial needs, should ask about and advise the youth and parents/caregivers about diabetes management responsibilities on an ongoing basis.

### Diabetes Self-Management Education and Support

#### Recommendation

**14.1** Youth with type 1 diabetes and their parents/caregivers (for patients aged <18 years) should receive culturally sensitive and developmentally appropriate individualized diabetes self-management education and support according to national standards at diagnosis and routinely thereafter. **B**

Self-management in pediatric diabetes involves both the youth and their parents/adult caregivers. No matter how sound the medical regimen is, it can only be effective if the family and/or affected individuals are able to implement it. Family involvement is a vital component of optimal diabetes management throughout childhood and adolescence. As parents/caregivers are critical to diabetes self-management in youth, diabetes care requires an approach that places the youth and their parents/caregivers at the center of the care model. The pediatric diabetes care team must be capable of evaluating the educational, behavioral, emotional, and psychosocial factors that impact the implementation of a treatment plan and must work with the youth and family to overcome barriers or redefine goals as appropriate. Diabetes self-management education and support requires periodic reassessment, especially as the youth grows, develops, and acquires the need and desire for greater independent self-care skills. The pediatric diabetes team should work with the youth and their parents/caregivers to ensure there is not a premature transfer of responsibilities for self-management to the youth during this time. In addition, it is necessary to assess the educational needs and skills of, and provide training to, day care workers, school nurses, and school personnel who are responsible for the care and supervision of the child with diabetes (9–11).

### Nutrition Therapy

#### Recommendations

- 14.2** Individualized medical nutrition therapy is recommended for children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes as an essential component of the overall treatment plan. **A**
- 14.3** Monitoring carbohydrate intake, whether by carbohydrate counting or experience-based estimation, is a key component to optimizing glycemic management. **B**
- 14.4** Comprehensive nutrition education at diagnosis, with annual updates, by an experienced registered dietitian nutritionist, is recommended to assess

caloric and nutrition intake in relation to weight status and cardiovascular disease risk factors and to inform macronutrient choices. **E**

Dietary management should be individualized: family habits, food preferences, religious or cultural needs, finances, schedules, physical activity, and the patient's and family's abilities in numeracy, literacy, and self-management should be considered. Visits with a registered dietitian nutritionist should include assessment for changes in food preferences over time, access to food, growth and development, weight status, cardiovascular risk, and potential for disordered eating. Dietary adherence is associated with better glycemic control in youth with type 1 diabetes (12).

### Physical Activity and Exercise

#### Recommendations

- 14.5** Physical activity is recommended for all youth with type 1 diabetes with the goal of 60 min of moderate- to vigorous-intensity aerobic activity daily, with vigorous muscle-strengthening and bone-strengthening activities at least 3 days per week. **C**
- 14.6** Frequent glucose monitoring before, during, and after exercise, via blood glucose meter or continuous glucose monitoring, is important to prevent, detect, and treat hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia associated with exercise. **C**
- 14.7** Youth and their parents/caregivers should receive education on targets and management of glycemia before, during, and after physical activity, individualized according to the type and intensity of the planned physical activity. **E**
- 14.8** Youth and their parents/caregivers should be educated on strategies to prevent hypoglycemia during, after, and overnight following physical activity and exercise, which may include reducing prandial insulin dosing for the meal/snack preceding (and, if needed, following) exercise, reducing

basal insulin doses, increasing carbohydrate intake, eating bedtime snacks, and/or using continuous glucose monitoring. Treatment for hypoglycemia should be accessible before, during, and after engaging in activity. **C**

Physical activity and exercise positively impact metabolic and psychological health in children with type 1 diabetes (13). While it affects insulin sensitivity, physical fitness, strength building, weight management, social interaction, mood, self-esteem building, and the creation of healthful habits for adulthood, it also has the potential to cause both hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia.

See below for strategies to mitigate hypoglycemia risk and minimize hyperglycemia associated with exercise. For an in-depth discussion, see recently published reviews and guidelines (14–16).

Overall, it is recommended that youth participate in 60 min of moderate- (e.g., brisk walking, dancing) to vigorous- (e.g., running, jumping rope) intensity aerobic activity daily, including resistance and flexibility training (17). Although uncommon in the pediatric population, patients should be medically evaluated for comorbid conditions or diabetes complications that may restrict participation in an exercise program. As hyperglycemia can occur before, during, and after physical activity, it is important to ensure that the elevated glucose level is not related to insulin deficiency that would lead to worsening hyperglycemia with exercise and ketosis risk. Intense activity should be postponed with marked hyperglycemia (glucose  $\geq 350$  mg/dL [19.4 mmol/L]), moderate to large urine ketones, and/or  $\beta$ -hydroxybutyrate (B-OHB)  $> 1.5$  mmol/L. Caution may be needed when B-OHB levels are  $\geq 0.6$  mmol/L (12,14).

The prevention and treatment of hypoglycemia associated with physical activity include decreasing the prandial insulin for the meal/snack before exercise and/or increasing food intake. Patients on insulin pumps can lower basal rates by  $\sim 10$ –50% or more or suspend for 1–2 h during exercise (18). Decreasing basal rates or long-acting insulin doses by  $\sim 20\%$  after exercise

may reduce delayed exercise-induced hypoglycemia (19). Accessible rapid-acting carbohydrates and frequent blood glucose monitoring before, during, and after exercise, with or without continuous glucose monitoring (CGM), maximize safety with exercise.

Blood glucose targets prior to physical activity and exercise should be 126–180 mg/dL (7.0–10.0 mmol/L) but should be individualized based on the type, intensity, and duration of activity (14,20). Consider additional carbohydrate intake during and/or after exercise, depending on the duration and intensity of physical activity, to prevent hypoglycemia. For low- to moderate-intensity aerobic activities (30–60 min), and if the youth is fasting, 10–15 g of carbohydrate may prevent hypoglycemia (21). After insulin boluses (relative hyperinsulinemia), consider 0.5–1.0 g of carbohydrates/kg per hour of exercise ( $\sim 30$ –60 g), which is similar to carbohydrate requirements to optimize performance in athletes without type 1 diabetes (22–24).

In addition, obesity is as common in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes as in those without diabetes. It is associated with a higher frequency of cardiovascular risk factors, and it disproportionately affects racial/ethnic minorities in the U.S. (25–29). Therefore, diabetes care providers should monitor weight status and encourage a healthy diet, exercise, and healthy weight as key components of pediatric type 1 diabetes care.

#### School and Child Care

As a large portion of a child's day is spent in school and/or day care, training of school or day care personnel to provide care in accordance with the child's individualized diabetes medical management plan is essential for optimal diabetes management and safe access to all school or day care–sponsored opportunities (10,11,30). In addition, federal and state laws require schools, day care facilities, and other entities to provide needed diabetes care to enable the child to safely access the school or day care environment. Refer to the ADA position statements “Diabetes Care in the School Setting” (10) and “Care of Young Children With Diabetes in the Child Care Setting” (11) and ADA's Safe at School website ([www.diabetes.org/resources/](http://www.diabetes.org/resources/)

know-your-rights/safe-at-school-state-laws) for additional details.

#### Psychosocial Issues

##### Recommendations

- 14.9** At diagnosis and during routine follow-up care, assess psychosocial issues and family stresses that could impact diabetes management and provide appropriate referrals to trained mental health professionals, preferably experienced in childhood diabetes. **E**
- 14.10** Mental health professionals should be considered integral members of the pediatric diabetes multidisciplinary team. **E**
- 14.11** Encourage developmentally appropriate family involvement in diabetes management tasks for children and adolescents, recognizing that premature transfer of diabetes care responsibility to the youth can result in diabetes burnout, suboptimal diabetes management, and deterioration in glycemic control. **A**
- 14.12** Providers should assess food security, housing stability/homelessness, health literacy, financial barriers, and social/community support and apply that information to treatment decisions. **E**
- 14.13** Providers should consider asking youth and their parents/caregivers about social adjustment (peer relationships) and school performance to determine whether further intervention is needed. **B**
- 14.14** Assess youth with diabetes for psychosocial and diabetes-related distress, generally starting at 7–8 years of age. **B**
- 14.15** Offer adolescents time by themselves with their care provider(s) starting at age 12 years, or when developmentally appropriate. **E**
- 14.16** Starting at puberty, preconception counseling should be incorporated into routine diabetes care for all girls of childbearing potential. **A**

**14.17** Begin screening youth with type 1 diabetes for disordered eating between 10 and 12 years of age. The Diabetes Eating Problems Survey-Revised (DEPS-R) is a reliable, valid, and brief screening tool for identifying disturbed eating behavior. **B**

Rapid and dynamic cognitive, developmental, and emotional changes occur during childhood, adolescence, and emerging adulthood. Diabetes management during childhood and adolescence places substantial burdens on the youth and family, necessitating ongoing assessment of psychosocial status, social determinants of health, and diabetes distress in the patient and the parents/caregivers during routine diabetes visits (31–39). It is important to consider the impact of diabetes on quality of life as well as the development of mental health problems related to diabetes distress, fear of hypoglycemia (and hyperglycemia), symptoms of anxiety, disordered eating behaviors and eating disorders, and symptoms of depression (40). Consider assessing youth for diabetes distress, generally starting at 7 or 8 years of age (41). Consider screening for depression and disordered eating behaviors using available screening tools (31,42). Early detection of depression, anxiety, disordered eating, and learning disabilities can facilitate effective treatment options and help minimize adverse effects on diabetes management and disease outcomes (36,41). There are validated tools, such as Problem Areas in Diabetes-Teen (PAID-T) and the parent version (P-PAID-T) (37), that can be used in assessing diabetes-specific distress in youth starting at age 12 years and in their parents/caregivers. Furthermore, the complexities of diabetes management require ongoing parental involvement in care throughout childhood with developmentally appropriate family teamwork between the growing child/teen and parent in order to maintain adherence and to prevent deterioration in glycemic control (43,44). As diabetes-specific family conflict is related to poorer adherence and glycemic control, it is appropriate to inquire about such conflict

during visits and to either help to negotiate a plan for resolution or refer to an appropriate mental health specialist (45). Monitoring of social adjustment (peer relationships) and school performance can facilitate both well-being and academic achievement (46). Suboptimal glycemic control is a risk factor for underperformance at school and increased absenteeism (47).

Shared decision-making with youth regarding the adoption of regimen components and self-management behaviors can improve diabetes self-efficacy, adherence, and metabolic outcomes (26,48). Although cognitive abilities vary, the ethical position often adopted is the “mature minor rule,” whereby children after age 12 or 13 years who appear to be “mature” have the right to consent or withhold consent to general medical treatment, except in cases in which refusal would significantly endanger health (49).

Beginning at the onset of puberty or at diagnosis of diabetes, all adolescent females with childbearing potential should receive education about the risks of malformations associated with poor metabolic control and the use of effective contraception to prevent unplanned pregnancy. Preconception counseling using developmentally appropriate educational tools enables adolescent girls to make well-informed decisions (50). Preconception counseling resources tailored for adolescents are available at no cost through the ADA (51). Refer to the ADA position statement “Psychosocial Care for People With Diabetes” for further details (41).

Youth with type 1 diabetes have an increased risk of disordered eating behavior as well as clinical eating disorders with serious short-term and long-term negative effects on diabetes outcomes and health in general. It is important to recognize the unique and dangerous disordered eating behavior of insulin omission for weight control in type 1 diabetes (52) using tools such as the Diabetes Eating Problems Survey-Revised (DEPS-R) to allow for early diagnosis and intervention (42,53–55).

The presence of a mental health professional on pediatric multidisciplinary teams highlights the importance of attending to the psychosocial issues of diabetes. These psychosocial factors are significantly related to self-management difficulties, suboptimal glycemic control, reduced quality of life, and

higher rates of acute and chronic diabetes complications.

### Glycemic Monitoring, Insulin Delivery, and Targets

#### Recommendations

- 14.18** All children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes should monitor glucose levels multiple times daily (up to 6–10 times/day by blood glucose meter or continuous glucose monitoring), including prior to meals and snacks, at bedtime, and as needed for safety in specific situations such as exercise, driving, or the presence of symptoms of hypoglycemia. **B**
- 14.19** Real-time continuous glucose monitoring **B** or intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring **E** should be offered for diabetes management in youth with diabetes on multiple daily injections or insulin pump therapy who are capable of using the device safely (either by themselves or with caregivers). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs.
- 14.20** Automated insulin delivery systems should be offered for diabetes management to youth with type 1 diabetes who are capable of using the device safely (either by themselves or with caregivers). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs. **A**
- 14.21** Insulin pump therapy alone should be offered for diabetes management to youth on multiple daily injections with type 1 diabetes who are capable of using the device safely (either by themselves or with caregivers). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs. **A**
- 14.22** Students must be supported at school in the use of diabetes technology, including continuous glucose monitors, insulin pumps, connected



insulin pens, and automated insulin delivery systems as prescribed by their diabetes care team. **E**

- 14.23** A1C goals must be individualized and reassessed over time. An A1C of <7% (53 mmol/mol) is appropriate for many children. **B**
- 14.24** Less stringent A1C goals (such as <7.5% [58 mmol/mol]) may be appropriate for patients who cannot articulate symptoms of hypoglycemia; have hypoglycemia unawareness; lack access to analog insulins, advanced insulin delivery technology, and/or continuous glucose monitoring; cannot check blood glucose regularly; or have nonglycemic factors that increase A1C (e.g., high glycoators). **B**
- 14.25** Even less stringent A1C goals (such as <8% [64 mmol/mol]) may be appropriate for patients with a history of severe hypoglycemia, limited life expectancy, or where the harms of treatment are greater than the benefits. **B**
- 14.26** Providers may reasonably suggest more stringent A1C goals (such as <6.5% [48 mmol/mol]) for selected individual patients if they can be achieved without significant hypoglycemia, negative impacts on well-being, or undue burden of care, or in those who have nonglycemic factors that decrease A1C (e.g., lower erythrocyte life span). Lower targets may also be appropriate during the honeymoon phase. **B**
- 14.27** Continuous glucose monitoring metrics derived from continuous glucose monitor use over the most recent 14 days (or longer for patients with more glycemic variability), including time in range (70–180 mg/dL), time below target (<70 and <54 mg/dL), and time above target (>180 mg/dL), are recommended to be used in conjunction with A1C whenever possible. **E**

Current standards for diabetes management reflect the need to minimize hyperglycemia as safely as possible. The Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT), which did not enroll children <13 years of age, demonstrated that near normalization of blood glucose levels was more difficult to achieve in adolescents than in adults. Nevertheless, the increased use of basal-bolus regimens, insulin pumps, frequent blood glucose monitoring, automated insulin delivery systems, goal setting, and improved patient education has been associated with more children and adolescents reaching the blood glucose targets recommended by the ADA (56–59), particularly in patients of families in which both the parents/caregivers and the child with diabetes participate jointly to perform the required diabetes-related tasks.

Lower A1C in adolescence and young adulthood is associated with a lower risk and rate of microvascular and macrovascular complications (60–64) and demonstrates the effects of metabolic memory (65–68).

In addition, type 1 diabetes can be associated with adverse effects on cognition during childhood and adolescence (6,69–71), and neurocognitive imaging differences related to hyperglycemia in children provide another motivation for achieving glycemic targets (6). DKA has been shown to cause adverse effects on brain development and function. Additional factors (72–75) that contribute to adverse effects on brain development and function include young age, severe hypoglycemia at <6 years of age, and chronic hyperglycemia (76,77). However, meticulous use of new therapeutic modalities such as rapid- and long-acting insulin analogs, technological advances (e.g., CGM, sensor-augmented pump therapy, and automated insulin delivery systems), and intensive self-management education now make it more feasible to achieve glycemic control while reducing the incidence of severe hypoglycemia (78–90).

In selecting individualized glycemic targets, the long-term health benefits of achieving a lower A1C should be balanced against the risks of hypoglycemia and the developmental burdens of intensive regimens in youth (91). Recent data with newer devices and insulins indicate

that the risk of hypoglycemia with lower A1C is less than it was before (79,92–100). Some data suggest that there could be a threshold where lower A1C is associated with more hypoglycemia (101,102); however, the confidence intervals were large, suggesting great variability. In addition, achieving lower A1C levels is likely facilitated by setting lower A1C targets (103,104). Lower goals may be possible during the “honeymoon” phase of type 1 diabetes. Special consideration should be given to the risk of hypoglycemia in young children (aged <6 years) who are often unable to recognize, articulate, and/or manage hypoglycemia. However, registry data indicate that A1C targets can be achieved in children, including those aged <6 years, without increased risk of severe hypoglycemia (92,103). Recent data have demonstrated that the use of real-time CGM lowered A1C and increased time in range in adolescents and young adults and, in children aged <8 years old, was associated with a lower risk of hypoglycemia (105,106). Please refer to Section 6, “Glycemic Targets” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>), for more information on glycemic assessment.

A strong relationship exists between the frequency of blood glucose monitoring and glycemic control (80–87, 107,108). Glucose levels for all children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes should be monitored multiple times daily by blood glucose monitoring or CGM. In the U.S., real-time CGM is approved for nonadjunctive use in children aged 2 years and older, and intermittently scanned CGM is approved for nonadjunctive use in children aged 4 years and older. Metrics derived from CGM include percent time in target range, below target range, and above target range (109). While studies indicate a relationship between time in range and A1C (110, 111), it is still uncertain what the ideal target time in range should be for children, and further studies are needed. Please refer to Section 7, “Diabetes Technology” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S007>), for more information on the use of blood glucose meters, CGM, and insulin pumps. More information on insulin injection technique can be found in Section 9, “Pharmacologic Approaches to Glycemic Treatment” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S009>).



### Key Concepts in Setting Glycemic Targets

- Targets should be individualized, and lower targets may be reasonable based on a benefit-risk assessment.
- Blood glucose targets should be modified in children with frequent hypoglycemia or hypoglycemia unawareness.
- Postprandial blood glucose values should be measured when there is a discrepancy between preprandial blood glucose values and A1C levels and to assess preprandial insulin doses in those on basal-bolus or pump regimens.

### Autoimmune Conditions

#### Recommendation

**14.28** Assess for additional autoimmune conditions soon after the diagnosis of type 1 diabetes and if symptoms develop. **B**

Because of the increased frequency of other autoimmune diseases in type 1 diabetes, screening for thyroid dysfunction and celiac disease should be considered (112–116). Periodic screening in asymptomatic individuals has been recommended, but the optimal frequency of screening is unclear.

Although much less common than thyroid dysfunction and celiac disease, other autoimmune conditions, such as Addison disease (primary adrenal insufficiency), autoimmune hepatitis, autoimmune gastritis, dermatomyositis, and myasthenia gravis, occur more commonly in the population with type 1 diabetes than in the general pediatric population and should be assessed and monitored as clinically indicated. In addition, relatives of patients should be offered testing for islet autoantibodies through research studies (e.g., TrialNet) and national programs for early diagnosis of preclinical type 1 diabetes (stages 1 and 2).

### Thyroid Disease

#### Recommendations

- 14.29** Consider testing children with type 1 diabetes for antithyroid peroxidase and antithyroglobulin antibodies soon after diagnosis. **B**
- 14.30** Measure thyroid-stimulating hormone concentrations at diagnosis when clinically

stable or soon after optimizing glycemia. If normal, suggest rechecking every 1–2 years or sooner if the youth has positive thyroid antibodies or develops symptoms or signs suggestive of thyroid dysfunction, thyromegaly, an abnormal growth rate, or unexplained glycemic variability. **B**

Autoimmune thyroid disease is the most common autoimmune disorder associated with diabetes, occurring in 17–30% of individuals with type 1 diabetes (113,117,118). At the time of diagnosis, ~25% of children with type 1 diabetes have thyroid autoantibodies (119), the presence of which is predictive of thyroid dysfunction—most commonly hypothyroidism, although hyperthyroidism occurs in ~0.5% of patients with type 1 diabetes (120,121). For thyroid autoantibodies, a study from Sweden indicated that antithyroid peroxidase antibodies were more predictive than antithyroglobulin antibodies in multivariate analysis (122). Thyroid function tests may be misleading (euthyroid sick syndrome) if performed at the time of diagnosis owing to the effect of previous hyperglycemia, ketosis or ketoacidosis, weight loss, etc. Therefore, if performed at diagnosis and slightly abnormal, thyroid function tests should be repeated soon after a period of metabolic stability and achievement of glycemic targets. Subclinical hypothyroidism may be associated with an increased risk of symptomatic hypoglycemia (123) and a reduced linear growth rate. Hyperthyroidism alters glucose metabolism and usually causes deterioration of glycemic control.

### Celiac Disease

#### Recommendations

- 14.31** Screen youth with type 1 diabetes for celiac disease by measuring IgA tissue transglutaminase (tTG) antibodies, with documentation of normal total serum IgA levels, soon after the diagnosis of diabetes, or IgG tTG and deamidated gliadin antibodies if IgA is deficient. **B**
- 14.32** Repeat screening within 2 years of diabetes diagnosis and then again after 5 years

and consider more frequent screening in youth who have symptoms or a first-degree relative with celiac disease. **B**

**14.33** Individuals with confirmed celiac disease should be placed on a gluten-free diet for treatment and to avoid complications; they should also have a consultation with a dietitian experienced in managing both diabetes and celiac disease. **B**

Celiac disease is an immune-mediated disorder that occurs with increased frequency in patients with type 1 diabetes (1.6–16.4% of individuals compared with 0.3–1% in the general population) (112,115,116,124–128). Screening patients with type 1 diabetes for celiac disease is further justified by its association with osteoporosis, iron deficiency, growth failure, and potential increased risk of retinopathy and albuminuria (129–132).

Screening for celiac disease includes measuring serum levels of IgA and tissue transglutaminase (tTG) IgA antibodies, or, with IgA deficiency, screening can include measuring tTG IgG antibodies or deamidated gliadin peptide IgG antibodies. Because most cases of celiac disease are diagnosed within the first 5 years after the diagnosis of type 1 diabetes, screening should be considered at the time of diagnosis and repeated at 2 and then 5 years (126) or if clinical symptoms indicate, such as poor growth or increased hypoglycemia (127,129).

Although celiac disease can be diagnosed more than 10 years after diabetes diagnosis, there are insufficient data after 5 years to determine the optimal screening frequency. Measurement of tTG antibody should be considered at other times in patients with symptoms suggestive of celiac disease (126). Monitoring for symptoms should include an assessment of linear growth and weight gain (127,129). A small bowel biopsy in antibody-positive children is recommended to confirm the diagnosis (133). European guidelines on screening for celiac disease in children (not specific to children with type 1 diabetes) suggest that biopsy may not be necessary in symptomatic children with high antibody titers (i.e., greater than 10 times the

upper limit of normal) provided that further testing is performed (verification of endomysial antibody positivity on a separate blood sample). Whether this approach may be appropriate for asymptomatic children in high-risk groups remains an open question, though evidence is emerging (134). It is also advisable to check for celiac disease-associated HLA types in patients who are diagnosed without a small intestinal biopsy. In symptomatic children with type 1 diabetes and confirmed celiac disease, gluten-free diets reduce symptoms and rates of hypoglycemia (135). The challenging dietary restrictions associated with having both type 1 diabetes and celiac disease place a significant burden on individuals. Therefore, a biopsy to confirm the diagnosis of celiac disease is recommended, especially in asymptomatic children, before establishing a diagnosis of celiac disease (136) and endorsing significant dietary changes. A gluten-free diet was beneficial in asymptomatic adults with positive antibodies confirmed by biopsy (137).

## Management of Cardiovascular Risk Factors

### Hypertension Screening

#### Recommendation

**14.34** Blood pressure should be measured at every routine visit. In youth with high blood pressure (blood pressure  $\geq$ 90th percentile for age, sex, and height or, in adolescents aged  $\geq$ 13 years, blood pressure  $\geq$ 120/80 mmHg) on three separate measurements, ambulatory blood pressure monitoring should be strongly considered. **B**

### Hypertension Treatment

#### Recommendations

**14.35** Treatment of elevated blood pressure (defined as 90th to  $<$ 95th percentile for age, sex, and height or, in adolescents aged  $\geq$ 13 years, 120–129/ $<$ 80 mmHg) is lifestyle modification focused on healthy nutrition, physical activity, sleep, and, if

appropriate, weight management. **C**

**14.36** In addition to lifestyle modification, ACE inhibitors or angiotensin receptor blockers should be started for treatment of confirmed hypertension (defined as blood pressure consistently  $\geq$ 95th percentile for age, sex, and height or, in adolescents aged  $\geq$ 13 years,  $\geq$ 130/80 mmHg). Due to the potential teratogenic effects, females should receive reproductive counseling and ACE inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers should be avoided in females of childbearing age who are not using reliable contraception. **B**

**14.37** The goal of treatment is blood pressure  $<$ 90th percentile for age, sex, and height or, in adolescents aged  $\geq$ 13 years,  $<$ 130/80 mmHg. **C**

Blood pressure measurements should be performed using the appropriate size cuff with the youth seated and relaxed. Elevated blood pressure should be confirmed on at least three separate days, and ambulatory blood pressure monitoring should be considered. Evaluation should proceed as clinically indicated (138,139). Treatment is generally initiated with an ACE inhibitor, but an angiotensin receptor blocker can be used if the ACE inhibitor is not tolerated (e.g., due to cough) (140).

### Dyslipidemia Screening

#### Recommendations

**14.38** Initial lipid profile should be performed soon after diagnosis, preferably after glycemia has improved and age is  $\geq$ 2 years. If initial LDL cholesterol is  $\leq$ 100 mg/dL (2.6 mmol/L), subsequent testing should be performed at 9–11 years of age. **B** Initial testing may be done with a nonfasting non-HDL cholesterol level with confirmatory testing with a fasting lipid panel.

**14.39** If LDL cholesterol values are within the accepted risk level ( $<$ 100 mg/dL [2.6 mmol/L]), a lipid profile repeated every 3 years is reasonable. **E**

### Dyslipidemia Treatment

#### Recommendations

**14.40** If lipids are abnormal, initial therapy should consist of optimizing glycemia and medical nutrition therapy to limit the amount of calories from fat to 25–30% and saturated fat to  $<$ 7%, limit cholesterol to  $<$ 200 mg/day, avoid *trans* fats, and aim for  $\sim$ 10% calories from monounsaturated fats. **A**

**14.41** After the age of 10 years, addition of a statin may be considered in patients who, despite medical nutrition therapy and lifestyle changes, continue to have LDL cholesterol  $>$ 160 mg/dL (4.1 mmol/L) or LDL cholesterol  $>$ 130 mg/dL (3.4 mmol/L) and one or more cardiovascular disease risk factors. **E** Due to the potential teratogenic effects, females should receive reproductive counseling and statins should be avoided in females of childbearing age who are not using reliable contraception. **B**

**14.42** The goal of therapy is an LDL cholesterol value  $<$ 100 mg/dL (2.6 mmol/L). **E**

Population-based studies estimate that 14–45% of children with type 1 diabetes have two or more atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD) risk factors (141–143), and the prevalence of cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk factors increase with age (143) and among racial/ethnic minorities (25), with girls having a higher risk burden than boys (142).

**Pathophysiology.** The atherosclerotic process begins in childhood, and although ASCVD events are not expected to occur during childhood, observations using a variety of methodologies show that youth with type 1 diabetes may have subclinical CVD within the first decade of diagnosis (144–146). Studies of carotid intima-media thick-

ness have yielded inconsistent results (139,140).

**Screening.** Diabetes predisposes to the development of accelerated arteriosclerosis. Lipid evaluation for these patients contributes to risk assessment and identifies an important proportion of those with dyslipidemia. Therefore, initial screening should be done soon after diagnosis. If the initial screen is normal, subsequent screening may be done at 9–11 years of age, which is a stable time for lipid assessment in children (147). Children with a primary lipid disorder (e.g., familial hyperlipidemia) should be referred to a lipid specialist. Non-HDL cholesterol level has been identified as a significant predictor of the presence of atherosclerosis—as powerful as any other lipoprotein cholesterol measure in children and adolescents. For both children and adults, non-HDL cholesterol level seems to be more predictive of persistent dyslipidemia and, therefore, atherosclerosis and future events than total cholesterol, LDL cholesterol, or HDL cholesterol levels alone. A major advantage of non-HDL cholesterol is that it can be accurately calculated in a nonfasting state and is therefore practical to obtain in clinical practice as a screening test (148). Youth with type 1 diabetes have a high prevalence of lipid abnormalities (141,149).

Even if normal, screening should be repeated within 3 years, as glycemic control and other cardiovascular risk factors can change dramatically during adolescence (150).

**Treatment.** Pediatric lipid guidelines provide some guidance relevant to children with type 1 diabetes and secondary dyslipidemia (139,147,151,152); however, there are few studies on modifying lipid levels in children with type 1 diabetes. A 6-month trial of dietary counseling produced a significant improvement in lipid levels (153); likewise, a lifestyle intervention trial with 6 months of exercise in adolescents demonstrated improvement in lipid levels (154). Data from the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth (SEARCH) study show that improved glucose over a 2-year period is associated with a more favorable lipid profile; however, improved glycemia alone will

not normalize lipids in youth with type 1 diabetes and dyslipidemia (150).

Although intervention data are sparse, the American Heart Association categorizes children with type 1 diabetes in the highest tier for cardiovascular risk and recommends both lifestyle and pharmacologic treatment for those with elevated LDL cholesterol levels (152,155). Initial therapy should include a nutrition plan that restricts saturated fat to 7% of total calories and dietary cholesterol to 200 mg/day. Data from randomized clinical trials in children as young as 7 months of age indicate that this diet is safe and does not interfere with normal growth and development (156).

Neither long-term safety nor cardiovascular outcome efficacy of statin therapy has been established for children; however, studies have shown short-term safety equivalent to that seen in adults and efficacy in lowering LDL cholesterol levels in familial hypercholesterolemia or severe hyperlipidemia, improving endothelial function and causing regression of carotid intimal thickening (157,158). Statins are not approved for patients aged <10 years, and statin treatment should generally not be used in children with type 1 diabetes before this age. Statins are contraindicated in pregnancy; therefore, the prevention of unplanned pregnancies is of paramount importance. Statins should be avoided in females of childbearing age who are not using reliable contraception (see Section 15, “Management of Diabetes in Pregnancy,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S015>, for more information). The multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled Adolescent Type 1 Diabetes Cardio-Renal Intervention Trial (AdDIT) provides safety data on pharmacologic treatment with an ACE inhibitor and statin in adolescents with type 1 diabetes (139).

#### Smoking

##### Recommendations

- 14.43** Elicit a smoking history at initial and follow-up diabetes visits; discourage smoking in youth who do not smoke and encourage smoking cessation in those who do smoke. **A**
- 14.44** Electronic cigarette use should be discouraged. **A**

The adverse health effects of smoking are well recognized with respect to future cancer and CVD risk. Despite this, smoking rates are significantly higher among youth with diabetes than among youth without diabetes (159,160). In youth with diabetes, it is important to avoid additional CVD risk factors. Smoking increases the risk of the onset of albuminuria; therefore, smoking avoidance is important to prevent both microvascular and macrovascular complications (147,161). Discouraging cigarette smoking, including electronic cigarettes (162,163), is an important part of routine diabetes care. In light of recent CDC evidence of deaths related to electronic cigarette use (164,165), no individuals should be advised to use electronic cigarettes, either as a way to stop smoking tobacco or as a recreational drug. In younger children, it is important to assess exposure to cigarette smoke in the home because of the adverse effects of secondhand smoke and to discourage youth from ever smoking.

#### Microvascular Complications

##### Nephropathy Screening

###### Recommendation

- 14.45** Annual screening for albuminuria with a random (morning sample preferred to avoid effects of exercise) spot urine sample for albumin-to-creatinine ratio should be considered at puberty or at age >10 years, whichever is earlier, once the child has had diabetes for 5 years. **B**

##### Nephropathy Treatment

###### Recommendation

- 14.46** An ACE inhibitor or an angiotensin receptor blocker, titrated to normalization of albumin excretion, may be considered when elevated urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio (>30 mg/g) is documented (two of three urine samples obtained over a 6-month interval following efforts to improve glycemic control and normalize blood pressure). **E** Due to the potential teratogenic effects, females should receive reproductive counseling and ACE inhibitors



and angiotensin receptor blockers should be avoided in females of childbearing age who are not using reliable contraception. **B**

Data from 7,549 participants <20 years of age in the T1D Exchange clinic registry emphasize the importance of good glycaemic and blood pressure control, particularly as diabetes duration increases, in order to reduce the risk of diabetic kidney disease. The data also underscore the importance of routine screening to ensure early diagnosis and timely treatment of albuminuria (166). An estimation of glomerular filtration rate (GFR), calculated using GFR estimating equations from the serum creatinine, height, age, and sex (167), should be considered at baseline and repeated as indicated based on clinical status, age, diabetes duration, and therapies. Improved methods are needed to screen for early GFR loss, since estimated GFR is inaccurate at  $\text{GFR} > 60 \text{ mL/min/1.73 m}^2$  (167,168). The AddIT study in adolescents with type 1 diabetes demonstrated the safety of ACE inhibitor treatment, but the treatment did not change the albumin-to-creatinine ratio over the course of the study (139).

### Retinopathy

#### Recommendations

- 14.47** An initial dilated and comprehensive eye examination is recommended once youth have had type 1 diabetes for 3–5 years, provided they are aged  $\geq 11$  years or puberty has started, whichever is earlier. **B**
- 14.48** After the initial examination, repeat dilated and comprehensive eye examination every 2 years. Less frequent examinations, every 4 years, may be acceptable on the advice of an eye care professional and based on risk factor assessment, including a history of  $\text{A1C} < 8\%$ . **B**
- 14.49** Programs that use retinal photography (with remote reading or use of a validated assessment tool) to improve access to diabetic retinopathy screening can be appropriate

screening strategies for diabetic retinopathy. Such programs need to provide pathways for timely referral for a comprehensive eye examination when indicated. **E**

Retinopathy (like albuminuria) most commonly occurs after the onset of puberty and after 5–10 years of diabetes duration (169). It is currently recognized that there is a low risk of development of vision-threatening retinal lesions prior to 12 years of age (170,171). A 2019 publication based on the follow-up of the DCCT adolescent cohort supports a lower frequency of eye examinations than previously recommended, particularly in adolescents with  $\text{A1C}$  closer to the target range (172,173). Referrals should be made to eye care professionals with expertise in diabetic retinopathy and experience in counseling pediatric patients and families on the importance of prevention, early detection, and intervention.

### Neuropathy

#### Recommendation

- 14.50** Consider an annual comprehensive foot exam at the start of puberty or at age  $\geq 10$  years, whichever is earlier, once the youth has had type 1 diabetes for 5 years. **B**

Diabetic neuropathy rarely occurs in prepubertal children or after only 1–2 years of diabetes (169), although data suggest a prevalence of distal peripheral neuropathy of 7% in 1,734 youth with type 1 diabetes and association with the presence of CVD risk factors (174,175). A comprehensive foot exam, including inspection, palpation of dorsalis pedis and posterior tibial pulses, and determination of proprioception, vibration, and monofilament sensation, should be performed annually along with an assessment of symptoms of neuropathic pain (175). Foot inspection can be performed at each visit to educate youth regarding the importance of foot care (see Section 12, “Retinopathy, Neuropathy, and Foot Care,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S012>).

### TYPE 2 DIABETES

For information on risk-based screening for type 2 diabetes and prediabetes in children and adolescents, please refer to Section 2, “Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>). For additional support for these recommendations, see the ADA position statement “Evaluation and Management of Youth-Onset Type 2 Diabetes” (3).

Type 2 diabetes in youth has increased over the past 20 years, and recent estimates suggest an incidence of  $\sim 5,000$  new cases per year in the U.S. (176). The CDC published projections for type 2 diabetes prevalence using the SEARCH database; assuming a 2.3% annual increase, the prevalence in those under 20 years of age will quadruple in 40 years (177,178).

Evidence suggests that type 2 diabetes in youth is different not only from type 1 diabetes but also from type 2 diabetes in adults and has unique features, such as a more rapidly progressive decline in  $\beta$ -cell function and accelerated development of diabetes complications (3,179). Long-term follow-up data from the Treatment Options for Type 2 Diabetes in Adolescents and Youth (TODAY) study showed that a majority of individuals with type 2 diabetes diagnosed as youth had microvascular complications by young adulthood (180). Type 2 diabetes disproportionately impacts youth of ethnic and racial minorities and can occur in complex psychosocial and cultural environments, which may make it difficult to sustain healthy lifestyle changes and self-management behaviors (26,181–184). Additional risk factors associated with type 2 diabetes in youth include adiposity, family history of diabetes, female sex, and low socioeconomic status (179).

As with type 1 diabetes, youth with type 2 diabetes spend much of the day in school. Therefore, close communication with and the cooperation of school personnel are essential for optimal diabetes management, safety, and maximal academic opportunities.

### Screening and Diagnosis

#### Recommendations

- 14.51** Risk-based screening for prediabetes and/or type 2 diabetes should be considered after the onset of puberty or  $\geq 10$  years



of age, whichever occurs earlier, in youth with overweight (BMI  $\geq$ 85th percentile) or obesity (BMI  $\geq$ 95th percentile) and who have one or more additional risk factors for diabetes (see **Table 2.4** for evidence grading of other risk factors).

- 14.52** If screening is normal, repeat screening at a minimum of 3-year intervals **E**, or more frequently if BMI is increasing. **C**
- 14.53** Fasting plasma glucose, 2-h plasma glucose during a 75-g oral glucose tolerance test, and A1C can be used to test for prediabetes or diabetes in children and adolescents. **B**
- 14.54** Children and adolescents with overweight or obesity in whom the diagnosis of type 2 diabetes is being considered should have a panel of pancreatic autoantibodies tested to exclude the possibility of autoimmune type 1 diabetes. **B**

In the last decade, the incidence and prevalence of type 2 diabetes in adolescents has increased dramatically, especially in racial and ethnic minority populations (147,185). A few studies suggest oral glucose tolerance tests or fasting plasma glucose values as more suitable diagnostic tests than A1C in the pediatric population, especially among certain ethnicities (186), although fasting glucose alone may overdiagnose diabetes in children (187,188). In addition, many of these studies do not recognize that diabetes diagnostic criteria are based on long-term health outcomes, and validations are not currently available in the pediatric population (189). A recent analysis of National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) data suggests using A1C for screening of high-risk youth (190).

The ADA acknowledges the limited data supporting A1C for diagnosing type 2 diabetes in children and adolescents. Although A1C is not recommended for diagnosis of diabetes in children with cystic fibrosis or symptoms suggestive of acute onset of type 1 diabetes, and only A1C assays without interference are appropriate

for children with hemoglobinopathies, the ADA continues to recommend A1C for diagnosis of type 2 diabetes in this population (191,192).

### Diagnostic Challenges

Given the current obesity epidemic, distinguishing between type 1 and type 2 diabetes in children can be difficult. Overweight and obesity are common in children with type 1 diabetes (27), and diabetes-associated autoantibodies and ketosis may be present in pediatric patients with clinical features of type 2 diabetes (including obesity and acanthosis nigricans) (187). The presence of islet autoantibodies has been associated with faster progression to insulin deficiency (187). At the onset, DKA occurs in  $\sim$ 6% of youth aged 10–19 years with type 2 diabetes (193). Although uncommon, type 2 diabetes has been observed in prepubertal children under the age of 10 years, and thus it should be part of the differential in children with suggestive symptoms (194). Finally, obesity contributes to the development of type 1 diabetes in some individuals (195), which further blurs the lines between diabetes types. However, accurate diagnosis is critical, as treatment regimens, educational approaches, dietary advice, and outcomes differ markedly between patients with the two diagnoses. The significant diagnostic difficulties posed by MODY are discussed in Section 2, “Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>). In addition, there are rare and atypical diabetes cases that represent a challenge for clinicians and researchers.

### Management

#### Lifestyle Management

##### Recommendations

- 14.55** All youth with type 2 diabetes and their families should receive comprehensive diabetes self-management education and support that is specific to youth with type 2 diabetes and is culturally appropriate. **B**
- 14.56** Youth with overweight/obesity and type 2 diabetes and their families should be provided with developmentally and culturally appropriate comprehensive lifestyle programs that are integrated

with diabetes management to achieve a 7–10% decrease in excess weight. **C**

- 14.57** Given the necessity of long-term weight management for youth with type 2 diabetes, lifestyle intervention should be based on a chronic care model and offered in the context of diabetes care. **E**
- 14.58** Youth with prediabetes and type 2 diabetes, like all children and adolescents, should be encouraged to participate in at least 60 min of moderate to vigorous physical activity daily (with muscle and bone strength training at least 3 days/week) **B** and to decrease sedentary behavior. **C**
- 14.59** Nutrition for youth with prediabetes and type 2 diabetes, like for all children and adolescents, should focus on healthy eating patterns that emphasize consumption of nutrient-dense, high-quality foods and decreased consumption of calorie-dense, nutrient-poor foods, particularly sugar-added beverages. **B**

#### Glycemic Targets

##### Recommendations

- 14.60** Blood glucose monitoring should be individualized, taking into consideration the pharmacologic treatment of the patient. **E**
- 14.61** 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 the device safely (either by themselves or with a caregiver). The choice of device should be made based on patient circumstances, desires, and needs. **E**
- 14.62** Glycemic status should be assessed every 3 months. **E**

**14.63** A reasonable A1C target for most children and adolescents with type 2 diabetes is <7% (53 mmol/mol). More stringent A1C targets (such as <6.5% [48 mmol/mol]) may be appropriate for selected individual patients if they can be achieved without significant hypoglycemia or other adverse effects of treatment. Appropriate patients might include those with a short duration of diabetes and lesser degrees of  $\beta$ -cell dysfunction and patients treated with lifestyle or metformin only who achieve significant weight improvement. **E**

**14.64** Less stringent A1C goals (such as 7.5% [58 mmol/mol]) may be appropriate if there is an increased risk of hypoglycemia. **E**

**14.65** A1C targets for patients on insulin should be individualized, taking into account the relatively low rates of hypoglycemia in youth-onset type 2 diabetes. **E**

### Pharmacologic Management

#### Recommendations

**14.66** Initiate pharmacologic therapy, in addition to behavioral counseling for healthful nutrition and physical activity changes, at diagnosis of type 2 diabetes. **A**

**14.67** In incidentally diagnosed or metabolically stable patients (A1C <8.5% [69 mmol/mol] and asymptomatic), metformin is the initial pharmacologic treatment of choice if renal function is normal. **A**

**14.68** Youth with marked hyperglycemia (blood glucose  $\geq$ 250 mg/dL [13.9 mmol/L], A1C  $\geq$ 8.5% [69 mmol/mol]) without acidosis at diagnosis who are symptomatic with polyuria, polydipsia, nocturia, and/or weight loss should be treated initially with basal insulin while metformin is initiated and titrated. **B**

**14.69** In patients with ketosis/ketoacidosis, treatment with subcutaneous or intravenous

insulin should be initiated to rapidly correct the hyperglycemia and the metabolic derangement. Once acidosis is resolved, metformin should be initiated while subcutaneous insulin therapy is continued. **A**

**14.70** In individuals presenting with severe hyperglycemia (blood glucose  $\geq$ 600 mg/dL [33.3 mmol/L]), consider assessment for hyperglycemic hyperosmolar nonketotic syndrome. **A**

**14.71** If glycemic targets are no longer met with metformin (with or without basal insulin), glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist therapy approved for youth with type 2 diabetes should be considered in children 10 years of age or older if they have no past medical history or family history of medullary thyroid carcinoma or multiple endocrine neoplasia type 2. **A**

**14.72** Patients treated with metformin, a glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist, and basal insulin who do not meet glycemic targets should be moved to multiple daily injections with basal and premeal bolus insulins or insulin pump therapy. **E**

**14.73** In patients initially treated with insulin and metformin who are meeting glucose targets based on blood glucose monitoring, insulin can be tapered over 2–6 weeks by decreasing the insulin dose 10–30% every few days. **B**

**14.74** Use of medications not approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for youth with type 2 diabetes is not recommended outside of research trials. **B**


Treatment of youth-onset type 2 diabetes should include lifestyle management, diabetes self-management education, and pharmacologic treatment. Initial treatment of youth with obesity and diabetes must take into account that diabetes type is often uncertain in the first few weeks of treatment due to overlap

in presentation and that a substantial percentage of youth with type 2 diabetes will present with clinically significant ketoacidosis (196). Therefore, initial therapy should address the hyperglycemia and associated metabolic derangements irrespective of ultimate diabetes type, with adjustment of therapy once metabolic compensation has been established and subsequent information, such as islet autoantibody results, becomes available. **Fig. 14.1** provides an approach to the initial treatment of new-onset diabetes in youth with overweight or obesity with clinical suspicion of type 2 diabetes.

Glycemic targets should be individualized, taking into consideration the long-term health benefits of more stringent targets and risk for adverse effects, such as hypoglycemia. A lower target A1C in youth with type 2 diabetes when compared with those recommended in type 1 diabetes is justified by a lower risk of hypoglycemia and higher risk of complications (180,197–200).

Self-management in pediatric diabetes involves both the youth and their parents/adult caregivers. Patients and their families should receive counseling for healthful nutrition and physical activity changes such as eating a balanced diet, achieving and maintaining a healthy weight, and exercising regularly. Physical activity should include aerobic, muscle-strengthening, and bone-strengthening activities (17). A family-centered approach to nutrition and lifestyle modification is essential in children and adolescents with type 2 diabetes, and nutrition recommendations should be culturally appropriate and sensitive to family resources (see Section 5, “Facilitating Behavior Change and Well-being to Improve Health Outcomes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S005>). Given the complex social and environmental context surrounding youth with type 2 diabetes, individual-level lifestyle interventions may not be sufficient to target the complex interplay of family dynamics, mental health, community readiness, and the broader environmental system (3).

A multidisciplinary diabetes team, including a physician, diabetes care and education specialist, registered dietitian nutritionist, and psychologist or social worker, is essential. In addition to achieving glycemic targets and self-management



**Figure 14.1**—Management of new-onset diabetes in youth with overweight or obesity with clinical suspicion of type 2 diabetes. A1C 8.5% = 69 mmol/mol. Adapted from the ADA position statement “Evaluation and Management of Youth-Onset Type 2 Diabetes” (3). BGM, blood glucose monitoring; CGM, continuous glucose monitoring; DKA, diabetic ketoacidosis; HHNK, hyperosmolar hyperglycemic nonketotic syndrome; MDI, multiple daily injections.

education (201–203), initial treatment must include management of comorbidities such as obesity, dyslipidemia, hypertension, and microvascular complications.

Current pharmacologic treatment options for youth-onset type 2 diabetes are limited to three approved drug classes: insulin, metformin, and glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists. Presentation with ketoacidosis or marked ketosis requires a period of insulin therapy until fasting and postprandial glycemia have been restored to normal or near-normal levels. Insulin pump therapy may be considered as an option for those on long-term multiple daily injections who are able to safely manage the device. Initial treatment should also be with insulin when the distinction between type 1 diabetes and type 2 diabetes is unclear and in patients who have random blood glucose concentrations  $\geq 250$  mg/dL (13.9 mmol/L) and/or A1C  $\geq 8.5\%$  (69 mmol/mol) (204). Metformin therapy should be added after resolution of ketosis/ketoacidosis.

When initial insulin treatment is not required, initiation of metformin is recommended. The TODAY study found that metformin alone provided durable glycemic control (A1C  $\leq 8\%$  [64 mmol/mol] for 6 months) in approximately half of the subjects (205). The Restoring Insulin Secretion (RISE) Consortium study did not demonstrate differences in measures of glucose or  $\beta$ -cell function preservation between metformin and insulin, but there was more weight gain with insulin (206).

To date, the TODAY study is the only trial combining lifestyle and metformin therapy in youth with type 2 diabetes; the combination did not perform better than metformin alone in achieving durable glycemic control (205).

A randomized clinical trial in youth aged 10–17 years with type 2 diabetes demonstrated the addition of subcutaneous liraglutide (up to 1.8 mg daily) to metformin (with or without basal insulin) as safe and effective to decrease A1C (estimated decrease of 1.06 percentage points at 26 weeks and 1.30 at 52

weeks), although it did increase the frequency of gastrointestinal side effects (207). Liraglutide and once-weekly exenatide extended release are approved for the treatment of type 2 diabetes in youth aged 10 years or older (208,209).

Home blood glucose monitoring regimens should be individualized, taking into consideration the pharmacologic treatment of the patient. Although data on CGM in youth with type 2 diabetes are sparse (210), CGM could be considered in individuals requiring frequent blood glucose monitoring for diabetes management.

### Metabolic Surgery

#### Recommendations

**14.75** Metabolic surgery may be considered for the treatment of adolescents with type 2 diabetes who have severe obesity (BMI  $>35$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>) and who have uncontrolled glycemia and/or serious comorbidities despite lifestyle and pharmacologic intervention. **A**

**14.76** Metabolic surgery should be performed only by an experienced surgeon working as part of a well-organized and engaged multidisciplinary team, including a surgeon, endocrinologist, dietitian nutritionist, behavioral health specialist, and nurse. **A**

The results of weight loss and lifestyle interventions for obesity in children and adolescents have been disappointing, and treatment options are limited. As an adjunct to lifestyle therapy, liraglutide (3.0 mg) was recently approved for adolescents aged 12 to 17 years with a body weight of at least 60 kg and an initial BMI corresponding to  $\geq 30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> for adults (211,212). Over the last decade, weight loss surgery has been increasingly performed in adolescents with obesity. Small retrospective analyses and a prospective multicenter, non-randomized study suggest that bariatric or metabolic surgery may have benefits in adolescents with obesity and type 2 diabetes similar to those observed in adults. Teenagers experience similar degrees of weight loss, diabetes remission, and improvement of cardiometabolic risk factors for at least 3 years after surgery (213). A secondary data analysis from the Teen-Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery (Teen-LABS) and TODAY studies suggests surgical treatment of adolescents with severe obesity and type 2 diabetes is associated with improved glycemic control (214); however, no randomized trials have yet compared the effectiveness and safety of surgery to those of conventional treatment options in adolescents (215). The guidelines used as an indication for metabolic surgery in adolescents generally include BMI  $>35$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> with comorbidities or BMI  $>40$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> with or without comorbidities (216–227). A number of groups, including the Pediatric Bariatric Study Group and Teen-LABS study, have demonstrated the effectiveness of metabolic surgery in adolescents (220–226).

## Prevention and Management of Diabetes Complications

### Hypertension

#### Recommendations

**14.77** Blood pressure should be measured at every visit. In

youth with high blood pressure (blood pressure  $\geq 90$ th percentile for age, sex, and height or, in adolescents aged  $\geq 13$  years,  $\geq 120/80$  mmHg) on three separate measurements, ambulatory blood pressure monitoring should be strongly considered. **B**

**14.78** Treatment of elevated blood pressure (defined as 90th to  $<95$ th percentile for age, sex, and height or, in adolescents aged  $\geq 13$  years, 120–129/ $<80$  mmHg) is lifestyle modification focused on healthy nutrition, physical activity, sleep, and, if appropriate, weight management. **C**

**14.79** In addition to lifestyle modification, ACE inhibitors or angiotensin receptor blockers should be started for treatment of confirmed hypertension (defined as blood pressure consistently  $\geq 95$ th percentile for age, sex, and height or, in adolescents aged  $\geq 13$  years,  $\geq 130/80$  mmHg). Due to the potential teratogenic effects, females should receive reproductive counseling and ACE inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers should be avoided in females of childbearing age who are not using reliable contraception. **B**

**14.80** The goal of treatment is blood pressure  $<90$ th percentile for age, sex, and height or, in adolescents aged  $\geq 13$  years,  $<130/80$  mmHg. **C**

### Nephropathy

#### Recommendations

**14.81** Protein intake should be at the recommended daily allowance of 0.8 g/kg/day. **E**

**14.82** Urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio should be obtained at the time of diagnosis and annually thereafter. An elevated urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio ( $>30$  mg/g creatinine) should be confirmed on two of three samples. **B**

**14.83** Estimated glomerular filtration rate should be determined at the time of diagnosis and annually thereafter. **E**

**14.84** In patients with diabetes and hypertension, either an ACE inhibitor or an angiotensin receptor blocker is recommended for those with modestly elevated urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio (30–299 mg/g creatinine) and is strongly recommended for those with urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio  $>300$  mg/g creatinine and/or estimated glomerular filtration rate  $<60$  mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>. **E** Due to the potential teratogenic effects, females should receive reproductive counseling and ACE inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers should be avoided in females of childbearing age who are not using reliable contraception. **B**

**14.85** For those with nephropathy, continued monitoring (yearly urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio, estimated glomerular filtration rate, and serum potassium) may aid in assessing adherence and detecting progression of disease. **E**

**14.86** Referral to nephrology is recommended in case of uncertainty of etiology, worsening urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio, or decrease in estimated glomerular filtration rate. **E**

### Neuropathy

#### Recommendations

**14.87** Youth with type 2 diabetes should be screened for the presence of neuropathy by foot examination at diagnosis and annually. The examination should include inspection, assessment of foot pulses, pinprick and 10-g monofilament sensation tests, testing of vibration sensation using a 128-Hz tuning fork, and ankle reflex tests. **C**

**14.88** Prevention should focus on achieving glycemic targets. **C**



### Retinopathy

#### Recommendations

- 14.89** Screening for retinopathy should be performed by dilated funduscopy at or soon after diagnosis and annually thereafter. **C**
- 14.90** Optimizing glycemia is recommended to decrease the risk or slow the progression of retinopathy. **B**
- 14.91** Less frequent examination (every 2 years) may be considered if achieving glycemic targets and a normal eye exam. **C**
- 14.92** Programs that use retinal photography (with remote reading or use of a validated assessment tool) to improve access to diabetic retinopathy screening can be appropriate screening strategies for diabetic retinopathy. Such programs need to provide pathways for timely referral for a comprehensive eye examination when indicated. **E**

### Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease

#### Recommendations

- 14.93** Evaluation for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (by measuring AST and ALT) should be done at diagnosis and annually thereafter. **B**
- 14.94** Referral to gastroenterology should be considered for persistently elevated or worsening transaminases. **B**

### Obstructive Sleep Apnea

#### Recommendation

- 14.95** Screening for symptoms of sleep apnea should be done at each visit, and referral to a pediatric sleep specialist for evaluation and a polysomnogram, if indicated, is recommended. Obstructive sleep apnea should be treated when documented. **B**

### Polycystic Ovary Syndrome

#### Recommendations

- 14.96** Evaluate for polycystic ovary syndrome in female adolescents with type 2 diabetes, including

laboratory studies when indicated. **B**

- 14.97** Oral contraceptive pills for treatment of polycystic ovary syndrome are not contraindicated for girls with type 2 diabetes. **C**
- 14.98** Metformin in addition to lifestyle modification is likely to improve the menstrual cyclicity and hyperandrogenism in girls with type 2 diabetes. **E**

### Cardiovascular Disease

#### Recommendation

- 14.99** Intensive lifestyle interventions focusing on weight loss, dyslipidemia, hypertension, and dysglycemia are important to prevent overt macrovascular disease in early adulthood. **E**

### Dyslipidemia

#### Recommendations

- 14.100** Lipid screening should be performed initially after optimizing glycemia and annually thereafter. **B**
- 14.101** Optimal goals are LDL cholesterol <100 mg/dL (2.6 mmol/L), HDL cholesterol >35 mg/dL (0.91 mmol/L), and triglycerides <150 mg/dL (1.7 mmol/L). **E**
- 14.102** If lipids are abnormal, initial therapy should consist of optimizing glucose control and medical nutritional therapy to limit the amount of calories from fat to 25–30% and saturated fat to <7%, limit cholesterol to <200 mg/day, avoid *trans* fats, and aim for ~10% calories from monounsaturated fats for elevated LDL. For elevated triglycerides, medical nutrition therapy should also focus on decreasing simple sugar intake and increasing dietary n-3 fatty acids in addition to the above changes. **A**
- 14.103** If LDL cholesterol remains >130 mg/dL after 6 months of dietary intervention, initiate therapy with statin, with a goal of LDL <100

mg/dL. Due to the potential teratogenic effects, females should receive reproductive counseling and statins should be avoided in females of childbearing age who are not using reliable contraception. **B**

- 14.104** If triglycerides are >400 mg/dL (4.7 mmol/L) fasting or >1,000 mg/dL (11.6 mmol/L) nonfasting, optimize glycemia and begin fibrate, with a goal of <400 mg/dL (4.7 mmol/L) fasting (to reduce risk for pancreatitis). **C**

### Cardiac Function Testing

#### Recommendation

- 14.105** Routine screening for heart disease with electrocardiogram, echocardiogram, or stress testing is not recommended in asymptomatic youth with type 2 diabetes. **B**

Comorbidities may already be present at the time of diagnosis of type 2 diabetes in youth (179,228). Therefore, blood pressure measurement, a fasting lipid panel, assessment of random urine albumin-to-creatinine ratio, and a dilated eye examination should be performed at diagnosis. Additional medical conditions that may need to be addressed include polycystic ovary disease and other comorbidities associated with pediatric obesity, such as sleep apnea, hepatic steatosis, orthopedic complications, and psychosocial concerns. The ADA position statement “Evaluation and Management of Youth-Onset Type 2 Diabetes” (3) provides guidance on the prevention, screening, and treatment of type 2 diabetes and its comorbidities in children and adolescents.

Youth-onset type 2 diabetes is associated with significant microvascular and macrovascular risk burden and a substantial increase in the risk of cardiovascular morbidity and mortality at an earlier age than in those diagnosed later in life (180,229). The higher complication risk in earlier-onset type 2 diabetes is likely related to prolonged lifetime exposure to hyperglycemia and other

atherogenic risk factors, including insulin resistance, dyslipidemia, hypertension, and chronic inflammation. There is a low risk of hypoglycemia in youth with type 2 diabetes, even if they are being treated with insulin (230), and there are high rates of complications (197–200). These diabetes comorbidities also appear to be higher than in youth with type 1 diabetes despite shorter diabetes duration and lower A1C (228). In addition, the progression of vascular abnormalities appears to be more pronounced in youth-onset type 2 diabetes compared with type 1 diabetes of similar duration, including ischemic heart disease and stroke (231).

#### Psychosocial Factors

##### Recommendations

- 14.106** Providers should assess food security, housing stability/homelessness, health literacy, financial barriers, and social/community support and apply that information to treatment decisions. **E**
- 14.107** Use patient-appropriate standardized and validated tools to assess for diabetes distress and mental/behavioral health in youth with type 2 diabetes, with attention to symptoms of depression and disordered eating, and refer to specialty care when indicated. **B**
- 14.108** When choosing glucose-lowering or other medications for youth with overweight or obesity and type 2 diabetes, consider medication-taking behavior and the medications' effect on weight. **E**
- 14.109** Starting at puberty, preconception counseling should be incorporated into routine diabetes clinic visits for all females of childbearing potential because of the adverse pregnancy outcomes in this population. **A**
- 14.110** Patients should be screened for tobacco, electronic cigarettes, and alcohol use at diagnosis and regularly thereafter. **C**

have low socioeconomic status, and often experience multiple psychosocial stressors (26,41,181–184). Consideration of the sociocultural context and efforts to personalize diabetes management are of critical importance to minimize barriers to care, enhance adherence, and maximize response to treatment.

Evidence about psychiatric disorders and symptoms in youth with type 2 diabetes is limited (232–236), but given the sociocultural context for many youth and the medical burden and obesity associated with type 2 diabetes, ongoing surveillance of mental health/behavioral health is indicated. Symptoms of depression and disordered eating are common and associated with poorer glycemic control (233,237,238).

Many of the medications prescribed for diabetes and psychiatric disorders are associated with weight gain and can increase patients' concerns about eating, body shape, and weight (239,240).

The TODAY study documented (241) that despite disease- and age-specific counseling, 10.2% of the females in the cohort became pregnant over an average of 3.8 years of study participation. Of note, 26.4% of pregnancies ended in a miscarriage, stillbirth, or intrauterine death, and 20.5% of the liveborn infants had a major congenital anomaly.

#### TRANSITION FROM PEDIATRIC TO ADULT CARE

##### Recommendations

- 14.111** Pediatric diabetes providers should begin to prepare youth for transition to adult health care in early adolescence and, at the latest, at least 1 year before the transition. **E**
- 14.112** Both pediatric and adult diabetes care providers should provide support and resources for transitioning young adults. **E**
- 14.113** Youth with type 2 diabetes should be transferred to an adult-oriented diabetes specialist when deemed appropriate by the patient and provider. **E**

Care and close supervision of diabetes management are increasingly shifted from parents and other adults to the youth with type 1 or type 2 diabetes throughout childhood and adolescence. The shift from pediatric to adult health care providers, however, often occurs abruptly as the older teen enters the next developmental stage, referred to as emerging adulthood (242), which is a critical period for young people who have diabetes. During this period of major life transitions, youth begin to move out of their parents' homes and must become fully responsible for their diabetes care. Their new responsibilities include self-management of their diabetes, making medical appointments, and financing health care, once they are no longer covered by their parents' health insurance plans (ongoing coverage until age 26 years is currently available under provisions of the U.S. Affordable Care Act). In addition to lapses in health care, this is also a period associated with deterioration in glycemic stability; increased occurrence of acute complications; psychosocial, emotional, and behavioral challenges; and the emergence of chronic complications (243–248). The transition period from pediatric to adult care is prone to fragmentation in health care delivery, which may adversely impact health care quality, cost, and outcomes (249). Worsening diabetes health outcomes during the transition to adult care and early adulthood have been documented (250,251).

Although scientific evidence is limited, it is clear that comprehensive and coordinated planning that begins in early adolescence is necessary to facilitate a seamless transition from pediatric to adult health care (243,244,252,253). New technologies and other interventions are being tried to support the transition to adult care in young adulthood (254–258). A comprehensive discussion regarding the challenges faced during this period, including specific recommendations, is found in the ADA position statement "Diabetes Care for Emerging Adults: Recommendations for Transition From Pediatric to Adult Diabetes Care Systems" (244).

The Endocrine Society, in collaboration with the ADA and other organizations, has developed transition tools for clinicians and youth and families (253).

Most youth with type 2 diabetes come from racial/ethnic minority groups,

## References

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Vaccines site: Healthcare Providers/Professionals. 2021. Accessed 20 October 2021. Available from <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/hcp/index.html>
- Chiang JL, Maahs DM, Garvey KC, et al. Type 1 diabetes in children and adolescents: a position statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2026–2044
- Arslanian S, Bacha F, Grey M, Marcus MD, White NH, Zeitler P. Evaluation and management of youth-onset type 2 diabetes: a position statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:2648–2668
- Mayer-Davis EJ, Lawrence JM, Dabelea D, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. Incidence trends of type 1 and type 2 diabetes among youths, 2002–2012. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:1419–1429
- Thomas NJ, Jones SE, Weedon MN, Shields BM, Oram RA, Hattersley AT. Frequency and phenotype of type 1 diabetes in the first six decades of life: a cross-sectional, genetically stratified survival analysis from UK Biobank. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2018;6:122–129
- Barnea-Goraly N, Raman M, Mazaika P, et al.; Diabetes Research in Children Network (DirecNet). Alterations in white matter structure in young children with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:332–340
- Cameron FJ, Scratch SE, Nadebaum C, et al.; DKA Brain Injury Study Group. Neurological consequences of diabetic ketoacidosis at initial presentation of type 1 diabetes in a prospective cohort study of children. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:1554–1562
- Markowitz JT, Garvey KC, Laffel LMB. Developmental changes in the roles of patients and families in type 1 diabetes management. *Curr Diabetes Rev* 2015;11:231–238
- Driscoll KA, Volkening LK, Haro H, et al. Are children with type 1 diabetes safe at school? Examining parent perceptions. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2015;16:613–620
- Jackson CC, Albanese-O'Neill A, Butler KL, et al. Diabetes care in the school setting: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1958–1963
- Siminerio LM, Albanese-O'Neill A, Chiang JL, et al.; American Diabetes Association. Care of young children with diabetes in the child care setting: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2834–2842
- Mehta SN, Volkening LK, Anderson BJ, et al.; Family Management of Childhood Diabetes Study Steering Committee. Dietary behaviors predict glycemic control in youth with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:1318–1320
- Absil H, Baudet L, Robert A, Lysy PA. Benefits of physical activity in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes: a systematic review. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2019;156:107810
- Riddell MC, Gallen IW, Smart CE, et al. Exercise management in type 1 diabetes: a consensus statement. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;5:377–390
- Colberg SR, Sigal RJ, Yardley JE, et al. Physical activity/exercise and diabetes: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2065–2079
- Robertson K, Adolfsson P, Scheiner G, Hanas R, Riddell MC. Exercise in children and adolescents with diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2009;10(Suppl. 12):154–168
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Physical activity guidelines for Americans, 2nd ed., 2018. Accessed 20 October 2021. Available from [https://health.gov/sites/default/files/2019-09/Physical\\_Activity\\_Guidelines\\_2nd\\_edition.pdf](https://health.gov/sites/default/files/2019-09/Physical_Activity_Guidelines_2nd_edition.pdf)
- Tsalikian E, Kollman C, Tamborlane WB, et al.; Diabetes Research in Children Network (DirecNet) Study Group. Prevention of hypoglycemia during exercise in children with type 1 diabetes by suspending basal insulin. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:2200–2204
- Taplin CE, Cobry E, Messer L, McFann K, Chase HP, Fiallo-Scharer R. Preventing post-exercise nocturnal hypoglycemia in children with type 1 diabetes. *J Pediatr* 2010;157:784–8.e1
- Moser O, Riddell MC, Eckstein ML, et al. Glucose management for exercise using continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) and intermittently scanned CGM (isCGM) systems in type 1 diabetes: position statement of the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD) and of the International Society for Pediatric and Adolescent Diabetes (ISPAD) endorsed by JDRF and supported by the American Diabetes Association (ADA). *Diabetologia* 2020;63:2501–2520
- Riddell MC, Milliken J. Preventing exercise-induced hypoglycemia in type 1 diabetes using real-time continuous glucose monitoring and a new carbohydrate intake algorithm: an observational field study. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2011;13:819–825
- Francescato MP, Stel G, Stenner E, Geat M. Prolonged exercise in type 1 diabetes: performance of a customizable algorithm to estimate the carbohydrate supplements to minimize glycemic imbalances. *PLoS One* 2015;10:e0125220
- Adolfsson P, Mattsson S, Jendle J. Evaluation of glucose control when a new strategy of increased carbohydrate supply is implemented during prolonged physical exercise in type 1 diabetes. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2015;115:2599–2607
- Baker LB, Rollo I, Stein KW, Jeukendrup AE. Acute effects of carbohydrate supplementation on intermittent sports performance. *Nutrients* 2015;7:5733–5763
- 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
- Liu LL, Lawrence JM, Davis C, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Prevalence of overweight and obesity in youth with diabetes in USA: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth study. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2010;11:4–11
- DuBose SN, Hermann JM, Tamborlane WV, et al.; Type 1 Diabetes Exchange Clinic Network and Diabetes Prospective Follow-up Registry. Obesity in youth with type 1 diabetes in Germany, Austria, and the United States. *J Pediatr* 2015;167:627–632.e4
- Corbin KD, Driscoll KA, Pratley RE, Smith SR, Maahs DM; Advancing Care for Type 1 Diabetes and Obesity Network (ACT1ON). Obesity in type 1 diabetes: pathophysiology, clinical impact, and mechanisms. *Endocr Rev* 2018;39:629–663
- Redondo MJ, Foster NC, Libman IM, et al. Prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors in youth with type 1 diabetes and elevated body mass index. *Acta Diabetol* 2016;53:271–277
- American Association of Diabetes Educators. Management of children with diabetes in the school setting. *Diabetes Educ* 2019;45:54–59
- Corathers SD, Kichler J, Jones N-HY, et al. Improving depression screening for adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *Pediatrics* 2013;132:e1395–e1402
- Hood KK, Beavers DP, Yi-Frazier J, et al. Psychosocial burden and glycemic control during the first 6 years of diabetes: results from the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth study. *J Adolesc Health* 2014;55:498–504
- Ducat L, Philipson LH, Anderson BJ. The mental health comorbidities of diabetes. *JAMA* 2014;312:691–692
- Hagger V, Hendrieckx C, Sturt J, Skinner TC, Speight J. Diabetes distress among adolescents with type 1 diabetes: a systematic review. *Curr Diab Rep* 2016;16:9
- Anderson BJ, Laffel LM, Domenger C, et al. Factors associated with diabetes-specific health-related quality of life in youth with type 1 diabetes: the global TEENs study. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1002–1009
- Hilliard ME, De Wit M, Wasserman RM, et al. Screening and support for emotional burdens of youth with type 1 diabetes: strategies for diabetes care providers. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2018;19:534–543
- Shapiro JB, Vesco AT, Weil LEG, Evans MA, Hood KK, Weissberg-Benchell J. Psychometric properties of the problem areas in diabetes: teen and parent of teen versions. *J Pediatr Psychol* 2018;43:561–571
- Iturralde E, Rausch JR, Weissberg-Benchell J, Hood KK. Diabetes-related emotional distress over time. *Pediatrics* 2019;143:e20183011
- Hill-Briggs F, Adler NE, Berkowitz SA, et al. Social determinants of health and diabetes: a scientific review. *Diabetes Care* 2020;44:258–279
- Lawrence JM, Yi-Frazier JP, Black MH, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Demographic and clinical correlates of diabetes-related quality of life among youth with type 1 diabetes. *J Pediatr* 2012;161:201–7.e2
- Young-Hyman D, de Groot M, Hill-Briggs F, Gonzalez JS, Hood K, Peyrot M. Psychosocial care for people with diabetes: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:2126–2140
- Markowitz JT, Butler DA, Volkening LK, Antisdell JE, Anderson BJ, Laffel LMB. Brief screening tool for disordered eating in diabetes: internal consistency and external validity in a contemporary sample of pediatric patients with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:495–500
- Katz ML, Volkening LK, Butler DA, Anderson BJ, Laffel LM. Family-based psychoeducation and Care Ambassador intervention to improve glycemic control in youth with type 1 diabetes: a randomized trial. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2014;15:142–150
- Laffel LMB, Vangsness L, Connell A, Goebel-Fabbri A, Butler D, Anderson BJ. Impact of ambulatory, family-focused teamwork intervention



- on glycemic control in youth with type 1 diabetes. *J Pediatr* 2003;142:409–416
45. Anderson BJ, Vangsness L, Connell A, Butler D, Goebel-Fabbri A, Laffel LMB. Family conflict, adherence, and glycaemic control in youth with short duration Type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med* 2002;19:635–642
46. Helgeson VS, Palladino DK. Implications of psychosocial factors for diabetes outcomes among children with type 1 diabetes: a review. *Soc Personal Psychol Compass* 2012;6:228–242
47. McCarthy AM, Lindgren S, Mengeling MA, Tsalkian E, Engvall J. Factors associated with academic achievement in children with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:112–117
48. Kuther TL. Medical decision-making and minors: issues of consent and assent. *Adolescence* 2003;38:343–358
49. Coleman DL, Rosoff PM. The legal authority of mature minors to consent to general medical treatment. *Pediatrics* 2013;131:786–793
50. Charron-Prochownik D, Sereika SM, Becker D, et al. Long-term effects of the booster-enhanced READY-Girls preconception counseling program on intentions and behaviors for family planning in teens with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:3870–3874
51. Charron-Prochownik D, Downs J. Diabetes and Reproductive Health for Girls. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2016
52. Wisting L, Frøisland DH, Skriverhaug T, Dahl-Jørgensen K, Rø O. Disturbed eating behavior and omission of insulin in adolescents receiving intensified insulin treatment: a nationwide population-based study. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:3382–3387
53. Goebel-Fabbri AE. Disturbed eating behaviors and eating disorders in type 1 diabetes: clinical significance and treatment recommendations. *Curr Diab Rep* 2009;9:133–139
54. Atik Altönok Y, Özgür S, Meseri R, Özen S, Darcan Ş, Gökşen D. Reliability and validity of the diabetes eating problem survey in Turkish children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *J Clin Res Pediatr Endocrinol* 2017;9:323–328
55. Saßmann H, Albrecht C, Busse-Widmann P, et al. Psychometric properties of the German version of the Diabetes Eating Problem Survey-Revised: additional benefit of disease-specific screening in adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med* 2015;32:1641–1647
56. Rosenbauer J, Dost A, Karges B, et al.; DPV Initiative and the German BMBF Competence Network Diabetes Mellitus. Improved metabolic control in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes: a trend analysis using prospective multicenter data from Germany and Austria. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:80–86
57. Cameron FJ, de Beaufort C, Aanstoot HJ, et al.; Hvidoere International Study Group. Lessons from the Hvidoere International Study Group on childhood diabetes: be dogmatic about outcome and flexible in approach. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2013;14:473–480
58. Nimri R, Weintrob N, Benzaquen H, Ofan R, Fayman G, Phillip M. Insulin pump therapy in youth with type 1 diabetes: a retrospective paired study. *Pediatrics* 2006;117:2126–2131
59. 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
60. Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group. Effect of intensive diabetes treatment on the development and progression of long-term complications in adolescents with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus: Diabetes Control and Complications Trial. *J Pediatr* 1994;125:177–188
61. White NH, Cleary PA, Dahms W, Goldstein D, Malone J; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT)/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) Research Group. Beneficial effects of intensive therapy of diabetes during adolescence: outcomes after the conclusion of the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT). *J Pediatr* 2001;139:804–812
62. Samuelsson U, Steineck I, Gubbjornsdottir S. A high mean-HbA<sub>1c</sub> value 3–15 months after diagnosis of type 1 diabetes in childhood is related to metabolic control, macroalbuminuria, and retinopathy in early adulthood—a pilot study using two nation-wide population based quality registries. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2014;15:229–235
63. Carlsen S, Skriverhaug T, Thue G, et al. Glycemic control and complications in patients with type 1 diabetes – a registry-based longitudinal study of adolescents and young adults. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2017;18:188–195
64. Lind M, Pivodic A, Svensson A-M, Ólafsdóttir AF, Wedel H, Ludvigsson J. HbA<sub>1c</sub> level as a risk factor for retinopathy and nephropathy in children and adults with type 1 diabetes: Swedish population based cohort study. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4894
65. Genuth SM, Backlund J-YC, Bayless M, et al.; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Effects of prior intensive versus conventional therapy and history of glycemia on cardiac function in type 1 diabetes in the DCCT/EDIC. *Diabetes* 2013;62:3561–3569
66. Writing Team for the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications Research Group. Sustained effect of intensive treatment of type 1 diabetes mellitus on development and progression of diabetic nephropathy: the Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) study. *JAMA* 2003;290:2159–2167
67. Writing Team for the DCCT/EDIC Research Group; Gubitosi-Klug RA, Sun W, Cleary PA, et al. Effects of prior intensive insulin therapy and risk factors on patient-reported visual function outcomes in the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC) Cohort. *JAMA Ophthalmol* 2016;134:137–145
68. Orchard TJ, Nathan DM, Zinman B, et al.; Writing Group for the DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Association between 7 years of intensive treatment of type 1 diabetes and long-term mortality. *JAMA* 2015;313:45–53
69. Foland-Ross LC, Reiss AL, Mazaika PK, et al.; Diabetes Research in Children Network (DirecNet). Longitudinal assessment of hippocampus structure in children with type 1 diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2018;19:1116–1123
70. Mauras N, Mazaika P, Buckingham B, et al.; Diabetes Research in Children Network (DirecNet). Longitudinal assessment of neuroanatomical and cognitive differences in young children with type 1 diabetes: association with hyperglycemia. *Diabetes* 2015;64:1770–1779
71. Foland-Ross LC, Tong G, Mauras N, et al.; Diabetes Research in Children Network (DirecNet). Brain function differences in children with type 1 diabetes: a functional MRI study of working memory. *Diabetes* 2020;69:1770–1778
72. Pourabbasi A, Tehrani-Doost M, Qavam SE, Arzaghi SM, Larijani B. Association of diabetes mellitus and structural changes in the central nervous system in children and adolescents: a systematic review. *J Diabetes Metab Disord* 2017;16:10
73. Perantie DC, Wu J, Koller JM, et al. Regional brain volume differences associated with hyperglycemia and severe hypoglycemia in youth with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2331–2337
74. Arbelaez AM, Semenkovich K, Hershey T. Glycemic extremes in youth with T1DM: Effects on the developing brain's structural and functional integrity. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2013;14:541–553
75. Broadley MM, White MJ, Andrew B. A systematic review and meta-analysis of executive function performance in type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Psychosom Med* 2017;79:684–696
76. Ryan CM. Why is cognitive dysfunction associated with the development of diabetes early in life? The diathesis hypothesis. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2006;7:289–297
77. Cameron FJ. The impact of diabetes on brain function in childhood and adolescence. *Pediatr Clin North Am* 2015;62:911–927
78. Campbell MS, Schatz DA, Chen V, et al.; T1D Exchange Clinic Network. A contrast between children and adolescents with excellent and poor control: the T1D Exchange clinic registry experience. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2014;15:110–117
79. Cooper MN, O'Connell SM, Davis EA, Jones TW. A population-based study of risk factors for severe hypoglycaemia in a contemporary cohort of childhood-onset type 1 diabetes. *Diabetologia* 2013;56:2164–2170
80. Bergenstal RM, Klonoff DC, Garg SK, et al.; ASPIRE In-Home Study Group. Threshold-based insulin-pump interruption for reduction of hypoglycemia. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369:224–232
81. Abraham MB, Davey R, O'Grady MJ, et al. Effectiveness of a predictive algorithm in the prevention of exercise-induced hypoglycemia in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2016;18:543–550
82. Buckingham BA, Bailey TS, Christiansen M, et al. Evaluation of a predictive low-glucose management system in-clinic. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2017;19:288–292
83. Nimri R, Muller I, Atlas E, et al. MD-Logic overnight control for 6 weeks of home use in patients with type 1 diabetes: randomized crossover trial. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:3025–3032
84. Thabit H, Tauschmann M, Allen JM, et al. Home use of an artificial beta cell in type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373:2129–2140
85. 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



86. Kovatchev B, Cheng P, Anderson SM, et al. Feasibility of long-term closed-loop control: a multicenter 6-month trial of 24/7 automated insulin delivery. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2017;19:18–24
87. El-Khatib FH, Balliro C, Hillard MA, et al. Home use of a bihormonal bionic pancreas versus insulin pump therapy in adults with type 1 diabetes: a multicentre randomised crossover trial. *Lancet* 2017;389:369–380
88. 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
89. Bergenstal RM, Nimri R, Beck RW, et al.; FLAIR Study Group. A comparison of two hybrid closed-loop systems in adolescents and young adults with type 1 diabetes (FLAIR): a multicentre, randomised, crossover trial. *Lancet* 2021;397:208–219
90. Breton MD, Kanapka LG, Beck RW, et al.; iDCL Trial Research Group. A randomized trial of closed-loop control in children with type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:836–845
91. Redondo MJ, Libman I, Maahs DM, et al. The evolution of hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> targets for youth with type 1 diabetes: rationale and supporting evidence. *Diabetes Care* 2021;44:301–312
92. Haynes A, Hermann JM, Miller KM, et al.; T1D Exchange, WACDD and DPV registries. Severe hypoglycemia rates are not associated with HbA<sub>1c</sub>: a cross-sectional analysis of 3 contemporary pediatric diabetes registry databases. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2017;18:643–650
93. Haynes A, Hermann JM, Clapin H, et al.; WACDD and DPV registries. Decreasing trends in mean HbA<sub>1c</sub> are not associated with increasing rates of severe hypoglycemia in children: a longitudinal analysis of two contemporary population-based pediatric type 1 diabetes registries from Australia and Germany/Austria between 1995 and 2016. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:1630–1636
94. Fredheim S, Johansen A, Thorsen SU, et al.; Danish Society for Diabetes in Childhood and Adolescence. Nationwide reduction in the frequency of severe hypoglycemia by half. *Acta Diabetol* 2015;52:591–599
95. 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
96. Ly TT, Nicholas JA, Retterath A, Lim EM, Davis EA, Jones TW. Effect of sensor-augmented insulin pump therapy and automated insulin suspension vs standard insulin pump therapy on hypoglycemia in patients with type 1 diabetes: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2013;310:1240–1247
97. Downie E, Craig ME, Hing S, Cusumano J, Chan AKF, Donaghue KC. Continued reduction in the prevalence of retinopathy in adolescents with type 1 diabetes: role of insulin therapy and glycemic control. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:2368–2373
98. Karges B, Rosenbauer J, Kapellen T, et al. Hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> levels and risk of severe hypoglycemia in children and young adults with type 1 diabetes from Germany and Austria: a trend analysis in a cohort of 37,539 patients between 1995 and 2012. *PLoS Med* 2014;11:e1001742
99. Johnson SR, Cooper MN, Jones TW, Davis EA. Long-term outcome of insulin pump therapy in children with type 1 diabetes assessed in a large population-based case-control study. *Diabetologia* 2013;56:2392–2400
100. Karges B, Kapellen T, Wagner VM, et al.; DPV Initiative. Glycated hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> as a risk factor for severe hypoglycemia in pediatric type 1 diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2017;18:51–58
101. Saydah S, Imperatore G, Divers J, et al. Occurrence of severe hypoglycaemic events among US youth and young adults with type 1 or type 2 diabetes. *Endocrinol Diabetes Metab* 2019;2:e00057
102. Ishtiak-Ahmed K, Carstensen B, Pedersen-Bjerggaard U, Jørgensen ME. Incidence trends and predictors of hospitalization for hypoglycemia in 17,230 adult patients with type 1 diabetes: a Danish register linkage cohort study. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:226–232
103. Maahs DM, Hermann JM, DuBose SN, et al.; DPV Initiative; T1D Exchange Clinic Network. Contrasting the clinical care and outcomes of 2,622 children with type 1 diabetes less than 6 years of age in the United States T1D Exchange and German/Austrian DPV registries. *Diabetologia* 2014;57:1578–1585
104. Swift PGF, Skinner TC, de Beaufort CE, et al.; Hvidoere Study Group on Childhood Diabetes. Target setting in intensive insulin management is associated with metabolic control: the Hvidoere Childhood Diabetes Study Group Centre Differences Study 2005. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2010;11:271–278
105. Laffel LM, Kanapka LG, Beck RW, et al.; CGM Intervention in Teens and Young Adults with T1D (CITY) Study Group. 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
106. Jaeb Center for Health Research. Strategies to Enhance New CGM Use in Early Childhood (SENCE). In: *ClinicalTrials.gov*. Accessed 20 October 2021. Available from <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02912728>
107. Levine BS, Anderson BJ, Butler DA, Antisdell JE, Brackett J, Laffel LM. Predictors of glycemic control and short-term adverse outcomes in youth with type 1 diabetes. *J Pediatr* 2001;139:197–203
108. 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
109. 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
110. Vigersky RA, McMahan C. The relationship of hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> to time-in-range in patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2019;21:81–85
111. Petersson J, Åkesson K, Sundberg F, Särnblad S. Translating glycated hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> into time spent in glucose target range: a multicenter study. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2019;20:339–344
112. Warncke K, Fröhlich-Reiterer EE, Thon A, Hofer SE, Wiemann D; DPV Initiative of the German Working Group for Pediatric Diabetology; German BMBF Competence Network for Diabetes Mellitus. Polyendocrinopathy in children, adolescents, and young adults with type 1 diabetes: a multicenter analysis of 28,671 patients from the German/Austrian DPV-Wiss database. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:2010–2012
113. Nederstigt C, Uitbeijer BS, Janssen LGM, Corssmit EPM, de Koning EJP, Dekkers OM. Associated auto-immune disease in type 1 diabetes patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Endocrinol* 2019;180:135–144
114. Kozhakhmetova A, Wyatt RC, Caygill C, et al. A quarter of patients with type 1 diabetes have co-existing non-islet autoimmunity: the findings of a UK population-based family study. *Clin Exp Immunol* 2018;192:251–258
115. Hughes JW, Riddlesworth TD, DiMeglio LA, Miller KM, Rickels MR, McGill JB. Autoimmune diseases in children and adults with type 1 diabetes from the T1D Exchange clinic registry. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2016;101:4931–4937
116. Kahaly GJ, Hansen MP. Type 1 diabetes associated autoimmunity. *Autoimmun Rev* 2016;15:644–648
117. Roldán MB, Alonso M, Barrio R. Thyroid autoimmunity in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Nutr Metab* 1999;12:27–31
118. Shun CB, Donaghue KC, Phelan H, Twigg SM, Craig ME. Thyroid autoimmunity in type 1 diabetes: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabet Med* 2014;31:126–135
119. Triolo TM, Armstrong TK, McFann K, et al. Additional autoimmune disease found in 33% of patients at type 1 diabetes onset. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1211–1213
120. Kordonouri O, Deiss D, Danne T, Dorow A, Bassir C, Grütters-Kieslich A. Predictivity of thyroid autoantibodies for the development of thyroid disorders in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *Diabet Med* 2002;19:518–521
121. Dost A, Rohrer TR, Fröhlich-Reiterer E, et al.; DPV Initiative and the German Competence Network Diabetes Mellitus. Hyperthyroidism in 276 children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes from Germany and Austria. *Horm Res Paediatr* 2015;84:190–198
122. Jonsdottir B, Larsson C, Carlsson A, et al.; Better Diabetes Diagnosis Study Group. Thyroid and islet autoantibodies predict autoimmune thyroid disease at type 1 diabetes diagnosis. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2017;102:1277–1285
123. Mohn A, Di Michele S, Di Luzio R, Tumini S, Chiarelli F. The effect of subclinical hypothyroidism on metabolic control in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Diabet Med* 2002;19:70–73
124. Holmes GKT. Screening for coeliac disease in type 1 diabetes. *Arch Dis Child* 2002;87:495–498
125. Rewers M, Liu E, Simmons J, Redondo MJ, Hoffenberg EJ. Celiac disease associated with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am* 2004;33:197–214, xi
126. Pham-Short A, Donaghue KC, Ambler G, Phelan H, Twigg S, Craig ME. Screening for celiac

- disease in type 1 diabetes: a systematic review. *Pediatrics* 2015;136:e170–e176
127. Craig ME, Prinz N, Boyle CT, et al.; Australasian Diabetes Data Network (ADDN); T1D Exchange Clinic Network (T1DX); National Paediatric Diabetes Audit (NPDA) and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health; Prospective Diabetes Follow-up Registry (DPV) initiative. Prevalence of celiac disease in 52,721 youth with type 1 diabetes: international comparison across three continents. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1034–1040
128. Cerutti F, Bruno G, Chiarelli F, Lorini R, Meschi F; Diabetes Study Group of the Italian Society of Pediatric Endocrinology and Diabetology. Younger age at onset and sex predict celiac disease in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes: an Italian multicenter study. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:1294–1298
129. Simmons JH, Foster NC, Riddlesworth TD, et al.; T1D Exchange Clinic Network. Sex- and age-dependent effects of celiac disease on growth and weight gain in children with type 1 diabetes: analysis of the Type 1 Diabetes Exchange clinic registry. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2018;19:741–748
130. Margoni D, Chouliaras G, Ducas G, et al. Bone health in children with celiac disease assessed by dual x-ray absorptiometry: effect of gluten-free diet and predictive value of serum biochemical indices. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 2012;54:680–684
131. Rohrer TR, Wolf J, Liptay S, et al.; DPV Initiative and the German BMBF Competence Network Diabetes Mellitus. Microvascular complications in childhood-onset type 1 diabetes and celiac disease: a multicenter longitudinal analysis of 56,514 patients from the German-Austrian DPV database. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:801–807
132. Mollazadegan K, Kugelberg M, Montgomery SM, Sanders DS, Ludvigsson J, Ludvigsson JF. A population-based study of the risk of diabetic retinopathy in patients with type 1 diabetes and celiac disease. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:316–321
133. Rubio-Tapia A, Hill ID, Kelly CP, Calderwood AH; American College of Gastroenterology. ACG clinical guidelines: diagnosis and management of celiac disease. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2013;108:656–676; quiz 677
134. Paul SP, Sandhu BK, Spray CH, Basude D, Ramani P. Evidence supporting serology-based pathway for diagnosing celiac disease in asymptomatic children from high-risk groups. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 2018;66:641–644
135. Abid N, McGlone O, Cardwell C, McCallion W, Carson D. Clinical and metabolic effects of gluten free diet in children with type 1 diabetes and coeliac disease. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2011;12:322–325
136. Husby S, Koletzko S, Korponay-Szabó IR, et al.; ESPGHAN Working Group on Coeliac Disease Diagnosis; ESPGHAN Gastroenterology Committee; European Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition. European Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition guidelines for the diagnosis of coeliac disease. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr* 2012;54:136–160
137. Kurppa K, Paavola A, Collin P, et al. Benefits of a gluten-free diet for asymptomatic patients with serologic markers of celiac disease. *Gastroenterology* 2014;147:610–617.e1
138. Flynn JT, Kaelber DC, Baker-Smith CM, et al.; Subcommittee on Screening and Management of High Blood Pressure in Children. Clinical practice guideline for screening and management of high blood pressure in children and adolescents. *Pediatrics* 2017;140:e20171904
139. Marcovecchio ML, Chiesa ST, Bond S, et al.; AdDIT Study Group. ACE inhibitors and statins in adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:1733–1745
140. de Ferranti SD, de Boer IH, Fonseca V, et al. Type 1 diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular disease: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association and American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2843–2863
141. Rodriguez BL, Fujimoto WY, Mayer-Davis EJ, et al. Prevalence of cardiovascular disease risk factors in U.S. children and adolescents with diabetes: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth study. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:1891–1896
142. Margeisdottir HD, Larsen JR, Brunborg C, Overby NC; Norwegian Study Group for Childhood Diabetes. High prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes: a population-based study. *Diabetologia* 2008;51:554–561
143. Schwab KO, Doerfer J, Hecker W, et al.; DPV Initiative of the German Working Group for Pediatric Diabetology. Spectrum and prevalence of atherogenic risk factors in 27,358 children, adolescents, and young adults with type 1 diabetes: cross-sectional data from the German diabetes documentation and quality management system (DPV). *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:218–225
144. Singh TP, Groehn H, Kazmers A. Vascular function and carotid intimal-medial thickness in children with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2003;41:661–665
145. Haller MJ, Stein J, Shuster J, et al. Peripheral artery tonometry demonstrates altered endothelial function in children with type 1 diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2007;8:193–198
146. Urbina EM, Wadwa RP, Davis C, et al. Prevalence of increased arterial stiffness in children with type 1 diabetes mellitus differs by measurement site and sex: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. *J Pediatr* 2010;156:731–737
147. Expert Panel on Integrated Guidelines for Cardiovascular Health and Risk Reduction in Children and Adolescents; National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute. Expert panel on integrated guidelines for cardiovascular health and risk reduction in children and adolescents: summary report. *Pediatrics* 2011;128(Suppl. 5):S213–S256
148. Blaha MJ, Blumenthal RS, Brinton EA; National Lipid Association Taskforce on Non-HDL Cholesterol. The importance of non-HDL cholesterol reporting in lipid management. *J Clin Lipidol* 2008;2:267–273
149. Kershner AK, Daniels SR, Imperatore G, et al. Lipid abnormalities are prevalent in youth with type 1 and type 2 diabetes: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. *J Pediatr* 2006;149:314–319
150. Maahs DM, Dabelea D, D'Agostino RB Jr, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. Glucose control predicts 2-year change in lipid profile in youth with type 1 diabetes. *J Pediatr* 2013;162:101–7.e1
151. Daniels SR; Committee on Nutrition. Lipid screening and cardiovascular health in childhood. *Pediatrics* 2008;122:198–208
152. Kavey R-EW, Allada V, Daniels SR, et al.; American Heart Association Expert Panel on Population and Prevention Science; American Heart Association Council on Cardiovascular Disease in the Young; American Heart Association Council on Epidemiology and Prevention; American Heart Association Council on Nutrition, Physical Activity and Metabolism; American Heart Association Council on High Blood Pressure Research; American Heart Association Council on Cardiovascular Nursing; American Heart Association Council on the Kidney in Heart Disease; Interdisciplinary Working Group on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research. Cardiovascular risk reduction in high-risk pediatric patients: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Expert Panel on Population and Prevention Science; the Councils on Cardiovascular Disease in the Young, Epidemiology and Prevention, Nutrition, Physical Activity and Metabolism, High Blood Pressure Research, Cardiovascular Nursing, and the Kidney in Heart Disease; and the Interdisciplinary Working Group on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research: endorsed by the American Academy of Pediatrics. *Circulation* 2006;114:2710–2738
153. Cadario F, Prodrom F, Pasqualicchio S, et al. Lipid profile and nutritional intake in children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes improve after a structured dietician training to a Mediterranean-style diet. *J Endocrinol Invest* 2012;35:160–168
154. Salem MA, AboElAsrar MA, Elbarbary NS, ElHilaly RA, Refaat YM. Is exercise a therapeutic tool for improvement of cardiovascular risk factors in adolescents with type 1 diabetes mellitus? A randomised controlled trial. *Diabetol Metab Syndr* 2010;2:47
155. McCrindle BW, Urbina EM, Dennison BA, et al.; American Heart Association Atherosclerosis, Hypertension, and Obesity in Youth Committee; American Heart Association Council of Cardiovascular Disease in the Young; American Heart Association Council on Cardiovascular Nursing. Drug therapy of high-risk lipid abnormalities in children and adolescents: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association Atherosclerosis, Hypertension, and Obesity in Youth Committee, Council of Cardiovascular Disease in the Young, with the Council on Cardiovascular Nursing. *Circulation* 2007;115:1948–1967
156. Salo P, Viikari J, Hämäläinen M, et al. Serum cholesterol ester fatty acids in 7- and 13-month-old children in a prospective randomized trial of a low-saturated fat, low-cholesterol diet: the STRIP baby project. *Acta Paediatr* 1999;88:505–512
157. McCrindle BW, Ose L, Marais AD. Efficacy and safety of atorvastatin in children and adolescents with familial hypercholesterolemia or severe hyperlipidemia: a multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *J Pediatr* 2003;143:74–80
158. Wiegman A, Hutten BA, de Groot E, et al. Efficacy and safety of statin therapy in children with familial hypercholesterolemia: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2004;292:331–337

159. Karter AJ, Stevens MR, Gregg EW, et al. Educational disparities in rates of smoking among diabetic adults: the translating research into action for diabetes study. *Am J Public Health* 2008;98:365–370
160. Reynolds K, Liese AD, Anderson AM, et al. Prevalence of tobacco use and association between cardiometabolic risk factors and cigarette smoking in youth with type 1 or type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Pediatr* 2011;158:594–601.e1
161. Scott LJ, Warram JH, Hanna LS, Laffel LM, Ryan L, Krolewski AS. A nonlinear effect of hyperglycemia and current cigarette smoking are major determinants of the onset of microalbuminuria in type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes* 2001;50:2842–2849
162. Chaffee BW, Watkins SL, Glantz SA. Electronic cigarette use and progression from experimentation to established smoking. *Pediatrics* 2018;141:e20173594
163. Audrain-McGovern J, Stone MD, Barrington-Trimis J, Unger JB, Leventhal AM. Adolescent e-cigarette, hookah, and conventional cigarette use and subsequent marijuana use. *Pediatrics* 2018;142:e20173616
164. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Smoking and Tobacco Use: Outbreak of lung injury associated with e-cigarette use, or vaping. Accessed 21 October 2021. Available from [https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/basic\\_information/e-cigarettes/severe-lung-disease.html](https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/basic_information/e-cigarettes/severe-lung-disease.html)
165. Miech R, Johnston L, O'Malley PM, Bachman JG, Patrick ME. Trends in adolescent vaping, 2017-2019. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:1490–1491
166. Daniels M, DuBose SN, Maahs DM, et al.; T1D Exchange Clinic Network. Factors associated with microalbuminuria in 7,549 children and adolescents with type 1 diabetes in the T1D Exchange clinic registry. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2639–2645
167. Schwartz GJ, Work DF. Measurement and estimation of GFR in children and adolescents. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2009;4:1832–1843
168. Inker LA, Schmid CH, Tighiouart H, et al.; CKD-EPI Investigators. Estimating glomerular filtration rate from serum creatinine and cystatin C. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367:20–29
169. Cho YH, Craig ME, Hing S, et al. Microvascular complications assessment in adolescents with 2- to 5-yr duration of type 1 diabetes from 1990 to 2006. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2011;12:682–689
170. Scanlon PH, Stratton IM, Bachmann MO, Jones C; Four Nations Diabetic Retinopathy Screening Study Group. Risk of diabetic retinopathy at first screen in children at 12 and 13 years of age. *Diabet Med* 2016;33:1655–1658
171. Beauchamp G, Boyle CT, Tamborlane WV, et al.; T1D Exchange Clinic Network. Treatable diabetic retinopathy is extremely rare among pediatric T1D Exchange clinic registry participants. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:e218–e219
172. Nathan DM, Bebu I, Hainsworth D, et al.; DCCT/EDIC Research Group. Frequency of evidence-based screening for retinopathy in type 1 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2017;376:1507–1516
173. Gubitosi-Klug RA, Bebu I, White NH, et al.; Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT)/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (EDIC) Research Group. Screening eye exams in youth with type 1 diabetes under 18 years of age: once may be enough? *Pediatr Diabetes* 2019;20:743–749
174. Jaiswal M, Divers J, Dabelea D, Isom S, Bell RA, Martin CL, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for diabetic peripheral neuropathy in youth with type 1 and type 2 diabetes: SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1226–1232
175. Pop-Busui R, Boulton AJM, Feldman EL, et al. Diabetic neuropathy: a position statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:136–154
176. Lawrence JM, Imperatore G, Pettitt DJ, et al. Incidence of diabetes in United States youth by diabetes type, race/ethnicity, and age, 2008–2009. *Diabetes* 2014;63(Suppl. 1):A407 [Abstract]
177. Imperatore G, Boyle JP, Thompson TJ, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Projections of type 1 and type 2 diabetes burden in the U.S. population aged <20 years through 2050: population modeling of incidence, mortality, and population growth. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:2515–2520
178. Pettitt DJ, Talton J, Dabelea D, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Prevalence of diabetes in U.S. youth in 2009: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:402–408
179. Copeland KC, Zeitler P, Geffner M, et al.; TODAY Study Group. Characteristics of adolescents and youth with recent-onset type 2 diabetes: the TODAY cohort at baseline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2011;96:159–167
180. Bjornstad P, Drews KL, Caprio S, et al.; TODAY Study Group. Long-term complications in youth-onset type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2021;385:416–426
181. Arslanian SA. Metabolic differences between Caucasian and African-American children and the relationship to type 2 diabetes mellitus. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab* 2002;15 (Suppl. 1):509–517
182. Naughton MJ, Ruggiero AM, Lawrence JM, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Health-related quality of life of children and adolescents with type 1 or type 2 diabetes mellitus: SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2008;162:649–657
183. Wadden TA, Webb VL, Moran CH, Bailer BA. Lifestyle modification for obesity: new developments in diet, physical activity, and behavior therapy. *Circulation* 2012;125:1157–1170
184. Whalen DJ, Belden AC, Tillman R, Barch DM, Luby JL. Early adversity, psychopathology, and latent class profiles of global physical health from preschool through early adolescence. *Psychosom Med* 2016;78:1008–1018
185. Dabelea D, Mayer-Davis EJ, Saydah S, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. Prevalence of type 1 and type 2 diabetes among children and adolescents from 2001 to 2009. *JAMA* 2014;311:1778–1786
186. Buse JB, Kaufman FR, Linder B, Hirst K, El Ghormli L; HEALTHY Study Group. Diabetes screening with hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> versus fasting plasma glucose in a multiethnic middle-school cohort. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:429–435
187. Klingensmith GJ, Pyle L, Arslanian S, et al.; TODAY Study Group. The presence of GAD and IA-2 antibodies in youth with a type 2 diabetes phenotype: results from the TODAY study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:1970–1975
188. Hannon TS, Arslanian SA. The changing face of diabetes in youth: lessons learned from studies of type 2 diabetes. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2015;1353:113–137
189. Kapadia C; Drugs and Therapeutics Committee of the Pediatric Endocrine Society. Hemoglobin A1c measurement for the diagnosis of type 2 diabetes in children. *Int J Pediatr Endocrinol* 2012;2012:31
190. Wallace AS, Wang D, Shin J-I, Selvin E. Screening and diagnosis of prediabetes and diabetes in US children and adolescents. *Pediatrics* 2020;146:e20200265
191. Kester LM, Hey H, Hannon TS. Using hemoglobin A1c for prediabetes and diabetes diagnosis in adolescents: can adult recommendations be upheld for pediatric use? *J Adolesc Health* 2012;50:321–323
192. Wu E-L, Kazzi NG, Lee JM. Cost-effectiveness of screening strategies for identifying pediatric diabetes mellitus and dysglycemia. *JAMA Pediatr* 2013;167:32–39
193. Dabelea D, Rewers A, Stafford JM, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Trends in the prevalence of ketoacidosis at diabetes diagnosis: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. *Pediatrics* 2014;133:e938–e945
194. Hutchins J, Barajas RA, Hale D, Escaname E, Lynch J. Type 2 diabetes in a 5-year-old and single center experience of type 2 diabetes in youth under 10. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2017;18:674–677
195. Ferrara CT, Geyer SM, Liu Y-F, et al.; Type 1 Diabetes TrialNet Study Group. Excess BMI in childhood: a modifiable risk factor for type 1 diabetes development? *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:698–701
196. Pinhas-Hamiel O, Dolan LM, Zeitler PS. Diabetic ketoacidosis among obese African-American adolescents with NIDDM. *Diabetes Care* 1997;20:484–486
197. TODAY Study Group. Safety and tolerability of the treatment of youth-onset type 2 diabetes: the TODAY experience. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1765–1771
198. TODAY Study Group. Retinopathy in youth with type 2 diabetes participating in the TODAY clinical trial. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1772–1774
199. TODAY Study Group. Lipid and inflammatory cardiovascular risk worsens over 3 years in youth with type 2 diabetes: the TODAY clinical trial. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1758–1764
200. TODAY Study Group. Rapid rise in hypertension and nephropathy in youth with type 2 diabetes: the TODAY clinical trial. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1735–1741
201. Grey M, Schreiner B, Pyle L. Development of a diabetes education program for youth with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Educ* 2009;35:108–116
202. American Diabetes Association. Be Healthy Today; Be Healthy For Life. Accessed 21 October 2021. Available from <http://main.diabetes.org/dorg/PDFs/Type-2-Diabetes-in-Youth/Type-2-Diabetes-in-Youth.pdf>
203. Atkinson A, Radjenovic D. Meeting quality standards for self-management education in pediatric type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Spectr* 2007;20:40–46
204. Copeland KC, Silverstein J, Moore KR, et al.; American Academy of Pediatrics. Management of newly diagnosed type 2 diabetes mellitus



- (T2DM) in children and adolescents. *Pediatrics* 2013;131:364–382
205. Zeitler P, Hirst K, Pyle L, et al.; TODAY Study Group. A clinical trial to maintain glycemic control in youth with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2012;366:2247–2256
206. RISE Consortium. Impact of insulin and metformin versus metformin alone on  $\beta$ -cell function in youth with impaired glucose tolerance or recently diagnosed type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1717–1725
207. Tamborlane WV, Barrientos-Pérez M, Fainberg U, et al.; Ellipse Trial Investigators. Liraglutide in children and adolescents with type 2 diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2019;381:637–646
208. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA approves new treatment for pediatric patients with type 2 diabetes. 2019. Accessed 21 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-new-treatment-pediatric-patients-type-2-diabetes>
209. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA approves treatment for pediatric patients with type 2 diabetes - drug information update. 2021. Accessed 21 October 2021. Available from <https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/USFDA/bulletins/2e98d66>
210. Chan CL. Use of continuous glucose monitoring in youth-onset type 2 diabetes. *Curr Diab Rep* 2017;17:66
211. Kelly AS, Auerbach P, Barrientos-Perez M, et al.; NN8022-4180 Trial Investigators. A randomized, controlled trial of liraglutide for adolescents with obesity. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382:2117–2128
212. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA approves weight management drug for patients aged 12 and older. 2021. Accessed 21 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-approves-weight-management-drug-patients-aged-12-and-older>
213. Inge TH, Courcoulas AP, Jenkins TM, et al.; Teen-LABS Consortium. Weight loss and health status 3 years after bariatric surgery in adolescents. *N Engl J Med* 2016;374:113–123
214. Inge TH, Laffel LM, Jenkins TM, et al.; Teen-Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery (Teen-LABS) and Treatment Options of Type 2 Diabetes in Adolescents and Youth (TODAY) Consortia. Comparison of surgical and medical therapy for type 2 diabetes in severely obese adolescents. *JAMA Pediatr* 2018;172:452–460
215. Rubino F, Nathan DM, Eckel RH, et al.; Delegates of the 2nd Diabetes Surgery Summit. Metabolic surgery in the treatment algorithm for type 2 diabetes: a joint statement by international diabetes organizations. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:861–877
216. Pratt JSA, Lenders CM, Dionne EA, et al. Best practice updates for pediatric/adolescent weight loss surgery. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2009;17:901–910
217. Dolan K, Creighton L, Hopkins G, Fielding G. Laparoscopic gastric banding in morbidly obese adolescents. *Obes Surg* 2003;13:101–104
218. Sugerma HJ, Sugerma EL, DeMaria EJ, et al. Bariatric surgery for severely obese adolescents. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2003;7:102–108
219. Inge TH, Garcia V, Daniels S, et al. A multidisciplinary approach to the adolescent bariatric surgical patient. *J Pediatr Surg* 2004;39:442–447
220. Lawson ML, Kirk S, Mitchell T, et al.; Pediatric Bariatric Study Group. One-year outcomes of Roux-en-Y gastric bypass for morbidly obese adolescents: a multicenter study from the Pediatric Bariatric Study Group. *J Pediatr Surg* 2006;41:137–143; discussion 137–143
221. Inge TH, Zeller M, Harmon C, et al. Teen-Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery: methodological features of the first prospective multicenter study of adolescent bariatric surgery. *J Pediatr Surg* 2007;42:1969–1971
222. Ells LJ, Mead E, Atkinson G, et al. Surgery for the treatment of obesity in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;6:CD011740
223. Michalsky MP, Inge TH, Simmons M, et al.; Teen-LABS Consortium. Cardiovascular risk factors in severely obese adolescents: the Teen Longitudinal Assessment of Bariatric Surgery (Teen-LABS) study. *JAMA Pediatr* 2015;169:438–444
224. Zeinoddini A, Heidari R, Talebpour M. Laparoscopic gastric plication in morbidly obese adolescents: a prospective study. *Surg Obes Relat Dis* 2014;10:1135–1139
225. Göthberg G, Gronowitz E, Flodmark C-E, et al. Laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass in adolescents with morbid obesity—surgical aspects and clinical outcome. *Semin Pediatr Surg* 2014;23:11–16
226. Inge TH, Prigeon RL, Elder DA, et al. Insulin sensitivity and  $\beta$ -cell function improve after gastric bypass in severely obese adolescents. *J Pediatr* 2015;167:1042–8.e1
227. Styne DM, Arslanian SA, Connor EL, et al. Pediatric obesity—assessment, treatment, and prevention: an Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2017;102:709–757
228. Eppens MC, Craig ME, Cusumano J, et al. Prevalence of diabetes complications in adolescents with type 2 compared with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:1300–1306
229. Song SH, Hardisty CA. Early onset type 2 diabetes mellitus: a harbinger for complications in later years—clinical observation from a secondary care cohort. *QJM* 2009;102:799–806
230. Zeitler P, Fu J, Tandon N, et al.; International Society for Pediatric and Adolescent Diabetes. ISPAD Clinical Practice Consensus Guidelines 2014. Type 2 diabetes in the child and adolescent. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2014;15(Suppl. 20):26–46
231. Song SH. Complication characteristics between young-onset type 2 versus type 1 diabetes in a UK population. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2015;3:e000044
232. Cefalu WT. “TODAY” reflects on the changing “faces” of type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1732–1734
233. Lawrence JM, Standiford DA, Loots B, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. Prevalence and correlates of depressed mood among youth with diabetes: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth study. *Pediatrics* 2006;117:1348–1358
234. Levitt Katz LE, Swami S, Abraham M, et al. Neuropsychiatric disorders at the presentation of type 2 diabetes mellitus in children. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2005;6:84–89
235. Lewis-Fernández R, Rotheram-Borus MJ, Betts VT, et al. Rethinking funding priorities in mental health research. *Br J Psychiatry* 2016;208:507–509
236. Reinehr T. Type 2 diabetes mellitus in children and adolescents. *World J Diabetes* 2013;4:270–281
237. Pinhas-Hamiel O, Hamiel U, Levy-Shraga Y. Eating disorders in adolescents with type 1 diabetes: challenges in diagnosis and treatment. *World J Diabetes* 2015;6:517–526
238. Wilfley D, Berkowitz R, Goebel-Fabbri A, et al.; TODAY Study Group. Binge eating, mood, and quality of life in youth with type 2 diabetes: baseline data from the today study. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:858–860
239. Shelton RC. Depression, antidepressants, and weight gain in children. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2016;24:2450
240. Baeza I, Vigo L, de la Serna E, et al. The effects of antipsychotics on weight gain, weight-related hormones and homocysteine in children and adolescents: a 1-year follow-up study. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2017;26:35–46
241. Klingensmith GJ, Pyle L, Nadeau KJ, et al.; TODAY Study Group. Pregnancy outcomes in youth with type 2 diabetes: the TODAY study experience. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:122–129
242. Arnett JJ. Emerging adulthood. A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *Am Psychol* 2000;55:469–480
243. Weissberg-Benchell J, Wolpert H, Anderson BJ. Transitioning from pediatric to adult care: a new approach to the post-adolescent young person with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2441–2446
244. Peters A; American Diabetes Association Transitions Working Group. Diabetes care for emerging adults: recommendations for transition from pediatric to adult diabetes care systems: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association, with representation by the American College of Osteopathic Family Physicians, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, the American Osteopathic Association, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Children with Diabetes, The Endocrine Society, the International Society for Pediatric and Adolescent Diabetes, Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation International, the National Diabetes Education Program, and the Pediatric Endocrine Society (formerly Lawson Wilkins Pediatric Endocrine Society). *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:2477–2485
245. Bryden KS, Peveler RC, Stein A, Neil A, Mayou RA, Dunger DB. Clinical and psychological course of diabetes from adolescence to young adulthood: a longitudinal cohort study. *Diabetes Care* 2001;24:1536–1540
246. Laing SP, Jones ME, Swerdlow AJ, Burden AC, Gatling W. Psychosocial and socioeconomic risk factors for premature death in young people with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2005;28:1618–1623
247. Kapellen TM, Müther S, Schwandt A, et al.; DPV initiative and the Competence Network Diabetes Mellitus funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research. Transition to adult diabetes care in Germany—high risk for acute complications and declining metabolic control during the transition phase. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2018;19:1094–1099



248. Agarwal S, Raymond JK, Isom S, et al. Transfer from paediatric to adult care for young adults with type 2 diabetes: the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. *Diabet Med* 2018;35:504–512
249. Mays JA, Jackson KL, Derby TA, et al. An evaluation of recurrent diabetic ketoacidosis, fragmentation of care, and mortality across Chicago, Illinois. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:1671–1676
250. Lotstein DS, Seid M, Klingensmith G, et al.; SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study Group. Transition from pediatric to adult care for youth diagnosed with type 1 diabetes in adolescence. *Pediatrics* 2013;131:e1062–e1070
251. Lyons SK, Becker DJ, Helgeson VS. Transfer from pediatric to adult health care: effects on diabetes outcomes. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2014;15:10–17
252. Garvey KC, Foster NC, Agarwal S, et al. Health care transition preparation and experiences in a U.S. national sample of young adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:317–324
253. The Endocrine Society. Transitions of Care. Accessed 21 October 2021. Available from <https://www.endocrine.org/improving-practice/patient-resources/transitions>
254. Reid MW, Krishnan S, Berget C, et al. CoYoT1 clinic: home telemedicine increases young adult engagement in diabetes care. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2018;20:370–379
255. Spaic T, Robinson T, Goldbloom E, et al.; JDRF Canadian Clinical Trial CCTN1102 Study Group. Closing the gap: results of the multicenter Canadian randomized controlled trial of structured transition in young adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:1018–1026
256. White M, O’Connell MA, Cameron FJ. Clinic attendance and disengagement of young adults with type 1 diabetes after transition of care from paediatric to adult services (TrACeD): a randomised, open-label, controlled trial. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health* 2017;1:274–283
257. Schultz AT, Smaldone A. Components of interventions that improve transitions to adult care for adolescents with type 1 diabetes. *J Adolesc Health* 2017;60:133–146
258. Sequeira PA, Pyatak EA, Weigensberg MJ, et al. Let’s Empower and Prepare (LEAP): evaluation of a structured transition program for young adults with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1412–1419



# 15. Management of Diabetes in Pregnancy: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S232–S243 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S015>

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 IN PREGNANCY

The prevalence of diabetes in pregnancy has been increasing in the U.S. in parallel with the worldwide epidemic of obesity. Not only is the prevalence of type 1 diabetes and type 2 diabetes increasing in women of reproductive age, but there is also a dramatic increase in the reported rates of gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM). Diabetes confers significantly greater maternal and fetal risk largely related to the degree of hyperglycemia but also related to chronic complications and comorbidities of diabetes. In general, specific risks of diabetes in pregnancy include spontaneous abortion, fetal anomalies, preeclampsia, fetal demise, macrosomia, neonatal hypoglycemia, hyperbilirubinemia, and neonatal respiratory distress syndrome, among others. In addition, diabetes in pregnancy may increase the risk of obesity, hypertension, and type 2 diabetes in offspring later in life (1,2).

## PRECONCEPTION COUNSELING

### Recommendations

- 15.1** Starting at puberty and continuing in all women with diabetes and reproductive potential, preconception counseling should be incorporated into routine diabetes care. **A**
- 15.2** Family planning should be discussed, and effective contraception (with consideration of long-acting, reversible contraception) should be prescribed and used until a woman’s treatment regimen and A1C are optimized for pregnancy. **A**
- 15.3** Preconception counseling should address the importance of achieving glucose levels as close to normal as is safely possible, ideally A1C <6.5%

\*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. 15. Management of diabetes in pregnancy: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S232–S243

© 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>.

(48 mmol/mol), to reduce the risk of congenital anomalies, preeclampsia, macrosomia, preterm birth, and other complications. **A**

All women of childbearing age with diabetes should be informed about the importance of achieving and maintaining as near euglycemia as safely possible prior to conception and throughout pregnancy. Observational studies show an increased risk of diabetic embryopathy, especially anencephaly, microcephaly, congenital heart disease, renal anomalies, and caudal regression, directly proportional to elevations in A1C during the first 10 weeks of pregnancy (3). Although observational studies are confounded by the association between elevated preconceptional A1C and other poor self-care behavior, the quantity and consistency of data are convincing and support the recommendation to optimize glycemia prior to conception, given that organogenesis occurs primarily at 5–8 weeks of gestation, with an A1C <6.5% (48 mmol/mol) being associated with the lowest risk of congenital anomalies, preeclampsia, and preterm birth (3–7). A systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies of preconception care for women with preexisting diabetes demonstrated lower A1C and reduced risk of birth defects, preterm delivery, perinatal mortality, small-for-gestational-age births, and neonatal intensive care unit admission (8).

There are opportunities to educate all women and adolescents of reproductive age with diabetes about the risks of unplanned pregnancies and about improved maternal and fetal outcomes with pregnancy planning (9). Effective preconception counseling could avert substantial health and associated cost burdens in offspring (10). Family planning should be discussed, including the benefits of long-acting, reversible contraception, and effective contraception should be prescribed and used until a woman is prepared and ready to become pregnant (11–15).

To minimize the occurrence of complications, beginning at the onset of puberty or at diagnosis, all girls and women with diabetes of childbearing potential should receive education about 1) the risks of

malformations associated with unplanned pregnancies and even mild hyperglycemia and 2) the use of effective contraception at all times when preventing a pregnancy. Preconception counseling using developmentally appropriate educational tools enables adolescent girls to make well-informed decisions (9). Preconception counseling resources tailored for adolescents are available at no cost through the American Diabetes Association (ADA) (16).

### Preconception Care

#### Recommendations

- 15.4** Women with preexisting diabetes who are planning a pregnancy should ideally be managed beginning in preconception in a multidisciplinary clinic including an endocrinologist, maternal-fetal medicine specialist, registered dietitian nutritionist, and diabetes care and education specialist, when available. **B**
- 15.5** In addition to focused attention on achieving glycemic targets **A**, standard preconception care should be augmented with extra focus on nutrition, diabetes education, and screening for diabetes comorbidities and complications. **E**
- 15.6** Women with preexisting type 1 or type 2 diabetes who are planning pregnancy or who have become pregnant should be counseled on the risk of development and/or progression of diabetic retinopathy. Dilated eye examinations should occur ideally before pregnancy or in the first trimester, and then patients should be monitored every trimester and for 1 year postpartum as indicated by the degree of retinopathy and as recommended by the eye care provider. **B**

The importance of preconception care for all women is highlighted by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) Committee Opinion 762, “Prepregnancy Counseling” (17). A key point is the need to incorporate a question about a woman’s plans for

pregnancy into routine primary and gynecologic care. The preconception care of women with diabetes should include the standard screenings and care recommended for all women planning pregnancy (17). Prescription of prenatal vitamins (with at least 400 μg of folic acid and 150 μg of potassium iodide [18]) is recommended prior to conception. Review and counseling on the use of nicotine products, alcohol, and recreational drugs, including marijuana, is important. Standard care includes screening for sexually transmitted diseases and thyroid disease, recommended vaccinations, routine genetic screening, a careful review of all prescription and nonprescription medications and supplements used, and a review of travel history and plans with special attention to areas known to have Zika virus, as outlined by ACOG. See **Table 15.1** for additional details on elements of preconception care (17,19). Counseling on the specific risks of obesity in pregnancy and lifestyle interventions to prevent and treat obesity, including referral to a registered dietitian nutritionist (RD/RDN), is recommended when indicated.

Diabetes-specific counseling should include an explanation of the risks to mother and fetus related to pregnancy and the ways to reduce risk, including glycemic goal setting, lifestyle and behavioral management, and medical nutrition therapy. The most important diabetes-specific component of preconception care is the attainment of glycemic goals prior to conception. Diabetes-specific testing should include A1C, creatinine, and urinary albumin-to-creatinine ratio. Special attention should be paid to the review of the medication list for potentially harmful drugs (i.e., ACE inhibitors [20,21], angiotensin receptor blockers [20], and statins [22,23]). A referral for a comprehensive eye exam is recommended. Women with preexisting diabetic retinopathy will need close monitoring during pregnancy to assess for progression of retinopathy and provide treatment if indicated (24).

Several studies have shown improved diabetes and pregnancy outcomes when care has been delivered from preconception through pregnancy by a multidisciplinary group focused on improved glycemic control (25–28). One study showed that care of preexisting diabetes in clinics that included diabetes

and obstetric specialists improved care (28). However, there is no consensus on the structure of multidisciplinary team care for diabetes and pregnancy, and there is a lack of evidence on the impact on outcomes of various methods of health care delivery (29).

## GLYCEMIC TARGETS IN PREGNANCY

### Recommendations

**15.7** Fasting and postprandial self-monitoring of blood glucose are recommended in both gestational diabetes mellitus and preexisting diabetes in pregnancy to achieve optimal glucose levels. Glucose targets are fasting plasma glucose <95 mg/dL (5.3 mmol/L) and either 1-h postprandial glucose <140 mg/dL (7.8 mmol/L) or 2-h postprandial glucose <120 mg/dL (6.7 mmol/L). Some women with preexisting diabetes should also test blood glucose preprandially. **B**

**15.8** Due to increased red blood cell turnover, A1C is slightly lower in normal pregnancy than in normal nonpregnant women. Ideally, the A1C target in pregnancy is <6% (42 mmol/mol) if this can be achieved without significant hypoglycemia, but the target may be relaxed to <7% (53 mmol/mol) if necessary to prevent hypoglycemia. **B**

**15.9** When used in addition to pre- and postprandial blood glucose monitoring, continuous glucose monitoring can help to achieve A1C targets in diabetes and pregnancy. **B**

**15.10** When used in addition to blood glucose monitoring targeting traditional pre- and postprandial targets, real-time continuous glucose monitoring can reduce macrosomia and neonatal hypoglycemia in pregnancy complicated by type 1 diabetes. **B**

**15.11** Continuous glucose monitoring metrics may be used in addition to but should not be used as a substitute for

**Table 15.1—Checklist for preconception care for women with diabetes (17,19)**

### Preconception education should include:

- Comprehensive nutrition assessment and recommendations for:
  - Overweight/obesity or underweight
  - Meal planning
  - Correction of dietary nutritional deficiencies
  - Caffeine intake
  - Safe food preparation technique
- Lifestyle recommendations for:
  - Regular moderate exercise
  - Avoidance of hyperthermia (hot tubs)
  - Adequate sleep
- Comprehensive diabetes self-management education
- Counseling on diabetes in pregnancy per current standards, including: natural history of insulin resistance in pregnancy and postpartum; preconception glycemic targets; avoidance of DKA/severe hyperglycemia; avoidance of severe hypoglycemia; progression of retinopathy; PCOS (if applicable); fertility in patients with diabetes; genetics of diabetes; risks to pregnancy including miscarriage, still birth, congenital malformations, macrosomia, preterm labor and delivery, hypertensive disorders in pregnancy, etc.
- Supplementation
  - Folic acid supplement (400 µg routine)
  - Appropriate use of over-the-counter medications and supplements

### Medical assessment and plan should include:

- General evaluation of overall health
- Evaluation of diabetes and its comorbidities and complications, including: DKA/severe hyperglycemia; severe hypoglycemia/hypoglycemia unawareness; barriers to care; comorbidities such as hyperlipidemia, hypertension, NAFLD, PCOS, and thyroid dysfunction; complications such as macrovascular disease, nephropathy, neuropathy (including autonomic bowel and bladder dysfunction), and retinopathy
- Evaluation of obstetric/gynecologic history, including history of: cesarean section, congenital malformations or fetal loss, current methods of contraception, hypertensive disorders of pregnancy, postpartum hemorrhage, preterm delivery, previous macrosomia, Rh incompatibility, and thrombotic events (DVT/PE)
- Review of current medications and appropriateness during pregnancy

### Screening should include:

- Diabetes complications and comorbidities, including: comprehensive foot exam; comprehensive ophthalmologic exam; ECG in women starting at age 35 years who have cardiac signs/symptoms or risk factors and, if abnormal, further evaluation; lipid panel; serum creatinine; TSH; and urine protein-to-creatinine ratio
- Anemia
- Genetic carrier status (based on history):
  - Cystic fibrosis
  - Sickle cell anemia
  - Tay-Sachs disease
  - Thalassemia
  - Others if indicated
- Infectious disease
  - *Neisseria gonorrhoea/Chlamydia trachomatis*
  - Hepatitis C
  - HIV
  - Pap smear
  - Syphilis

### Immunizations should include:

- Rubella
- Varicella
- Hepatitis B
- Influenza
- Others if indicated

### Preconception plan should include:

- Nutrition and medication plan to achieve glycemic targets prior to conception, including appropriate implementation of monitoring, continuous glucose monitoring, and pump technology
- Contraceptive plan to prevent pregnancy until glycemic targets are achieved
- Management plan for general health, gynecologic concerns, comorbid conditions, or complications, if present, including: hypertension, nephropathy, retinopathy; Rh incompatibility; and thyroid dysfunction

DKA, diabetic ketoacidosis; DVT/PE, deep vein thrombosis/pulmonary embolism; ECG, electrocardiogram; NAFLD, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease; PCOS, polycystic ovary syndrome; TSH, thyroid-stimulating hormone.



self-monitoring of blood glucose to achieve optimal pre- and postprandial glycemic targets. **E**

**15.12** Commonly used estimated A1C and glucose management indicator calculations should not be used in pregnancy as estimates of A1C. **C**

Pregnancy in women with normal glucose metabolism is characterized by fasting levels of blood glucose that are lower than in the nonpregnant state, due to insulin-independent glucose uptake by the fetus and placenta, and by mild postprandial hyperglycemia and carbohydrate intolerance as a result of diabetogenic placental hormones. In patients with preexisting diabetes, glycemic targets are usually achieved through a combination of insulin administration and medical nutrition therapy. Because glycemic targets in pregnancy are stricter than in nonpregnant individuals, it is important that women with diabetes eat consistent amounts of carbohydrates to match with insulin dosage and to avoid hyperglycemia or hypoglycemia. Referral to an RD/RDN is important in order to establish a food plan and insulin-to-carbohydrate ratio and to determine weight gain goals.

### Insulin Physiology

Given that early pregnancy is a time of enhanced insulin sensitivity and lower glucose levels, many women with type 1 diabetes will have lower insulin requirements and an increased risk for hypoglycemia (30). Around 16 weeks, insulin resistance begins to increase, and total daily insulin doses increase linearly ~5% per week through week 36. This usually results in a doubling of daily insulin dose compared with the pre-pregnancy requirement. The insulin requirement levels off toward the end of the third trimester with placental aging. A rapid reduction in insulin requirements can indicate the development of placental insufficiency (31). In women with normal pancreatic function, insulin production is sufficient to meet the challenge of this physiological insulin resistance and to maintain normal glucose levels. However, in women

with diabetes, hyperglycemia occurs if treatment is not adjusted appropriately.

### Glucose Monitoring

Reflecting this physiology, fasting and postprandial monitoring of blood glucose is recommended to achieve metabolic control in pregnant women with diabetes. Preprandial testing is also recommended when using insulin pumps or basal-bolus therapy so that premeal rapid-acting insulin dosage can be adjusted. Postprandial monitoring is associated with better glycemic control and a lower risk of preeclampsia (32–34). There are no adequately powered randomized trials comparing different fasting and postmeal glycemic targets in diabetes in pregnancy.

Similar to the targets recommended by ACOG (upper limits are the same as for GDM, described below) (35), the ADA-recommended targets for women with type 1 or type 2 diabetes are as follows:

- Fasting glucose 70–95 mg/dL (3.9–5.3 mmol/L) and either
- One-hour postprandial glucose 110–140 mg/dL (6.1–7.8 mmol/L) or
- Two-hour postprandial glucose 100–120 mg/dL (5.6–6.7 mmol/L)

Lower limits are based on the mean of normal blood glucose in pregnancy (36). Lower limits do not apply to diet-controlled type 2 diabetes. Hypoglycemia in pregnancy is as defined and treated in Recommendations 6.9–6.14 (Section 6, “Glycemic Targets,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S006>). These values represent optimal control if they can be achieved safely. In practice, it may be challenging for women with type 1 diabetes to achieve these targets without hypoglycemia, particularly women with a history of recurrent hypoglycemia or hypoglycemia unawareness. If women cannot achieve these targets without significant hypoglycemia, the ADA suggests less stringent targets based on clinical experience and individualization of care.

### A1C in Pregnancy

In studies of women without preexisting diabetes, increasing A1C levels within the normal range are associated with adverse outcomes (37). In the Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome

(HAPO) study, increasing levels of glycemia were also associated with worsening outcomes (38). Observational studies in preexisting diabetes and pregnancy show the lowest rates of adverse fetal outcomes in association with A1C <6–6.5% (42–48 mmol/mol) early in gestation (4–6,39). Clinical trials have not evaluated the risks and benefits of achieving these targets, and treatment goals should account for the risk of maternal hypoglycemia in setting an individualized target of <6% (42 mmol/mol) to <7% (53 mmol/mol). Due to physiological increases in red blood cell turnover, A1C levels fall during normal pregnancy (40,41). Additionally, as A1C represents an integrated measure of glucose, it may not fully capture postprandial hyperglycemia, which drives macrosomia. Thus, although A1C may be useful, it should be used as a secondary measure of glycemic control in pregnancy, after blood glucose monitoring.

In the second and third trimesters, A1C <6% (42 mmol/mol) has the lowest risk of large-for-gestational-age infants (39,42,43), preterm delivery (44), and preeclampsia (1,45). Taking all of this into account, a target of <6% (42 mmol/mol) is optimal during pregnancy if it can be achieved without significant hypoglycemia. The A1C target in a given patient should be achieved without hypoglycemia, which, in addition to the usual adverse sequelae, may increase the risk of low birth weight (46). Given the alteration in red blood cell kinetics during pregnancy and physiological changes in glycemic parameters, A1C levels may need to be monitored more frequently than usual (e.g., monthly).

### Continuous Glucose Monitoring in Pregnancy

CONCEPTT (Continuous Glucose Monitoring in Pregnant Women With Type 1 Diabetes Trial) was a randomized controlled trial (RCT) of real-time continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) in addition to standard care, including optimization of pre- and postprandial glucose targets versus standard care for pregnant women with type 1 diabetes. It demonstrated the value of real-time CGM in pregnancy complicated by type 1 diabetes by showing a mild improvement in A1C without an increase in hypoglycemia and reductions in large-for-gestational-age births, length of stay,

and neonatal hypoglycemia (47). An observational cohort study that evaluated the glycemic variables reported using CGM 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 (48). Use of the CGM-reported mean glucose is superior to the use of estimated A1C, glucose management indicator, and other calculations to estimate A1C given the changes to A1C that occur in pregnancy (49). CGM time in range (TIR) can be used for assessment of glycemic control in patients with type 1 diabetes, but it does not provide actionable data to address fasting and postprandial hypoglycemia or hyperglycemia. There are no data to support the use of TIR in women with type 2 diabetes or GDM.

The international consensus on time in range (50) endorses pregnancy target ranges and goals for TIR for patients with type 1 diabetes using CGM as reported on the ambulatory glucose profile; however, it does not specify the type or accuracy of the device or need for alarms and alerts. Selection of CGM device should be individualized based on patient circumstances.

- Target range 63–140 mg/dL (3.5–7.8 mmol/L): TIR, goal >70%
- Time below range (<63 mg/dL [3.5 mmol/L]), goal <4%
- Time below range (<54 mg/dL [3.0 mmol/L]), goal <1%
- Time above range (>140 mg/dL [7.8 mmol/L]), goal <25%

## MANAGEMENT OF GESTATIONAL DIABETES MELLITUS

### Recommendations

**15.13** Lifestyle behavior change is an essential component of management of gestational diabetes mellitus and may suffice for the treatment of many women. Insulin should be added if needed to achieve glycemic targets. **A**

**15.14** Insulin is the preferred medication for treating hyperglycemia in gestational diabetes mellitus. Metformin and glyburide should not be used as first-line agents, as both cross

the placenta to the fetus. **A** Other oral and noninsulin injectable glucose-lowering medications lack long-term safety data.

**15.15** Metformin, when used to treat polycystic ovary syndrome and induce ovulation, should be discontinued by the end of the first trimester. **A**

**15.16** Telehealth visits for pregnant women with gestational diabetes mellitus improve outcomes compared with standard in-person care. **A**

GDM is characterized by increased risk of large-for-gestational-age birth weight and neonatal and pregnancy complications and an increased risk of long-term maternal type 2 diabetes and offspring abnormal glucose metabolism in childhood. These associations with maternal oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) results are continuous with no clear inflection points (38,51). Offspring with exposure to untreated GDM have reduced insulin sensitivity and  $\beta$ -cell compensation and are more likely to have impaired glucose tolerance in childhood (52). In other words, short-term and long-term risks increase with progressive maternal hyperglycemia. Therefore, all women should be screened as outlined in Section 2, “Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>). Although there is some heterogeneity, many RCTs and a Cochrane review suggest that the risk of GDM may be reduced by diet, exercise, and lifestyle counseling, particularly when interventions are started during the first or early in the second trimester (53–55). There are no intervention trials in offspring of mothers with GDM. A meta-analysis of 11 RCTs demonstrated that metformin treatment in pregnancy does not reduce the risk of GDM in high-risk women with obesity, polycystic ovary syndrome, or preexisting insulin resistance (56). A meta-analysis of 32 RCTs evaluating the effectiveness of telehealth visits for GDM demonstrated reduction of incidences of cesarean delivery, neonatal hypoglycemia, premature rupture of membranes, macrosomia, pregnancy-induced hypertension or preeclampsia, preterm birth, neonatal asphyxia, and polyhy-

dramnios compared with standard in-person care (57).

### Lifestyle and Behavioral Management

After diagnosis, treatment starts with medical nutrition therapy, physical activity, and weight management, depending on pregestational weight, as outlined in the section below on preexisting type 2 diabetes, as well as glucose monitoring aiming for the targets recommended by the Fifth International Workshop-Conference on Gestational Diabetes Mellitus (58):

- Fasting glucose <95 mg/dL (5.3 mmol/L) and either
- One-hour postprandial glucose <140 mg/dL (7.8 mmol/L) or
- Two-hour postprandial glucose <120 mg/dL (6.7 mmol/L)

Glycemic target lower limits defined above for preexisting diabetes apply for GDM that is treated with insulin. Depending on the population, studies suggest that 70–85% of women diagnosed with GDM under Carpenter-Coustan criteria can control GDM with lifestyle modification alone; it is anticipated that this proportion will be even higher if the lower International Association of the Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups (59) diagnostic thresholds are used.

### Medical Nutrition Therapy

Medical nutrition therapy for GDM is an individualized nutrition plan developed between the woman and an RD/RDN familiar with the management of GDM (60,61). The food plan should provide adequate calorie intake to promote fetal/neonatal and maternal health, achieve glycemic goals, and promote weight gain according to 2009 Institute of Medicine recommendations (62). There is no definitive research that identifies a specific optimal calorie intake for women with GDM or suggests that their calorie needs are different from those of pregnant women without GDM. The food plan should be based on a nutrition assessment with guidance from the Dietary Reference Intakes (DRI). The DRI for all pregnant women recommends a minimum of 175 g of carbohydrate, a minimum of 71 g of protein, and 28 g of fiber. The diet should emphasize

monounsaturated and polyunsaturated fats while limiting saturated fats and avoiding *trans* fats. As is true for all nutrition therapy in patients with diabetes, the amount and type of carbohydrate will impact glucose levels. The current recommended amount of carbohydrate is 175 g, or ~35% of a 2,000-calorie diet. Liberalizing higher quality, nutrient-dense carbohydrates results in controlled fasting/postprandial glucose, lower free fatty acids, improved insulin action, and vascular benefits and may reduce excess infant adiposity. Mothers who substitute fat for carbohydrate may unintentionally enhance lipolysis, promote elevated free fatty acids, and worsen maternal insulin resistance (63,64). Fasting urine ketone testing may be useful to identify women who are severely restricting carbohydrates to control blood glucose. Simple carbohydrates will result in higher post-meal excursions.

### Physical Activity

A systematic review demonstrated improvements in glucose control and reductions in need to start insulin or insulin dose requirements with an exercise intervention. There was heterogeneity in the types of effective exercise (aerobic, resistance, or both) and duration of exercise (20–50 min/day, 2–7 days/week of moderate intensity) (65).

### Pharmacologic Therapy

Treatment of GDM with lifestyle and insulin has been demonstrated to improve perinatal outcomes in two large randomized studies as summarized in a U.S. Preventive Services Task Force review (66). Insulin is the first-line agent recommended for treatment of GDM in the U.S. While individual RCTs support limited efficacy of metformin (67,68) and glyburide (69) in reducing glucose levels for the treatment of GDM, these agents are not recommended as first-line treatment for GDM because they are known to cross the placenta and data on long-term safety for offspring is of some concern (35). Furthermore, glyburide and metformin failed to provide adequate glycemic control in separate RCTs in 23% and 25–28% of women with GDM, respectively (70,71).

### Sulfonylureas

Sulfonylureas are known to cross the placenta and have been associated with increased neonatal hypoglycemia. Concentrations of glyburide in umbilical cord plasma are approximately 50–70% of maternal levels (70,71). Glyburide was associated with a higher rate of neonatal hypoglycemia, macrosomia, and increased neonatal abdominal circumference than insulin or metformin in meta-analyses and systematic reviews (72,73).

Glyburide failed to be found noninferior to insulin based on a composite outcome of neonatal hypoglycemia, macrosomia, and hyperbilirubinemia (74). Long-term safety data for offspring exposed to glyburide are not available (74).

### Metformin

Metformin was associated with a lower risk of neonatal hypoglycemia and less maternal weight gain than insulin in systematic reviews (72,75–77). However, metformin readily crosses the placenta, resulting in umbilical cord blood levels of metformin as high or higher than simultaneous maternal levels (78,79). In the Metformin in Gestational Diabetes: The Offspring Follow-Up (MiG TOFU) study's analyses of 7- to 9-year-old offspring, the 9-year-old offspring exposed to metformin for the treatment of GDM in the Auckland cohort were heavier and had a higher waist-to-height ratio and waist circumference than those exposed to insulin (80). This difference was not found in the Adelaide cohort. In two RCTs of metformin use in pregnancy for polycystic ovary syndrome, follow-up of 4-year-old offspring demonstrated higher BMI and increased obesity in the offspring exposed to metformin (81,82). A follow-up study at 5–10 years showed that the offspring had higher BMI, weight-to-height ratios, waist circumferences, and a borderline increase in fat mass (82,83). A recent meta-analysis concluded that metformin exposure resulted in smaller neonates with an acceleration of postnatal growth, resulting in higher BMI in childhood (82).

Randomized, double-blind, controlled trials comparing metformin with other therapies for ovulation induction in women with polycystic ovary syndrome have not demonstrated benefit in preventing spontaneous abortion or GDM

(84), and there is no evidence-based need to continue metformin in such patients (85–87).

There are some women with GDM requiring medical therapy who, due to cost, language barriers, comprehension, or cultural influences, may not be able to use insulin safely or effectively in pregnancy. Oral agents may be an alternative in these women after a discussion of the known risks and the need for more long-term safety data in offspring. However, due to the potential for growth restriction or acidosis in the setting of placental insufficiency, metformin should not be used in women with hypertension or preeclampsia or at risk for intrauterine growth restriction (88,89).

### Insulin

Insulin use should follow the guidelines below. Both multiple daily insulin injections and continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion are reasonable delivery strategies, and neither has been shown to be superior to the other during pregnancy (90).

## MANAGEMENT OF PREEXISTING TYPE 1 DIABETES AND TYPE 2 DIABETES IN PREGNANCY

### Insulin Use

#### Recommendations

**15.17** Insulin should be used for management of type 1 diabetes in pregnancy. **A** Insulin is the preferred agent for the management of type 2 diabetes in pregnancy. **B**

**15.18** Either multiple daily injections or insulin pump technology can be used in pregnancy complicated by type 1 diabetes. **C**

The physiology of pregnancy necessitates frequent titration of insulin to match changing requirements and underscores the importance of daily and frequent blood glucose monitoring. Due to the complexity of insulin management in pregnancy, referral to a specialized center offering team-based care (with team members including maternal-fetal medicine specialist, endocrinologist or other provider experienced in managing pregnancy in women with preexisting diabetes, dietitian, nurse, and social worker, as



needed) is recommended if this resource is available.

None of the currently available human insulin preparations have been demonstrated to cross the placenta (90–95). Insulins studied in RCTs are preferred (96–99) over those studied in cohort studies (100), which are preferred over those studied in case reports only.

While many providers prefer insulin pumps in pregnancy, it is not clear that they are superior to multiple daily injections (101,102). Insulin pumps that allow for the achievement of pregnancy fasting and postprandial glycemic targets may reduce hypoglycemia and allow for more aggressive prandial dosing to achieve targets. Not all hybrid closed-loop pumps are able to achieve the pregnancy targets. None of the current hybrid closed-loop insulin pump systems achieve pregnancy targets. However, predictive low glucose suspend (PLGS) technology has been shown in nonpregnant people to be better than sensor augment technology (SAP) for reducing low glucoses (103). It may be suited for pregnancy because the predict low glucose threshold for suspending insulin is in the range of premeal and overnight glucoses targets in pregnancy and may allow for more aggressive prandial dosing.

### Type 1 Diabetes

Women with type 1 diabetes have an increased risk of hypoglycemia in the first trimester and, like all women, have altered counterregulatory response in pregnancy that may decrease hypoglycemia awareness. Education for patients and family members about the prevention, recognition, and treatment of hypoglycemia is important before, during, and after pregnancy to help to prevent and manage the risks of hypoglycemia. Insulin resistance drops rapidly with delivery of the placenta.

Pregnancy is a ketogenic state, and women with type 1 diabetes, and to a lesser extent those with type 2 diabetes, are at risk for diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) at lower blood glucose levels than in the nonpregnant state. Women with type 1 diabetes should be prescribed ketone strips and receive education on DKA prevention and detection. DKA carries a high risk of stillbirth.

Women in DKA who are unable to eat often require 10% dextrose with an insulin drip to adequately meet the higher carbohydrate demands of the placenta and fetus in the third trimester in order to resolve their ketosis.

Retinopathy is a special concern in pregnancy. The necessary rapid implementation of euglycemia in the setting of retinopathy is associated with worsening of retinopathy (24).

### Type 2 Diabetes

Type 2 diabetes is often associated with obesity. Recommended weight gain during pregnancy for women with overweight is 15–25 lb and for women with obesity is 10–20 lb (62). There are no adequate data on optimal weight gain versus weight maintenance in women with BMI >35 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.

Glycemic control is often easier to achieve in women with type 2 diabetes than in those with type 1 diabetes but can require much higher doses of insulin, sometimes necessitating concentrated insulin formulations. Insulin is the preferred treatment for type 2 diabetes in pregnancy. An RCT of metformin added to insulin for the treatment of type 2 diabetes found less maternal weight gain and fewer cesarean births. There were fewer macrosomic neonates, but there was a doubling of small-for-gestational-age neonates (104). As in type 1 diabetes, insulin requirements drop dramatically after delivery.

The risk for associated hypertension and other comorbidities may be as high or higher with type 2 diabetes as with type 1 diabetes, even if diabetes is better controlled and of shorter apparent duration, with pregnancy loss appearing to be more prevalent in the third trimester in women with type 2 diabetes, compared with the first trimester in women with type 1 diabetes (105,106).

## PRECLAMPسيا AND ASPIRIN

### Insulin Use

#### Recommendation

**15.19** Women with type 1 or type 2 diabetes should be prescribed low-dose aspirin 100–150 mg/day starting at 12 to 16 weeks of gestation to lower the risk of preeclampsia. **E** A dosage of 162

mg/day may be acceptable **E**; currently, in the U.S., low-dose aspirin is available in 81-mg tablets.

Diabetes in pregnancy is associated with an increased risk of preeclampsia (107). The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force recommends the use of low-dose aspirin (81 mg/day) as a preventive medication at 12 weeks of gestation in women who are at high risk for preeclampsia (108). However, a meta-analysis and an additional trial demonstrate that low-dose aspirin <100 mg is not effective in reducing preeclampsia. Low-dose aspirin >100 mg is required (109–111). A cost-benefit analysis has concluded that this approach would reduce morbidity, save lives, and lower health care costs (112). However, there are insufficient data regarding the benefits of aspirin in women with preexisting diabetes (110). More studies are needed to assess the long-term effects of prenatal aspirin exposure on offspring (113).

## PREGNANCY AND DRUG CONSIDERATIONS

### Recommendations

**15.20** In pregnant patients with diabetes and chronic hypertension, a blood pressure target of 110–135/85 mmHg is suggested in the interest of reducing the risk for accelerated maternal hypertension **A** and minimizing impaired fetal growth. **E**

**15.21** Potentially harmful medications in pregnancy (i.e., ACE inhibitors, angiotensin receptor blockers, statins) should be stopped at conception and avoided in sexually active women of child-bearing age who are not using reliable contraception. **B**

In normal pregnancy, blood pressure is lower than in the nonpregnant state. In a pregnancy complicated by diabetes and chronic hypertension, a target goal blood pressure of 110–135/85 mmHg is suggested to reduce the risk of uncontrolled maternal hypertension and minimize impaired fetal growth (114–116). The 2015 study (116) excluded pregnancies complicated by



preexisting diabetes, and only 6% had GDM at enrollment. There was no difference in pregnancy loss, neonatal care, or other neonatal outcomes between the groups with tighter versus less tight control of hypertension (116).

During pregnancy, treatment with ACE inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers is contraindicated because they may cause fetal renal dysplasia, oligohydramnios, pulmonary hypoplasia, and intrauterine growth restriction (20).

A large study found that after adjusting for confounders, first trimester ACE inhibitor exposure does not appear to be associated with congenital malformations (21). However, ACE inhibitors and angiotensin receptor blockers should be stopped as soon as possible in the first trimester to avoid second and third trimester fetopathy (21). Antihypertensive drugs known to be effective and safe in pregnancy include methyldopa, nifedipine, labetalol, diltiazem, clonidine, and prazosin. Atenolol is not recommended, but other  $\beta$ -blockers may be used, if necessary. Chronic diuretic use during pregnancy is not recommended as it has been associated with restricted maternal plasma volume, which may reduce uteroplacental perfusion (117). On the basis of available evidence, statins should also be avoided in pregnancy (118).

See pregnancy and antihypertensive medications in Section 10, "Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S010>), for more information on managing blood pressure in pregnancy.

## POSTPARTUM CARE

### Recommendations

**15.22** Insulin resistance decreases dramatically immediately postpartum, and insulin requirements need to be evaluated and adjusted as they are often roughly half the prepregnancy requirements for the initial few days postpartum. **C**

**15.23** A contraceptive plan should be discussed and implemented with all women with diabetes of reproductive potential. **A**

**15.24** Screen women with a recent history of gestational diabetes

mellitus at 4–12 weeks postpartum, using the 75-g oral glucose tolerance test and clinically appropriate nonpregnancy diagnostic criteria. **B**

**15.25** Women with a history of gestational diabetes mellitus found to have prediabetes should receive intensive lifestyle interventions and/or metformin to prevent diabetes. **A**

**15.26** Women with a history of gestational diabetes mellitus should have lifelong screening for the development of type 2 diabetes or prediabetes every 1–3 years. **B**

**15.27** Women with a history of gestational diabetes mellitus should seek preconception screening for diabetes and preconception care to identify and treat hyperglycemia and prevent congenital malformations. **E**

**15.28** Postpartum care should include psychosocial assessment and support for self-care. **E**

## Gestational Diabetes Mellitus

### Initial Testing

Because GDM often represents previously undiagnosed prediabetes, type 2 diabetes, maturity-onset diabetes of the young, or even developing type 1 diabetes, women with GDM should be tested for persistent diabetes or prediabetes at 4–12 weeks postpartum with a fasting 75-g OGTT using nonpregnancy criteria as outlined in Section 2, "Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>), specifically **Table 2.2**. In the absence of unequivocal hyperglycemia, a positive screen for diabetes requires two abnormal values. If both the fasting plasma glucose ( $\geq 126$  mg/dL [7.0 mmol/L]) and 2-h plasma glucose ( $\geq 200$  mg/dL [11.1 mmol/L]) are abnormal in a single screening test, then the diagnosis of diabetes is made. If only one abnormal value in the OGTT meets diabetes criteria, the test should be repeated to confirm that the abnormality persists.

### Postpartum Follow-up

The OGTT is recommended over A1C at 4–12 weeks postpartum because A1C may be persistently impacted (lowered

by the increased red blood cell turnover related to pregnancy, by blood loss at delivery, or by the preceding 3-month glucose profile. The OGTT is more sensitive at detecting glucose intolerance, including both prediabetes and diabetes. Women of reproductive age with prediabetes may develop type 2 diabetes by the time of their next pregnancy and will need preconception evaluation. Because GDM is associated with an increased lifetime maternal risk for diabetes estimated at 50–60% (119,120), women should also be tested every 1–3 years thereafter if the 4–12 weeks postpartum 75-g OGTT is normal. Ongoing evaluation may be performed with any recommended glycemic test (e.g., annual A1C, annual fasting plasma glucose, or triennial 75-g OGTT using nonpregnant thresholds).

### Gestational Diabetes Mellitus and Type 2 Diabetes

Women with a history of GDM have a greatly increased risk of conversion to type 2 diabetes over time (120). Women with GDM have a 10-fold increased risk of developing type 2 diabetes compared with women without GDM (119). Absolute risk increases linearly through a woman's lifetime, being approximately 20% at 10 years, 30% at 20 years, 40% at 30 years, 50% at 40 years, and 60% at 50 years (120). In the prospective Nurses' Health Study II (NHS II), subsequent diabetes risk after a history of GDM was significantly lower in women who followed healthy eating patterns (121). Adjusting for BMI attenuated this association moderately, but not completely. Interpregnancy or postpartum weight gain is associated with increased risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes in subsequent pregnancies (122) and earlier progression to type 2 diabetes.

Both metformin and intensive lifestyle intervention prevent or delay progression to diabetes in women with prediabetes and a history of GDM. Of women with a history of GDM and prediabetes, only 5–6 women need to be treated with either intervention to prevent one case of diabetes over 3 years (123). In these women, lifestyle intervention and metformin reduced progression to diabetes by 35% and 40%, respectively, over 10 years compared with placebo (124). If the pregnancy has motivated the adoption of a healthier diet, building on these gains to support

weight loss is recommended in the postpartum period.

### Preexisting Type 1 and Type 2 Diabetes

Insulin sensitivity increases dramatically with delivery of the placenta. In one study, insulin requirements in the immediate postpartum period are roughly 34% lower than prepregnancy insulin requirements (125). Insulin sensitivity then returns to prepregnancy levels over the following 1–2 weeks. In women taking insulin, particular attention should be directed to hypoglycemia prevention in the setting of breastfeeding and erratic sleep and eating schedules (126).

### Lactation

In light of the immediate nutritional and immunological benefits of breastfeeding for the baby, all women, including those with diabetes, should be supported in attempts to breastfeed. Breastfeeding may also confer longer-term metabolic benefits to both mother (127) and offspring (128). However, lactation can increase the risk of overnight hypoglycemia, and insulin dosing may need to be adjusted.

### Contraception

A major barrier to effective preconception care is the fact that the majority of pregnancies are unplanned. Planning pregnancy is critical in women with preexisting diabetes due to the need for preconception glycemic control to prevent congenital malformations and reduce the risk of other complications. Therefore, all women with diabetes of childbearing potential should have family planning options reviewed at regular intervals to make sure that effective contraception is implemented and maintained. This applies to women in the immediate postpartum period. Women with diabetes have the same contraception options and recommendations as those without diabetes. Long-acting, reversible contraception may be ideal for many women. The risk of an unplanned pregnancy outweighs the risk of any given contraception option.

### References

1. Dabelea D, Hanson RL, Lindsay RS, et al. Intrauterine exposure to diabetes conveys risks for type 2 diabetes and obesity: a study of discordant sibships. *Diabetes* 2000;49:2208–2211
2. Holmes VA, Young IS, Patterson CC, et al.; Diabetes and Pre-eclampsia Intervention Trial Study Group. Optimal glycemic control, pre-

eclampsia, and gestational hypertension in women with type 1 diabetes in the diabetes and pre-eclampsia intervention trial. *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1683–1688

3. Guerin A, Nisenbaum R, Ray JG. Use of maternal GHb concentration to estimate the risk of congenital anomalies in the offspring of women with prepregnancy diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:1920–1925
4. Jensen DM, Korsholm L, Ovesen P, et al. Periconceptional A1C and risk of serious adverse pregnancy outcome in 933 women with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1046–1048
5. Nielsen GL, Møller M, Sørensen HT. HbA<sub>1c</sub> in early diabetic pregnancy and pregnancy outcomes: a Danish population-based cohort study of 573 pregnancies in women with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2006;29:2612–2616
6. Suhonen L, Hiilesmaa V, Teramo K. Glycaemic control during early pregnancy and fetal malformations in women with type I diabetes mellitus. *Diabetologia* 2000;43:79–82
7. Ludvigsson JF, Neovius M, Söderling J, et al. Maternal glycemic control in type 1 diabetes and the risk for preterm birth: a population-based cohort study. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;170:691–701
8. Wahabi HA, Fayed A, Esmail S, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of pre-pregnancy care for women with diabetes for improving maternal and perinatal outcomes. *PLoS One* 2020;15:e0237571
9. Charron-Prochownik D, Sereika SM, Becker D, et al. Long-term effects of the booster-enhanced READY-Girls preconception counseling program on intentions and behaviors for family planning in teens with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:3870–3874
10. Peterson C, Grosse SD, Li R, et al. Preventable health and cost burden of adverse birth outcomes associated with pregestational diabetes in the United States. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2015;212:74.e1–74.e9
11. Britton LE, Hussey JM, Berry DC, Crandell JL, Brooks JL, Bryant AG. Contraceptive use among women with prediabetes and diabetes in a US national sample. *J Midwifery Womens Health* 2019;64:36–45
12. Morris JR, Tepper NK. Description and comparison of postpartum use of effective contraception among women with and without diabetes. *Contraception* 2019;100:474–479
13. Goldstuck ND, Steyn PS. The intrauterine device in women with diabetes mellitus type i and ii: a systematic review. *ISRN Obstet Gynecol* 2013;2013:814062
14. Wu JP, Moniz MH, Ursu AN. Long-acting reversible contraception—highly efficacious, safe, and underutilized. *JAMA* 2018;320:397–398
15. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Committee on Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 201: Pregestational diabetes mellitus. *Obstet Gynecol* 2018;132:e228–e248
16. Charron-Prochownik D, Downs J. Diabetes and Reproductive Health for Girls. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2016
17. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Committee on Gynecologic Practice; American Society for Reproductive Medicine. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 762: Prepregnancy counseling. *Obstet Gynecol* 2019;133:e78–e89

18. Alexander EK, Pearce EN, Brent GA, et al. 2017 guidelines of the American Thyroid Association for the diagnosis and management of thyroid disease during pregnancy and the postpartum. *Thyroid* 2017;27:315–389
19. Ramos DE. Preconception health: changing the paradigm on well-woman health. *Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am* 2019;46:399–408
20. Bullo M, Tschumi S, Bucher BS, Bianchetti MG, Simonetti GD. Pregnancy outcome following exposure to angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors or angiotensin receptor antagonists: a systematic review. *Hypertension* 2012;60:444–450
21. Bateman BT, Patorno E, Desai RJ, et al. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and the risk of congenital malformations. *Obstet Gynecol* 2017;129:174–184
22. Taguchi N, Rubin ET, Hosokawa A, et al. Prenatal exposure to HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors: effects on fetal and neonatal outcomes. *Reprod Toxicol* 2008;26:175–177
23. Bateman BT, Hernandez-Diaz S, Fischer MA, et al. Statins and congenital malformations: cohort study. *BMJ* 2015;350:h1035
24. Chew EY, Mills JL, Metzger BE, et al.; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Diabetes in Early Pregnancy Study. Metabolic control and progression of retinopathy. *The Diabetes in Early Pregnancy Study*. *Diabetes Care* 1995;18:631–637
25. McElvy SS, Miodovnik M, Rosenn B, et al. A focused preconceptional and early pregnancy program in women with type 1 diabetes reduces perinatal mortality and malformation rates to general population levels. *J Matern Fetal Med* 2000;9:14–20
26. Murphy HR, Roland JM, Skinner TC, et al. Effectiveness of a regional prepregnancy care program in women with type 1 and type 2 diabetes: benefits beyond glycemic control. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:2514–2520
27. Elixhauser A, Weschler JM, Kitzmiller JL, et al. Cost-benefit analysis of preconception care for women with established diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 1993;16:1146–1157
28. Owens LA, Avalos G, Kirwan B, Carmody L, Dunne F. ATLANTIC DIP: closing the loop: a change in clinical practice can improve outcomes for women with pregestational diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:1669–1671
29. Taylor C, McCance DR, Chappell L, et al. Implementation of guidelines for multidisciplinary team management of pregnancy in women with pre-existing diabetes or cardiac conditions: results from a UK national survey. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2017;17:434
30. García-Patterson A, Gich I, Amini SB, Catalano PM, de Leiva A, Corcoy R. Insulin requirements throughout pregnancy in women with type 1 diabetes mellitus: three changes of direction. *Diabetologia* 2010;53:446–451
31. Padmanabhan S, Lee VW, Mclean M, et al. The association of falling insulin requirements with maternal biomarkers and placental dysfunction: a prospective study of women with preexisting diabetes in pregnancy. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1323–1330
32. Manderson JG, Patterson CC, Hadden DR, Traub AI, Ennis C, McCance DR. Preprandial versus postprandial blood glucose monitoring in type 1 diabetic pregnancy: a randomized

- controlled clinical trial. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2003;189:507–512
33. de Veciana M, Major CA, Morgan MA, et al. Postprandial versus preprandial blood glucose monitoring in women with gestational diabetes mellitus requiring insulin therapy. *N Engl J Med* 1995;333:1237–1241
34. Jovanovic-Peterson L, Peterson CM, Reed GF, et al.; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development—Diabetes in Early Pregnancy Study. Maternal postprandial glucose levels and infant birth weight: the Diabetes in Early Pregnancy Study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1991;164:103–111
35. Committee on Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 190: Gestational diabetes mellitus. *Obstet Gynecol* 2018;131:e49–e64
36. Hernandez TL, Friedman JE, Van Pelt RE, Barbour LA. Patterns of glycemia in normal pregnancy: should the current therapeutic targets be challenged? *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:1660–1668
37. Ho Y-R, Wang P, Lu M-C, Tseng S-T, Yang C-P, Yan Y-H. Associations of mid-pregnancy HbA<sub>1c</sub> with gestational diabetes and risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes in high-risk Taiwanese women. *PLoS One* 2017;12:e0177563
38. Metzger BE, Lowe LP, Dyer AR, et al.; HAPO Study Cooperative Research Group. Hyperglycemia and adverse pregnancy outcomes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:1991–2002
39. Maresh MJA, Holmes VA, Patterson CC, et al.; Diabetes and Pre-eclampsia Intervention Trial Study Group. Glycemic targets in the second and third trimester of pregnancy for women with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:34–42
40. Nielsen LR, Ekbohm P, Damm P, et al. HbA<sub>1c</sub> levels are significantly lower in early and late pregnancy. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:1200–1201
41. Mosca A, Paleari R, Dalfrà MG, et al. Reference intervals for hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> in pregnant women: data from an Italian multicenter study. *Clin Chem* 2006;52:1138–1143
42. Hummel M, Marienfeld S, Huppmann M, et al. Fetal growth is increased by maternal type 1 diabetes and HLA DR4-related gene interactions. *Diabetologia* 2007;50:850–858
43. Cyganek K, Skupien J, Kutra B, et al. Risk of macrosomia remains glucose-dependent in a cohort of women with pregestational type 1 diabetes and good glycemic control. *Endocrine* 2017;55:447–455
44. Abell SK, Boyle JA, de Courten B, et al. Impact of type 2 diabetes, obesity and glycaemic control on pregnancy outcomes. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol* 2017;57:308–314
45. Temple RC, Aldridge V, Stanley K, Murphy HR. Glycaemic control throughout pregnancy and risk of pre-eclampsia in women with type 1 diabetes. *BJOG* 2006;113:1329–1332
46. Combs CA, Gunderson E, Kitzmiller JL, Gavin LA, Main EK. Relationship of fetal macrosomia to maternal postprandial glucose control during pregnancy. *Diabetes Care* 1992;15:1251–1257
47. Feig DS, Donovan LE, Corcoy R, et al.; CONCEPT Collaborative Group. Continuous glucose monitoring in pregnant women with type 1 diabetes (CONCEPT): a multicentre international randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2017;390:2347–2359
48. 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
49. 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
50. 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
51. Scholtens DM, Kuang A, Lowe LP, et al.; HAPO Follow-up Study Cooperative Research Group; HAPO Follow-Up Study Cooperative Research Group. Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome Follow-up Study (HAPO FUS): maternal glycemia and childhood glucose metabolism. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:381–392
52. Lowe WL Jr, Scholtens DM, Kuang A, et al.; HAPO Follow-up Study Cooperative Research Group. Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome Follow-up Study (HAPO FUS): maternal gestational diabetes mellitus and childhood glucose metabolism. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:372–380
53. Koivusalo SB, Rönö K, Klemetti MM, et al. Gestational diabetes mellitus can be prevented by lifestyle intervention: the Finnish Gestational Diabetes Prevention Study (RADIEL): a randomized controlled trial. *Diabetes Care* 2016;39:24–30
54. Wang C, Wei Y, Zhang X, et al. A randomized clinical trial of exercise during pregnancy to prevent gestational diabetes mellitus and improve pregnancy outcome in overweight and obese pregnant women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2017;216:340–351
55. Griffith RJ, Alsweller J, Moore AE, et al. Interventions to prevent women from developing gestational diabetes mellitus: an overview of Cochrane Reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;6:CD012394
56. Doi SAR, Furuya-Kanamori L, Toft E, et al. Metformin in pregnancy to avert gestational diabetes in women at high risk: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Obes Rev* 2020;21:e12964
57. Xie W, Dai P, Qin Y, Wu M, Yang B, Yu X. Effectiveness of telemedicine for pregnant women with gestational diabetes mellitus: an updated meta-analysis of 32 randomized controlled trials with trial sequential analysis. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 2020;20:198
58. Metzger BE, Buchanan TA, Coustan DR, et al. Summary and recommendations of the Fifth International Workshop-Conference on Gestational Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30(Suppl. 2):S251–S260
59. Mayo K, Melamed N, Vandenberghe H, Berger H. The impact of adoption of the International Association of Diabetes in Pregnancy Study Group criteria for the screening and diagnosis of gestational diabetes. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2015;212:224.e1–224.e9
60. Han S, Crowther CA, Middleton P, Heatley E. Different types of dietary advice for women with gestational diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013;3:CD009275
61. Viana LV, Gross JL, Azevedo MJ. Dietary intervention in patients with gestational diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials on maternal and newborn outcomes. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:3345–3355
62. Institute of Medicine and National Research Council. *Weight Gain During Pregnancy: Reexamining the Guidelines*. Washington, D.C., National Academies Press, 2009
63. Hernandez TL, Mande A, Barbour LA. Nutrition therapy within and beyond gestational diabetes. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2018;145:39–50
64. Hernandez TL, Van Pelt RE, Anderson MA, et al. A higher-complex carbohydrate diet in gestational diabetes mellitus achieves glucose targets and lowers postprandial lipids: a randomized crossover study. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:1254–1262
65. Laredo-Aguilera JA, Gallardo-Bravo M, Rabanales-Sotos JA, Cobo-Cuenca AI, Carmona-Torres JM. Physical activity programs during pregnancy are effective for the control of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17:E6151
66. Hartling L, Dryden DM, Guthrie A, Muise M, Vandermeer B, Donovan L. Benefits and harms of treating gestational diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force and the National Institutes of Health Office of Medical Applications of Research. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;159:123–129
67. Rowan JA, Hague WM, Gao W, Battin MR; MiG Trial Investigators. Metformin versus insulin for the treatment of gestational diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:2003–2015
68. Gui J, Liu Q, Feng L. Metformin vs insulin in the management of gestational diabetes: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e64585
69. Langer O, Conway DL, Berkus MD, Xenakis EM-J, Gonzales O. A comparison of glyburide and insulin in women with gestational diabetes mellitus. *N Engl J Med* 2000;343:1134–1138
70. Hebert MF, Ma X, Naraharisetty SB, et al.; Obstetric-Fetal Pharmacology Research Unit Network. Are we optimizing gestational diabetes treatment with glyburide? The pharmacologic basis for better clinical practice. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2009;85:607–614
71. Malek R, Davis SN. Pharmacokinetics, efficacy and safety of glyburide for treatment of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Expert Opin Drug Metab Toxicol* 2016;12:691–699
72. Balsells M, Garcia-Patterson A, Solà I, Roqué M, Gich I, Corcoy R. Glibenclamide, metformin, and insulin for the treatment of gestational diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2015;350:h102
73. Tarry-Adkins JL, Aiken CE, Ozanne SE. Comparative impact of pharmacological treatments for gestational diabetes on neonatal anthropometry independent of maternal glycaemic control: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* 2020;17:e1003126
74. Sénat M-V, Affres H, Letourneau A, et al.; Groupe de Recherche en Obstétrique et Gynécologie (GROG). Effect of glyburide vs subcutaneous insulin on perinatal complications among women with gestational diabetes: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2018;319:1773–1780
75. Silva JC, Pacheco C, Bizato J, de Souza BV, Ribeiro TE, Bertini AM. Metformin compared with glyburide for the management of gestational diabetes. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2010;111:37–40



76. Nachum Z, Zafran N, Salim R, et al. Glyburide versus metformin and their combination for the treatment of gestational diabetes mellitus: a randomized controlled study. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:332–337
77. Jiang Y-F, Chen X-Y, Ding T, Wang X-F, Zhu Z-N, Su S-W. Comparative efficacy and safety of OADs in management of GDM: network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2015;100:2071–2080
78. Vanky E, Zahlsen K, Spigset O, Carlsen SM. Placental passage of metformin in women with polycystic ovary syndrome. *Fertil Steril* 2005;83:1575–1578
79. Charles B, Norris R, Xiao X, Hague W. Population pharmacokinetics of metformin in late pregnancy. *Ther Drug Monit* 2006;28:67–72
80. Rowan JA, Rush EC, Plank LD, et al. Metformin in gestational diabetes: the offspring follow-up (MiG TOFU): body composition and metabolic outcomes at 7–9 years of age. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2018;6:e000456
81. Hanem LGE, Stridsklev S, Júlíusson PB, et al. Metformin use in PCOS pregnancies increases the risk of offspring overweight at 4 years of age: follow-up of two RCTs. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2018;103:1612–1621
82. Tarry-Adkins JL, Aiken CE, Ozanne SE. Neonatal, infant, and childhood growth following metformin versus insulin treatment for gestational diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* 2019;16:e1002848
83. Hanem LGE, Salvesen Ø, Júlíusson PB, et al. Intrauterine metformin exposure and offspring cardiometabolic risk factors (PedMet study): a 5–10 year follow-up of the PregMet randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health* 2019;3:166–174
84. Vanky E, Stridsklev S, Heimstad R, et al. Metformin versus placebo from first trimester to delivery in polycystic ovary syndrome: a randomized, controlled multicenter study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2010;95:E448–E455
85. Legro RS, Barnhart HX, Schlaff WD, et al.; Cooperative Multicenter Reproductive Medicine Network. Clomiphene, metformin, or both for infertility in the polycystic ovary syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2007;356:551–566
86. Palomba S, Orío F Jr, Falbo A, et al. Prospective parallel randomized, double-blind, double-dummy controlled clinical trial comparing clomiphene citrate and metformin as the first-line treatment for ovulation induction in nonobese anovulatory women with polycystic ovary syndrome. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2005;90:4068–4074
87. Palomba S, Orío F Jr, Nardo LG, et al. Metformin administration versus laparoscopic ovarian diathermy in clomiphene citrate-resistant women with polycystic ovary syndrome: a prospective parallel randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2004;89:4801–4809
88. Barbour LA, Scifres C, Valent AM, et al. A cautionary response to SMFM statement: pharmacological treatment of gestational diabetes. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2018;219:367.e1–367.e7
89. Barbour LA, Feig DS. Metformin for gestational diabetes mellitus: progeny, perspective, and a personalized approach. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:396–399
90. Farrar D, Tuffnell DJ, West J, West HM. Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion versus multiple daily injections of insulin for pregnant women with diabetes. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;6:CD005542
91. Pollex EK, Feig DS, Lubetsky A, Yip PM, Koren G. Insulin glargine safety in pregnancy: a transplacental transfer study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:29–33
92. Holcberg G, Tsadkin-Tamir M, Sapir O, et al. Transfer of insulin lispro across the human placenta. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2004;115:117–118
93. Boskovic R, Feig DS, Derewlany L, Knie B, Portnoi G, Koren G. Transfer of insulin lispro across the human placenta: in vitro perfusion studies. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:1390–1394
94. McCance DR, Damm P, Mathiesen ER, et al. Evaluation of insulin antibodies and placental transfer of insulin aspart in pregnant women with type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetologia* 2008;51:2141–2143
95. Suffecool K, Rosenn B, Niederkofler EE, et al. Insulin detemir does not cross the human placenta. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:e20–e21
96. Mathiesen ER, Hod M, Ivanisevic M, et al.; Detemir in Pregnancy Study Group. Maternal efficacy and safety outcomes in a randomized, controlled trial comparing insulin detemir with NPH insulin in 310 pregnant women with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:2012–2017
97. Hod M, Mathiesen ER, Jovanović L, et al. A randomized trial comparing perinatal outcomes using insulin detemir or neutral protamine Hagedorn in type 1 diabetes. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2014;27:7–13
98. Hod M, Damm P, Kaaja R, et al.; Insulin Aspart Pregnancy Study Group. Fetal and perinatal outcomes in type 1 diabetes pregnancy: a randomized study comparing insulin aspart with human insulin in 322 subjects. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2008;198:186.e1–186.e7
99. Persson B, Swahn M-L, Hjertberg R, et al. Insulin lispro therapy in pregnancies complicated by type 1 diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2002;58:115–121
100. Pollex E, Moretti ME, Koren G, Feig DS. Safety of insulin glargine use in pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Pharmacother* 2011;45:9–16
101. Carta Q, Meriggi E, Trossarelli GF, et al. Continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion versus intensive conventional insulin therapy in type I and type II diabetic pregnancy. *Diabete Metab* 1986;12:121–129
102. Kernaghan D, Farrell T, Hammond P, Owen P. Fetal growth in women managed with insulin pump therapy compared to conventional insulin. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2008;137:47–49
103. 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
104. Feig DS, Donovan LE, Zinman B, et al.; MiTy Collaborative Group. Metformin in women with type 2 diabetes in pregnancy (MiTy): a multicentre, international, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol* 2020;8:834–844
105. Clausen TD, Mathiesen E, Ekblom P, Hellmuth E, Mandrup-Poulsen T, Damm P. Poor pregnancy outcome in women with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2005;28:323–328
106. Cundy T, Gamble G, Neale L, et al. Differing causes of pregnancy loss in type 1 and type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2007;30:2603–2607
107. Duckitt K, Harrington D. Risk factors for pre-eclampsia at antenatal booking: systematic review of controlled studies. *BMJ* 2005;330:565
108. Henderson JT, Whitlock EP, O’Conner E, Senger CA, Thompson JH, Rowland MG. Low-dose aspirin for the prevention of morbidity and mortality from preeclampsia: a systematic evidence review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Rockville, MD, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2014. (Evidence Syntheses, No. 112). Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK196392/>
109. Roberge S, Bujold E, Nicolaidis KH. Aspirin for the prevention of preeclampsia and term preeclampsia: systematic review and metaanalysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2018;218:287–293.e1
110. Rolnik DL, Wright D, Poon LC, et al. Aspirin versus placebo in pregnancies at high risk for preterm preeclampsia. *N Engl J Med* 2017;377:613–622
111. Hoffman MK, Goudar SS, Kodkany BS, et al.; ASPIRIN Study Group. Low-dose aspirin for the prevention of preterm delivery in nulliparous women with a singleton pregnancy (ASPIRIN): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2020;395:285–293
112. Werner EF, Hauspurg AK, Rouse DJ. A Cost-benefit analysis of low-dose aspirin prophylaxis for the prevention of preeclampsia in the United States. *Obstet Gynecol* 2015;126:1242–1250
113. Voutetakis A, Pervanidou P, Kanaka-Gantenbein C. Aspirin for the prevention of preeclampsia and potential consequences for fetal brain development. *JAMA Pediatr* 2019;173:619–620
114. Brown MA, Magee LA, Kenny LC, et al.; International Society for the Study of Hypertension in Pregnancy (ISSHP). Hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: ISSHP classification, diagnosis, and management recommendations for international practice. *Hypertension* 2018;72:24–43
115. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists’ Committee on Practice Bulletins—Obstetrics. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 203: Chronic hypertension in pregnancy. *Obstet Gynecol* 2019;133:e26–e50
116. Magee LA, von Dadelszen P, Rey E, et al. Less-tight versus tight control of hypertension in pregnancy. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372:407–417
117. Sibai BM. Treatment of hypertension in pregnant women. *N Engl J Med* 1996;335:257–265
118. Kazmin A, Garcia-Bournissen F, Koren G. Risks of statin use during pregnancy: a systematic review. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* 2007;29:906–908
119. Vounzoulaki E, Khunti K, Abner SC, Tan BK, Davies MJ, Gillies CL. Progression to type 2 diabetes in women with a known history of gestational diabetes: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2020;369:m1361



120. Li Z, Cheng Y, Wang D, et al. Incidence rate of type 2 diabetes mellitus after gestational diabetes mellitus: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 170,139 women. *J Diabetes Res* 2020;2020:3076463
121. Tobias DK, Hu FB, Chavarro J, Rosner B, Mozaffarian D, Zhang C. Healthful dietary patterns and type 2 diabetes mellitus risk among women with a history of gestational diabetes mellitus. *Arch Intern Med* 2012;172:1566–1572
122. Villamor E, Cnattingius S. Interpregnancy weight change and risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes: a population-based study. *Lancet* 2006;368:1164–1170
123. Ratner RE, Christophi CA, Metzger BE, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. Prevention of diabetes in women with a history of gestational diabetes: effects of metformin and lifestyle interventions. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2008;93:4774–4779
124. Aroda VR, Christophi CA, Edelstein SL, et al.; Diabetes Prevention Program Research Group. The effect of lifestyle intervention and metformin on preventing or delaying diabetes among women with and without gestational diabetes: the Diabetes Prevention Program outcomes study 10-year follow-up. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2015;100:1646–1653
125. Achong N, Duncan EL, McIntyre HD, Callaway L. Peripartum management of glycemia in women with type 1 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:364–371
126. Riviello C, Mello G, Jovanovic LG. Breastfeeding and the basal insulin requirement in type 1 diabetic women. *Endocr Pract* 2009;15:187–193
127. Stuebe AM, Rich-Edwards JW, Willett WC, Manson JE, Michels KB. Duration of lactation and incidence of type 2 diabetes. *JAMA* 2005;294:2601–2610
128. Pereira PF, Alfenas R de CG, Araújo RMA. Does breastfeeding influence the risk of developing diabetes mellitus in children? A review of current evidence. *J Pediatr (Rio J)* 2014;90:7–15



# 16. Diabetes Care in the Hospital: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S244–S253 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S016>

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).

Among hospitalized patients, hyperglycemia, hypoglycemia, and glucose variability are associated with adverse outcomes, including death (1–3). Therefore, careful management of inpatients with diabetes has direct and immediate benefits. Hospital management of diabetes is facilitated by preadmission treatment of hyperglycemia in patients having elective procedures, a dedicated inpatient diabetes service applying well-developed standards, and careful transition out of the hospital to prearranged outpatient management. These steps can shorten hospital stays and reduce the need for readmission, as well as improve patient outcomes. Some in-depth reviews of hospital care for patients with diabetes have been published (3–5). For older hospitalized patients or for patients in the long-term care facilities, please see Section 13, “Older Adults” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>).

## HOSPITAL CARE DELIVERY STANDARDS

### Recommendations

- 16.1** Perform an A1C test on all patients with diabetes or hyperglycemia (blood glucose >140 mg/dL [7.8 mmol/L]) admitted to the hospital if not performed in the prior 3 months. **B**
- 16.2** Insulin should be administered using validated written or computerized protocols that allow for predefined adjustments in the insulin dosage based on glycemic fluctuations. **B**

### Considerations on Admission

High-quality hospital care for diabetes requires standards for care delivery, which are best implemented using structured order sets, and quality assurance for process improvement. Unfortunately, “best practice” protocols, reviews, and guidelines (2–4) are inconsistently implemented within hospitals. To correct this, medical centers striving for optimal inpatient diabetes treatment should establish protocols and structured order sets, which include computerized physician order entry (CPOE).

\*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. 16. Diabetes care in the hospital: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S244–S253

© 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>.

Initial orders should state the type of diabetes (i.e., type 1, type 2, gestational diabetes mellitus, pancreatic diabetes) when it is known. Because inpatient treatment and discharge planning are more effective if based on preadmission glycemia, an A1C should be measured for all patients with diabetes or hyperglycemia admitted to the hospital if the test has not been performed in the previous 3 months (6–9). In addition, diabetes self-management knowledge and behaviors should be assessed on admission and diabetes self-management education provided, if appropriate. Diabetes self-management education should include appropriate skills needed after discharge, such as medication dosing and administration, glucose monitoring, and recognition and treatment of hypoglycemia (2,3). There is evidence to support preadmission treatment of hyperglycemia in patients scheduled for elective surgery as an effective means of reducing adverse outcomes (10–13).

The National Academy of Medicine recommends CPOE to prevent medication-related errors and to increase efficiency in medication administration (14). A Cochrane review of randomized controlled trials using computerized advice to improve glucose control in the hospital found significant improvement in the percentage of time patients spent in the target glucose range, lower mean blood glucose levels, and no increase in hypoglycemia (15). Thus, where feasible, there should be structured order sets that provide computerized advice for glucose control. Electronic insulin order templates also improve mean glucose levels without increasing hypoglycemia in patients with type 2 diabetes, so structured insulin order sets should be incorporated into the CPOE (16,17).

### Diabetes Care Providers in the Hospital

#### Recommendation

**16.3** When caring for hospitalized patients with diabetes, consult with a specialized diabetes or glucose management team when possible. **C**

Appropriately trained specialists or specialty teams may reduce the length

of stay, improve glycemic control, and improve outcomes (10,18,19). In addition, the greater risk of 30-day readmission following hospitalization that has been attributed to diabetes can be reduced and costs saved when inpatient care is provided by a specialized diabetes management team (20,21). In a cross-sectional comparison of usual care to management by specialists who reviewed cases and made recommendations solely through the electronic medical record, rates of both hyper- and hypoglycemia were reduced 30–40% by electronic “virtual care” (22). Details of team formation are available in the Joint Commission standards for programs and from the Society of Hospital Medicine (23,24).

Even the best orders may not be carried out in a way that improves quality, nor are they automatically updated when new evidence arises. To this end, the Joint Commission has an accreditation program for the hospital care of diabetes (23), and the Society of Hospital Medicine has a workbook for program development (24).

### GLYCEMIC TARGETS IN HOSPITALIZED PATIENTS

#### Recommendations

- 16.4** Insulin therapy should be initiated for treatment of persistent hyperglycemia starting at a threshold  $\geq 180$  mg/dL (10.0 mmol/L) (checked on two occasions). Once insulin therapy is started, a target glucose range of 140–180 mg/dL (7.8–10.0 mmol/L) is recommended for the majority of critically ill and noncritically ill patients. **A**
- 16.5** More stringent goals, such as 110–140 mg/dL (6.1–7.8 mmol/L), may be appropriate for selected patients if they can be achieved without significant hypoglycemia. **C**

#### Standard Definitions of Glucose Abnormalities

Hyperglycemia in hospitalized patients is defined as blood glucose levels  $> 140$  mg/dL (7.8 mmol/L) (2,3,25). Blood glucose levels persistently above this level should prompt conservative interventions, such as alterations in diet or

changes to medications that cause hyperglycemia. An admission A1C value  $\geq 6.5\%$  (48 mmol/mol) suggests that the onset of diabetes preceded hospitalization (see Section 2, “Classification and Diagnosis of Diabetes,” <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S002>) (2,25). Hypoglycemia in hospitalized patients is categorized by blood glucose concentration and clinical correlates (**Table 6.4**) (26): Level 1 hypoglycemia is a glucose concentration 54–70 mg/dL (3.0–3.9 mmol/L). Level 2 hypoglycemia is a blood glucose concentration  $< 54$  mg/dL (3.0 mmol/L), which is typically the threshold for neuroglycopenic symptoms. Level 3 hypoglycemia is a clinical event characterized by altered mental and/or physical functioning that requires assistance from another person for recovery. Levels 2 and 3 require immediate correction of low blood glucose.

#### Glycemic Targets

In a landmark clinical trial, Van den Berghe et al. (27) demonstrated that an intensive intravenous insulin regimen to reach a target glycemic range of 80–110 mg/dL (4.4–6.1 mmol/L) reduced mortality by 40% compared with a standard approach targeting blood glucose of 180–215 mg/dL (10–12 mmol/L) in critically ill patients with recent surgery. This study provided robust evidence that active treatment to lower blood glucose in hospitalized patients had immediate benefits. However, a large, multicenter follow-up study, the Normoglycemia in Intensive Care Evaluation and Survival Using Glucose Algorithm Regulation (NICE-SUGAR) trial (28), led to a reconsideration of the optimal target range for glucose lowering in critical illness. In this trial, critically ill patients randomized to intensive glycemic control (80–110 mg/dL) derived no significant treatment advantage compared with a group with more moderate glycemic targets (140–180 mg/dL [7.8–10.0 mmol/L]) and, in fact, had slightly but significantly higher mortality (27.5% vs. 25%). The intensively treated group had 10- to 15-fold greater rates of hypoglycemia, which may have contributed to the adverse outcomes noted. The findings from NICE-SUGAR are supported by several meta-analyses, some of which suggest that tight glycemic control increases mortality compared with

more moderate glycemic targets and generally causes higher rates of hypoglycemia (29–31). Based on these results, insulin therapy should be initiated for treatment of persistent hyperglycemia  $\geq 180$  mg/dL (10.0 mmol/L) and targeted to a glucose range of 140–180 mg/dL (7.8–10.0 mmol/L) for the majority of critically ill patients. Although not as well supported by data from randomized controlled trials, these recommendations have been extended to hospitalized patients without critical illness. More stringent goals, such as 110–140 mg/dL (6.1–7.8 mmol/L), may be appropriate for selected patients (e.g., critically ill postsurgical patients or patients with cardiac surgery), as long as they can be achieved without significant hypoglycemia (32,33). On the other hand, glucose concentrations between 180 mg/dL and 250 mg/dL (10–13.9 mmol/L) may be acceptable in patients with severe comorbidities and in inpatient care settings where frequent glucose monitoring or close nursing supervision is not feasible. Glycemic levels above 250 mg/dL (13.9 mmol/L) may be acceptable in terminally ill patients with short life expectancy. In these patients, less aggressive insulin regimens to minimize glucosuria, dehydration, and electrolyte disturbances are often more appropriate. Clinical judgment combined with ongoing assessment of clinical status, including changes in the trajectory of glucose measures, illness severity, nutritional status, or concomitant medications that might affect glucose levels (e.g., glucocorticoids), should be incorporated into the day-to-day decisions regarding insulin dosing (34).

### BEDSIDE BLOOD GLUCOSE MONITORING

In hospitalized patients with diabetes who are eating, bedside glucose monitoring should be performed before meals; in those not eating, glucose monitoring is advised every 4–6 h (2). More frequent bedside blood glucose testing ranging from every 30 min to every 2 h is the required standard for safe use of intravenous insulin. Safety standards for blood glucose monitoring that prohibit the sharing of lancets, other testing materials, and needles are mandatory (35).

The vast majority of hospital glucose monitoring is performed using standard glucose monitors and capillary blood taken from fingersticks, similar to the process used by outpatients for home glucose monitoring (36). Point-of-care (POC) meters are not as accurate or as precise as laboratory glucose analyzers, and capillary blood glucose readings are subject to artifact due to perfusion, edema, anemia/erythrocytosis, and several medications commonly used in the hospital (37). The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has established standards for capillary (fingerstick) blood glucose meters used in the ambulatory setting, as well as standards to be applied for POC measures in the hospital (37). The balance between analytic requirements (e.g., accuracy, precision, interference) and clinical requirements (rapidity, simplicity, point of care) has not been uniformly resolved (36,38), and most hospitals/medical centers have arrived at their own policies to balance these parameters. It is critically important that devices selected for in-hospital use, and the workflow through which they are applied, have careful analysis of performance and reliability and ongoing quality assessments. Recent studies indicate that POC measures provide adequate information for usual practice, with only rare instances where care has been compromised (39,40). Good practice dictates that any glucose result that does not correlate with the patient's clinical status should be confirmed through measurement of a serum sample in the clinical laboratory.

### Continuous Glucose Monitoring

Real-time continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) provides frequent measurements of interstitial glucose levels as well as the direction and magnitude of glucose trends. Even though CGM has theoretical advantages over POC glucose testing in detecting and reducing the incidence of hypoglycemia, it has not been approved by the FDA for inpatient use. Some hospitals with established glucose management teams allow the use of CGM in selected patients on an individual basis, provided both the patients and the glucose management team are well educated in the use of this technology. CGM is not approved for intensive care unit use.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, several institutions used CGM to minimize contact between health care providers and patients, especially those in the intensive care unit (41–49). This approach seems to be helpful in that regard, as well as helping to minimize the use of personal protective equipment. Unfortunately, the data about the use of CGM to improve either glycemic control or hospitalization outcomes are not yet available. Preliminary data that are already at hand suggest that CGM can offer significant improvement to both glycemic control and outcomes of hospitalization.

For more information on CGM, see Section 7, “Diabetes Technology” (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-5007>).

### GLUCOSE-LOWERING TREATMENT IN HOSPITALIZED PATIENTS

#### Recommendations

- 16.6** Basal insulin or a basal plus bolus correction insulin regimen is the preferred treatment for non-critically ill hospitalized patients with poor oral intake or those who are taking nothing by mouth. **A**
- 16.7** An insulin regimen with basal, prandial, and correction components is the preferred treatment for non-critically ill hospitalized patients with good nutritional intake. **A**
- 16.8** Use of only a sliding scale insulin regimen in the inpatient hospital setting is strongly discouraged. **A**

### Insulin Therapy

#### Critical Care Setting

In the critical care setting, continuous intravenous insulin infusion is the most effective method for achieving glycemic targets. Intravenous insulin infusions should be administered based on validated written or computerized protocols that allow for predefined adjustments in the infusion rate, accounting for glycemic fluctuations and insulin dose (3).

#### Noncritical Care Setting

In most instances, insulin is the preferred treatment for hyperglycemia in hospitalized patients. However, in certain circumstances, it may be appropriate to continue home regimens, including oral



glucose-lowering medications (50). If oral medications are held in the hospital, there should be a protocol for resuming them 1–2 days before discharge. For patients using insulin, recent reports indicate that inpatient use of insulin pens is safe and may be associated with improved nurse satisfaction compared with the use of insulin vials and syringes (51–53). Insulin pens have been the subject of an FDA warning because of potential blood-borne diseases; the warning “For single patient use only” should be rigorously followed (54).

Outside of critical care units, scheduled insulin regimens are recommended to manage hyperglycemia in patients with diabetes. Regimens using insulin analogs and human insulin result in similar glycemic control in the hospital setting (55). The use of subcutaneous rapid- or short-acting insulin before meals, or every 4–6 h if no meals are given or if the patient is receiving continuous enteral/parenteral nutrition, is indicated to correct hyperglycemia. Basal insulin, or a basal plus bolus correction regimen, is the preferred treatment for noncritically ill hospitalized patients with poor oral intake or those who are restricted from oral intake. An insulin regimen with basal, prandial, and correction components is the preferred treatment for noncritically ill hospitalized patients with good nutritional intake.

For patients who are eating, insulin injections should align with meals. In such instances, POC glucose testing should be performed immediately before meals. If oral intake is poor, a safer procedure is to administer prandial insulin immediately after the patient eats, with the dose adjusted to be appropriate for the amount ingested (55).

A randomized controlled trial has shown that basal-bolus treatment improved glycemic control and reduced hospital complications compared with reactive, or sliding scale, insulin regimens (i.e., dosing given in response to elevated glucose rather than preemptively) in general surgery patients with type 2 diabetes (56). Prolonged use of sliding scale insulin regimens as the sole treatment of hyperglycemic inpatients is strongly discouraged (19,57).

While there is evidence for using premixed insulin formulations in the outpatient setting (58), a recent inpatient study of 70/30 NPH/regular insulin

versus basal-bolus therapy showed comparable glycemic control but significantly increased hypoglycemia in the group receiving premixed insulin (59). Therefore, premixed insulin regimens are not routinely recommended for in-hospital use.

#### **Type 1 Diabetes**

For patients with type 1 diabetes, dosing insulin based solely on premeal glucose levels does not account for basal insulin requirements or caloric intake, increasing the risk of both hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia. Typically, basal insulin dosing schemes are based on body weight, with some evidence that patients with renal insufficiency should be treated with lower doses (60,61). An insulin regimen with basal and correction components is necessary for all hospitalized patients with type 1 diabetes, with the addition of prandial insulin if the patient is eating. Most importantly, patients with type 1 diabetes should always be treated with insulin.

#### **Transitioning Intravenous to Subcutaneous Insulin**

When discontinuing intravenous insulin, a transition protocol is associated with less morbidity and lower costs of care (62,63) and is therefore recommended. A patient with type 1 or type 2 diabetes being transitioned to a subcutaneous regimen should receive a dose of subcutaneous basal insulin 2 h before the intravenous infusion is discontinued. The dose of basal insulin is best calculated on the basis of the insulin infusion rate during the last 6 h when stable glycemic goals were achieved (64). For patients transitioning to regimens with concentrated insulin (U-200, U-300, or U-500) in the inpatient setting, it is important to ensure correct dosing by utilizing an individual pen and cartridge for each patient and by meticulous supervision of the dose administered (64,65).

#### **Noninsulin Therapies**

The safety and efficacy of noninsulin glucose-lowering therapies in the hospital setting is an area of active research (66,67). Several recent randomized trials have demonstrated the potential effectiveness of glucagon-like peptide 1 (GLP-1) receptor agonists and dipeptidyl peptidase 4 inhibitors in specific groups of hospitalized

patients (68–71). However, an FDA bulletin states that providers should consider discontinuing saxagliptin and alogliptin in people who develop heart failure (72).

Sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors should be avoided in cases of severe illness, in patients with ketonemia or ketonuria, and during prolonged fasting and surgical procedures (4). Until safety and effectiveness are established, SGLT2 inhibitors are not recommended for routine in-hospital use. Furthermore, the FDA has recently warned that SGLT2 inhibitors should be stopped 3 days before scheduled surgeries (4 days in the case of ertugliflozin).

## **HYPOGLYCEMIA**

### **Recommendations**

- 16.9** A hypoglycemia management protocol should be adopted and implemented by each hospital or hospital system. A plan for preventing and treating hypoglycemia should be established for each patient. Episodes of hypoglycemia in the hospital should be documented in the medical record and tracked for quality improvement/quality assessment. **E**
- 16.10** For individual patients, treatment regimens should be reviewed and changed as necessary to prevent further hypoglycemia when a blood glucose value of <70 mg/dL (3.9 mmol/L) is documented. **C**

Patients with or without diabetes may experience hypoglycemia in the hospital setting. While hypoglycemia is associated with increased mortality (73), in many cases it is a marker of underlying disease rather than the cause of fatality. However, hypoglycemia is a severe consequence of dysregulated metabolism and/or diabetes treatment, and it is imperative that it be minimized in hospitalized patients. Many episodes of hypoglycemia among inpatients are preventable. Therefore, a hypoglycemia prevention and management protocol should be adopted and implemented by each hospital or hospital system. A standardized hospital-wide, nurse-initiated hypogly-

emia treatment protocol should be in place to immediately address blood glucose levels of  $<70$  mg/dL (3.9 mmol/L). In addition, individualized plans for preventing and treating hypoglycemia for each patient should also be developed. An American Diabetes Association consensus statement recommends that a patient's treatment regimen be reviewed any time a blood glucose value of  $<70$  mg/dL (3.9 mmol/L) occurs, as such readings often predict subsequent level 3 hypoglycemia (2). Episodes of hypoglycemia in the hospital should be documented in the medical record and tracked (3).

### Triggering Events and Prevention of Hypoglycemia

Insulin is one of the most common drugs causing adverse events in hospitalized patients, and errors in insulin dosing and/or administration occur relatively frequently (73–75). Beyond insulin dosing errors, common preventable sources of iatrogenic hypoglycemia are improper prescribing of other glucose-lowering medications, inappropriate management of the first episode of hypoglycemia, and nutrition-insulin mismatch, often related to an unexpected interruption of nutrition. A recent study describes acute kidney injury as an important risk factor for hypoglycemia in the hospital (76), possibly as a result of decreased insulin clearance. Studies of “bundled” preventive therapies, including proactive surveillance of glycemic outliers and an interdisciplinary data-driven approach to glycemic management, showed that hypoglycemic episodes in the hospital could be prevented. Compared with baseline, two such studies found that hypoglycemic events fell by 56–80% (77,78). The Joint Commission recommends that all hypoglycemic episodes be evaluated for a root cause and the episodes be aggregated and reviewed to address systemic issues (23).

In addition to errors with insulin treatment, iatrogenic hypoglycemia may be induced by a sudden reduction of corticosteroid dose, reduced oral intake, emesis, inappropriate timing of short- or rapid-acting insulin in relation to meals, reduced infusion rate of intravenous dextrose, unexpected interruption of enteral or parenteral feedings, delayed or missed blood glucose checks, and

altered ability of the patient to report symptoms (5).

### Predictors of Hypoglycemia

In ambulatory patients with diabetes, it is well established that an episode of severe hypoglycemia increases the risk for a subsequent event, in part because of impaired counterregulation (79,80). This relationship also holds for inpatients. For example, in a study of hospitalized patients treated for hyperglycemia, 84% who had an episode of “severe hypoglycemia” (defined as  $<40$  mg/dL [2.2 mmol/L]) had a preceding episode of hypoglycemia ( $<70$  mg/dL [3.9 mmol/L]) during the same admission (81). In another study of hypoglycemic episodes (defined as  $<50$  mg/dL [2.8 mmol/L]), 78% of patients were using basal insulin, with the incidence of hypoglycemia peaking between midnight and 6:00 A.M. Despite recognition of hypoglycemia, 75% of patients did not have their dose of basal insulin changed before the next insulin administration (82).

Recently, several groups have developed algorithms to predict episodes of hypoglycemia among inpatients (83,84). Models such as these are potentially important and, once validated for general use, could provide a valuable tool to reduce rates of hypoglycemia in hospitalized patients.

### MEDICAL NUTRITION THERAPY IN THE HOSPITAL

The goals of medical nutrition therapy in the hospital are to provide adequate calories to meet metabolic demands, optimize glycemic control, address personal food preferences, and facilitate the creation of a discharge plan. The American Diabetes Association does not endorse any single meal plan or specified percentages of macronutrients. Current nutrition recommendations advise individualization based on treatment goals, physiological parameters, and medication use. Consistent carbohydrate meal plans are preferred by many hospitals as they facilitate matching the prandial insulin dose to the amount of carbohydrate consumed (85).

Orders should also indicate that the meal delivery and nutritional insulin coverage should be coordinated, as their variability often creates the

possibility of hyperglycemic and hypoglycemic events.

Many hospitals offer “meals on demand,” allowing patients to order meals from the menu at any time of the day. This option improves patient satisfaction but complicates meal–insulin coordination. Finally, if carbohydrate counting is provided by the hospital kitchen, this option should be used in patients counting carbohydrates at home (86).

### SELF-MANAGEMENT IN THE HOSPITAL

Diabetes self-management in the hospital may be appropriate for specific patients (87,88). Candidates include both adolescent and adult patients who successfully conduct self-management of diabetes at home and whose cognitive and physical skills needed to successfully self-administer insulin and perform self-monitoring of blood glucose are not compromised. In addition, they should have adequate oral intake, be proficient in carbohydrate estimation, use multiple daily insulin injections or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (CSII), have stable insulin requirements, and understand sick-day management. If self-management is to be used, a protocol should include a requirement that the patient, nursing staff, and physician agree that patient self-management is appropriate. If CSII or CGM is to be used, hospital policy and procedures delineating guidelines for CSII therapy, including the changing of infusion sites, are advised (89,90). As outlined in Recommendation 7.29, patients using diabetes devices should be allowed to use them in an inpatient setting when proper supervision is available.

### STANDARDS FOR SPECIAL SITUATIONS

#### Enteral/Parenteral Feedings

For patients receiving enteral or parenteral feedings who require insulin, the regimen should include coverage of basal, prandial, and correctional needs (91,92). It is particularly important that patients with type 1 diabetes continue to receive basal insulin even if feedings are discontinued.

Most patients receiving basal insulin should continue with their basal dose,

while the dose of insulin for the total daily nutritional component may be calculated as 1 unit of insulin for every 10–15 g carbohydrate in the formula. Commercially available cans of enteral nutrition contain variable amounts of carbohydrate and may be infused at different rates. All of this must be taken into consideration while calculating insulin doses to cover the nutritional component of enteral nutrition (86). Most specialists recommend using NPH insulin twice or three times daily (every 8 or 12 h) to cover patient needs. Adjustments in insulin doses must be made frequently. Correctional insulin should also be administered subcutaneously every 6 h using human regular insulin or every 4 h using a rapid-acting insulin. If enteral nutrition is interrupted, a 10% dextrose infusion must be started immediately to prevent hypoglycemia and to allow time to select more appropriate insulin doses.

For patients receiving enteral bolus feedings, approximately 1 unit of regular human insulin or rapid-acting insulin per 10–15 g carbohydrate should be given subcutaneously before each feeding. Correctional insulin coverage should be added as needed before each feeding.

In patients receiving nocturnal tube feeding, NPH insulin administered with the initiation of feeding represents a reasonable approach to cover this nutritional load.

For patients receiving continuous peripheral or central parenteral nutrition, human regular insulin may be added to the solution, particularly if >20 units of correctional insulin have been required in the past 24 h. A starting dose of 1 unit of human regular insulin for every 10 g dextrose has been recommended (93) and should be adjusted daily in the solution. Adding insulin to the parenteral nutrition bag is the safest way to prevent hypoglycemia if the parenteral nutrition is stopped or interrupted. Correctional insulin should be administered subcutaneously. For full enteral/parenteral feeding guidance, please refer to review articles detailing this topic (91,94).

Because continuous enteral or parenteral nutrition results in a continuous postprandial state, any attempt to bring blood glucose levels to below 140 mg/dL (7.8 mmol/L) substantially increases

the risk of hypoglycemia in these patients.

### Glucocorticoid Therapy

The prevalence of glucocorticoid therapy in hospitalized patients can approach 10%, and these medications can induce hyperglycemia in patients with and without antecedent diabetes (95). Glucocorticoid type and duration of action must be considered in determining insulin treatment regimens. Daily-ingested short-acting glucocorticoids such as prednisone reach peak plasma levels in 4–6 h (96) but have pharmacologic actions that last through the day. Patients on morning steroid regimens have disproportionate hyperglycemia during the day, but they frequently reach normal blood glucose levels overnight regardless of treatment (95). In subjects on once- or twice-daily steroids, administration of intermediate-acting (NPH) insulin is a standard approach. NPH is usually administered in addition to daily basal-bolus insulin or in addition to oral antidiabetes medications. Because NPH action peaks at 4–6 h after administration, it is best to give it concomitantly with steroids (97). For long-acting glucocorticoids such as dexamethasone and multidose or continuous glucocorticoid use, long-acting insulin may be required to control fasting blood glucose (50,98). For higher doses of glucocorticoids, increasing doses of prandial and correctional insulin, sometimes in extraordinary amounts, are often needed in addition to basal insulin (99,100). Whatever orders are started, adjustments based on anticipated changes in glucocorticoid dosing and POC glucose test results are critical.

### Perioperative Care

Many standards for perioperative care lack a robust evidence base. However, the following approach (101–103) may be considered:

1. The target range for blood glucose in the perioperative period should be 80–180 mg/dL (4.4–10.0 mmol/L).
2. A preoperative risk assessment should be performed for patients with diabetes who are at high risk for ischemic heart disease and those with autonomic neuropathy or renal failure.

3. Metformin should be withheld on the day of surgery.
4. SGLT2 inhibitors must be discontinued 3–4 days before surgery.
5. Withhold any other oral glucose-lowering agents the morning of surgery or procedure and give half of NPH dose or 75–80% doses of long-acting analog or pump basal insulin.
6. Monitor blood glucose at least every 2–4 h while the patient is taking nothing by mouth and dose with short- or rapid-acting insulin as needed.
7. There are no data on the use and/or influence of GLP-1 receptor agonists or ultra-long-acting insulin analogs upon glycemia in perioperative care.

A recent review concluded that perioperative glycemic control tighter than 80–180 mg/dL (4.4–10.0 mmol/L) did not improve outcomes and was associated with more hypoglycemia (102); therefore, in general, tighter glycemic targets are not advised. Evidence from a recent study indicates that compared with usual dosing, a reduction of insulin given the evening before surgery by ~25% was more likely to achieve perioperative blood glucose levels in the target range with a lower risk for hypoglycemia (104).

In noncardiac general surgery patients, basal insulin plus premeal short- or rapid-acting insulin (basal-bolus) coverage has been associated with improved glycemic control and lower rates of perioperative complications compared with the reactive, sliding scale regimens (short- or rapid-acting insulin coverage only with no basal insulin dosing) (56,105).

### Diabetic Ketoacidosis and Hyperosmolar Hyperglycemic State

There is considerable variability in the presentation of diabetic ketoacidosis (DKA) and hyperosmolar hyperglycemic states, ranging from euglycemia or mild hyperglycemia and acidosis to severe hyperglycemia, dehydration, and coma; therefore, individualization of treatment based on a careful clinical and laboratory assessment is needed (106–109).

Management goals include restoration of circulatory volume and tissue perfusion, resolution of hyperglycemia, and

correction of electrolyte imbalance and acidosis. It is also important to treat any correctable underlying cause of DKA, such as sepsis, myocardial infarction, or stroke. In critically ill and mentally obtunded patients with DKA or hyperosmolar hyperglycemia, continuous intravenous insulin is the standard of care. Successful transition of patients from intravenous to subcutaneous insulin requires administration of basal insulin 2–4 h prior to the intravenous insulin being stopped to prevent recurrence of ketoacidosis and rebound hyperglycemia (108). There is no significant difference in outcomes for intravenous human regular insulin versus subcutaneous rapid-acting analogs when combined with aggressive fluid management for treating mild or moderate DKA (110). Patients with uncomplicated DKA may sometimes be treated with subcutaneous insulin in the emergency department or step-down units (111), an approach that may be safer and more cost-effective than treatment with intravenous insulin. If subcutaneous insulin administration is used, it is important to provide an adequate fluid replacement, frequent bedside testing, appropriate treatment of any concurrent infections, and appropriate follow-up to avoid recurrent DKA. Several studies have shown that the use of bicarbonate in patients with DKA made no difference in resolution of acidosis or time to discharge, and its use is generally not recommended. For further information regarding treatment, refer to recent in-depth reviews (4).

## TRANSITION FROM THE HOSPITAL TO THE AMBULATORY SETTING

### Recommendation

**16.11** There should be a structured discharge plan tailored to the individual patient with diabetes. **B**

A structured discharge plan tailored to the individual patient may reduce the length of hospital stay and readmission rates and increase patient satisfaction (112). Discharge planning should begin at admission and be updated as patient needs change.

The transition from the acute care setting presents risks for all patients.

Inpatients may be discharged to varied settings, including home (with or without visiting nurse services), assisted living, rehabilitation, or skilled nursing facilities. For the patient who is discharged to home or to assisted living, the optimal program will need to consider diabetes type and severity, effects of the patient's illness on blood glucose levels, and the patient's capacities and preferences. See Section 13, "Older Adults" (<https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>), for more information.

An outpatient follow-up visit with the primary care provider, endocrinologist, or diabetes care and education specialist within 1 month of discharge is advised for all patients experiencing hyperglycemia in the hospital. If glycemic medications are changed, or if glucose control is not optimal at discharge, an earlier appointment (in 1–2 weeks) is preferred, and frequent contact may be needed to avoid hyperglycemia and hypoglycemia. A recently described discharge algorithm for glycemic medication adjustment based on admission A1C was found useful to guide treatment decisions and significantly improved A1C after discharge (7). Therefore, if an A1C from the prior 3 months is unavailable, measuring the A1C in all patients with diabetes or hyperglycemia admitted to the hospital is recommended.

Clear communication with outpatient providers either directly or via hospital discharge summaries facilitates safe transitions to outpatient care. Providing information regarding the cause of hyperglycemia (or the plan for determining the cause), related complications and comorbidities, and recommended treatments can assist outpatient providers as they assume ongoing care.

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality recommends that, at a minimum, discharge plans include the following (113):

### Medication Reconciliation

- The patient's medications must be cross-checked to ensure that no chronic medications were stopped and to ensure the safety of new prescriptions.
- Prescriptions for new or changed medication should be filled and reviewed with the patient and family at or before discharge.

### Structured Discharge Communication

- Information on medication changes, pending tests and studies, and follow-up needs must be accurately and promptly communicated to outpatient physicians.
- Discharge summaries should be transmitted to the primary care provider as soon as possible after discharge.
- Scheduling follow-up appointments prior to discharge increases the likelihood that patients will attend.

It is recommended that the following areas of knowledge be reviewed and addressed prior to hospital discharge:

- Identification of the health care provider who will provide diabetes care after discharge.
- Level of understanding related to the diabetes diagnosis, self-monitoring of blood glucose, home blood glucose goals, and when to call the provider.
- Definition, recognition, treatment, and prevention of hyperglycemia and hypoglycemia.
- Information on making healthy food choices at home and referral to an outpatient registered dietitian nutritionist to guide individualization of the meal plan, if needed.
- If relevant, when and how to take blood glucose-lowering medications, including insulin administration.
- Sick-day management.
- Proper use and disposal of needles and syringes.

It is important that patients be provided with appropriate durable medical equipment, medications, supplies (e.g., blood glucose test strips), and prescriptions, along with appropriate education at the time of discharge in order to avoid a potentially dangerous hiatus in care.

### PREVENTING ADMISSIONS AND READMISSIONS

In patients with diabetes, the hospital readmission rate is between 14% and 20%, nearly twice that in patients without diabetes (114,115). This reflects increased disease burden for patients and has important financial implications. Of patients with diabetes who are hospitalized, 30% have two or more hospital



stays, and these admissions account for over 50% of inpatient costs for diabetes (116). Factors contributing to readmission include male sex, longer duration of prior hospitalization, number of previous hospitalizations, number and severity of comorbidities, and lower socioeconomic and/or educational status; scheduled home health visits and timely outpatient follow-up reduce rates of readmission (114,115). While there is no standard to prevent readmissions, several successful strategies have been reported (115). These include targeting ketosis-prone patients with type 1 diabetes (117), insulin treatment of patients with admission A1C >9% (75 mmol/mol) (118), and use of a transitional care model (119). For people with diabetic kidney disease, collaborative patient-centered medical homes may decrease risk-adjusted readmission rates (120). A recently published algorithm based on patient demographic and clinical characteristics had only moderate predictive power but identifies a promising future strategy (121).

Age is also an important risk factor in hospitalization and readmission among patients with diabetes (refer to Section 13, "Older Adults," <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S013>, for detailed criteria).

## References

- Clement S, Braithwaite SS, Magee MF, et al.; American Diabetes Association Diabetes in Hospitals Writing Committee. Management of diabetes and hyperglycemia in hospitals [published corrections appear in *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:856 and *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:1255]. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:553–591
- Moghissi ES, Korytkowski MT, DiNardo M, et al.; American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists; American Diabetes Association. American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists and American Diabetes Association consensus statement on inpatient glycemic control. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1119–1131
- Bogun M, Inzucchi SE. Inpatient management of diabetes and hyperglycemia. *Clin Ther* 2013;35:724–733
- Moghissi E, Inzucchi S. The evolution of glycemic control in the hospital setting. In *Managing Diabetes and Hyperglycemia in the Hospital Setting*. Draznin B, Ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2016, pp. 1–10
- Umpierrez G, Korytkowski M. Diabetic emergencies - ketoacidosis, hyperglycaemic hyperosmolar state and hypoglycaemia. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2016;12:222–232
- Pasquel FJ, Gomez-Huelgas R, Anzola I, et al. Predictive value of admission hemoglobin A<sub>1c</sub> on inpatient glycemic control and response to insulin therapy in medicine and surgery patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:e202–e203
- Umpierrez GE, Reyes D, Smiley D, et al. Hospital discharge algorithm based on admission HbA<sub>1c</sub> for the management of patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2934–2939
- Carpenter DL, Gregg SR, Xu K, Buchman TG, Coopersmith CM. Prevalence and impact of unknown diabetes in the ICU. *Crit Care Med* 2015;43:e541–e550
- Rhee MK, Safo SE, Jackson SL, et al. Inpatient glucose values: determining the nondiabetic range and use in identifying patients at high risk for diabetes. *Am J Med* 2018;131:443.e11–443.e24
- Garg R, Schuman B, Bader A, et al. Effect of preoperative diabetes management on glycemic control and clinical outcomes after elective surgery. *Ann Surg* 2018;267:858–862
- van den Boom W, Schroeder RA, Manning MW, Setji TL, Fiestan G-O, Dunson DB. Effect of A1C and glucose on postoperative mortality in noncardiac and cardiac surgeries. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:782–788
- Setji T, Hopkins TJ, Jimenez M, et al. Rationalization, development, and implementation of a preoperative diabetes optimization program designed to improve perioperative outcomes and reduce cost. *Diabetes Spectr* 2017;30:217–223
- Okabayashi T, Shima Y, Sumiyoshi T, et al. Intensive versus intermediate glucose control in surgical intensive care unit patients. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:1516–1524
- Institute of Medicine. *Preventing Medication Errors*. Aspden P, Wolcott J, Bootman JL, Cronenwett LR, Eds. Washington, DC, National Academies Press, 2007
- Gillaizeau F, Chan E, Trinquart L, et al. Computerized advice on drug dosage to improve prescribing practice. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013;11:CD002894
- Wexler DJ, Shrader P, Burns SM, Cagliero E. Effectiveness of a computerized insulin order template in general medical inpatients with type 2 diabetes: a cluster randomized trial. *Diabetes Care* 2010;33:2181–2183
- Schnipper JL, Liang CL, Ndumele CD, Pendergrass ML. Effects of a computerized order set on the inpatient management of hyperglycemia: a cluster-randomized controlled trial. *Endocr Pract* 2010;16:209–218
- Wang YJ, Seggelke S, Hawkins RM, et al. Impact of glucose management team on outcomes of hospitalization in patients with type 2 diabetes admitted to the medical service. *Endocr Pract* 2016;22:1401–1405
- Draznin B, Gilden J, Golden SH, et al.; PRIDE investigators. Pathways to quality inpatient management of hyperglycemia and diabetes: a call to action. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:1807–1814
- Bansal V, Mottalib A, Pawar TK, et al. Inpatient diabetes management by specialized diabetes team versus primary service team in non-critical care units: impact on 30-day readmission rate and hospital cost. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2018;6:e000460
- Ostling S, Wyckoff J, Ciarkowski SL, et al. The relationship between diabetes mellitus and 30-day readmission rates. *Clin Diabetes Endocrinol* 2017;3:3
- Rushakoff RJ, Sullivan MM, MacMaster HW, et al. Association between a virtual glucose management service and glycemic control in hospitalized adult patients: an observational study. *Ann Intern Med* 2017;166:621–627
- Arnold P, Scheurer D, Dake AW, et al. Hospital guidelines for diabetes management and the Joint Commission-American Diabetes Association inpatient diabetes certification. *Am J Med Sci* 2016;351:333–341
- Society of Hospital Medicine. Glycemic control for hospitalists. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://www.hospitalmedicine.org/clinical-topics/glycemic-control/>
- Umpierrez GE, Hellman R, Korytkowski MT, et al.; Endocrine Society. Management of hyperglycemia in hospitalized patients in non-critical care setting: an endocrine society clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2012;97:16–38
- Agiostatridou G, Anhalt H, Ball D, et al. Standardizing clinically meaningful outcome measures beyond HbA<sub>1c</sub> for type 1 diabetes: a consensus report of the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, the American Association of Diabetes Educators, the American Diabetes Association, the Endocrine Society, JDRF International, The Leona M. and Harry B. Helmsley Charitable Trust, the Pediatric Endocrine Society, and the T1D Exchange. *Diabetes Care* 2017;40:1622–1630
- van den Berghe G, Wouters P, Weekers F, et al. Intensive insulin therapy in critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:1359–1367
- Finfer S, Chittock DR, Su SY, et al.; NICE-SUGAR Study Investigators. Intensive versus conventional glucose control in critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:1283–1297
- Kansagara D, Fu R, Freeman M, Wolf F, Helfand M. Intensive insulin therapy in hospitalized patients: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;154:268–282
- Sathya B, Davis R, Taveira T, Whitlatch H, Wu W-C. Intensity of peri-operative glycemic control and postoperative outcomes in patients with diabetes: a meta-analysis. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2013;102:8–15
- Umpierrez G, Cardona S, Pasquel F, et al. Randomized controlled trial of intensive versus conservative glucose control in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass graft surgery: GLUCO-CABG Trial. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:1665–1672
- Duncan AE, Abd-Elseyed A, Maheshwari A, Xu M, Soltesz E, Koch CG. Role of intraoperative and postoperative blood glucose concentrations in predicting outcomes after cardiac surgery. *Anesthesiology* 2010;112:860–871
- Furnary AP, Wu Y, Bookin SO. Effect of hyperglycemia and continuous intravenous insulin infusions on outcomes of cardiac surgical procedures: the Portland Diabetic Project. *Endocr Pract* 2004;10(Suppl. 2):21–33
- Low Wang CC, Draznin B. Practical approach to management of inpatient hyperglycemia in select patient populations. *Hosp Pract (1995)* 2013;41:45–53
- Cobaugh DJ, Maynard G, Cooper L, et al. Enhancing insulin-use safety in hospitals: practical recommendations from an ASHP Foundation expert consensus panel. *Am J Health Syst Pharm* 2013;70:1404–1413
- Rice MJ, Coursin DB. Glucose meters: here today, gone tomorrow? *Crit Care Med* 2016;44:e97–e100

37. Rice MJ, Smith JL, Coursin DB. Glucose measurement in the ICU: regulatory intersects reality. *Crit Care Med* 2017;45:741–743
38. Klonoff DC, Draznin B, Drincic A, et al. PRIDE statement on the need for a moratorium on the CMS plan to cite hospitals for performing point-of-care capillary blood glucose monitoring on critically ill patients. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2015;100:3607–3612
39. DuBois JA, Slingerland RJ, Fokkert M, et al. Bedside glucose monitoring—is it safe? A new, regulatory-compliant risk assessment evaluation protocol in critically ill patient care settings. *Crit Care Med* 2017;45:567–574
40. Zhang R, Isakow W, Kolfel MH, Scott MG. Performance of a modern glucose meter in ICU and general hospital inpatients: 3 years of real-world paired meter and central laboratory results. *Crit Care Med* 2017;45:1509–1514
41. Wallia A, Prince G, Touma E, El Muayed M, Seley JJ. Caring for hospitalized patients with diabetes mellitus, hyperglycemia, and COVID-19: bridging the remaining knowledge gaps. *Curr Diab Rep* 2020;20:77
42. Aljehani FA, Funke K, Hermayer KL. Inpatient diabetes and hyperglycemia management protocol in the COVID-19 era. *Am J Med Sci* 2020;360:423–426
43. Pasquel FJ, Umpierrez GE. Individualizing inpatient diabetes management during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2020;14:705–707
44. Ceriello A, Standl E, Catrinou D, et al.; “Diabetes and Cardiovascular Disease (D&CVD)” Study Group of the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). Issues for the management of people with diabetes and COVID-19 in ICU. *Cardiovasc Diabetol* 2020;19:114
45. Korytkowski M, Antinori-Lent K, Drincic A, et al. A pragmatic approach to inpatient diabetes management during the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2020;105:dga342
46. 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
47. 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
48. 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
49. Faulds ER, Jones L, McNett M, et al. Facilitators and barriers to nursing implementation of continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) in critically ill patients with COVID-19. *Endocr Pract* 2021;27:354–361
50. Maynard G, Wesorick DH, O’Malley C; Society of Hospital Medicine Glycemic Control Task Force. Subcutaneous insulin order sets and protocols: effective design and implementation strategies. *J Hosp Med* 2008;3(Suppl.):29–41
51. Brown KE, Hertig JB. Determining current insulin pen use practices and errors in the inpatient setting. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2016;42:568–575, AP1–AP7
52. Horne J, Bond R, Sarangarm P. Comparison of inpatient glycemic control with insulin vials versus insulin pens in general medicine patients. *Hosp Pharm* 2015;50:514–521
53. Veronesi G, Poerio CS, Braus A, et al. Determinants of nurse satisfaction using insulin pen devices with safety needles: an exploratory factor analysis. *Clin Diabetes Endocrinol* 2015;1:15
54. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA Drug Safety Communication: FDA requires label warnings to prohibit sharing of multi-dose diabetes pen devices among patients. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/ucm435271.htm>
55. Bueno E, Benitez A, Rufinelli JV, et al. Basal-bolus regimen with insulin analogues versus human insulin in medical patients with type 2 diabetes: a randomized controlled trial in Latin America. *Endocr Pract* 2015;21:807–813
56. Umpierrez GE, Smiley D, Jacobs S, et al. Randomized study of basal-bolus insulin therapy in the inpatient management of patients with type 2 diabetes undergoing general surgery (RABBIT 2 surgery). *Diabetes Care* 2011;34:256–261
57. Colunga-Lozano LE, Gonzalez Torres FJ, Delgado-Figueroa N, et al. Sliding scale insulin for non-critically ill hospitalized adults with diabetes mellitus. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2018;11:CD011296
58. Giugliano D, Chiodini P, Maiorino MI, Bellastella G, Esposito K. Intensification of insulin therapy with basal-bolus or premixed insulin regimens in type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Endocrine* 2016;51:417–428
59. Bellido V, Suarez L, Rodriguez MG, et al. Comparison of basal-bolus and premixed insulin regimens in hospitalized patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2015;38:2211–2216
60. Baldwin D, Zander J, Munoz C, et al. A randomized trial of two weight-based doses of insulin glargine and glulisine in hospitalized subjects with type 2 diabetes and renal insufficiency. *Diabetes Care* 2012;35:1970–1974
61. Iyengar R, Franzese J, Gianchandani R. Inpatient glycemic management in the setting of renal insufficiency/failure/dialysis. *Curr Diab Rep* 2018;18:75
62. Shomali ME, Herr DL, Hill PC, Pehlivanova M, Sharretts JM, Magee MF. Conversion from intravenous insulin to subcutaneous insulin after cardiovascular surgery: transition to target study. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2011;13:121–126
63. Lien LF, Low Wang CC, Kreider KE, Baldwin D. Transitioning from intravenous to subcutaneous insulin. In *Managing Diabetes and Hyperglycemia in the Hospital Setting*. Draznin B, Ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2016, pp. 115–128
64. Tripathy PR, Lansang MC. U-500 regular insulin use in hospitalized patients. *Endocr Pract* 2015;21:54–58
65. Lansang MC, Umpierrez GE. Inpatient hyperglycemia management: a practical review for primary medical and surgical teams. *Cleve Clin J Med* 2016;83(Suppl. 1):S34–S43
66. Umpierrez GE, Gianchandani R, Smiley D, et al. Safety and efficacy of sitagliptin therapy for the inpatient management of general medicine and surgery patients with type 2 diabetes: a pilot, randomized, controlled study. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:3430–3435
67. Pasquel FJ, Fayman M, Umpierrez GE. Debate on insulin vs non-insulin use in the hospital setting—is it time to revise the guidelines for the management of inpatient diabetes? *Curr Diab Rep* 2019;19:65
68. Fushimi N, Shibuya T, Yoshida Y, Ito S, Hachiya H, Mori A. Dulaglutide-combined basal plus correction insulin therapy contributes to ideal glycemic control in non-critical hospitalized patients. *J Diabetes Investig* 2020;11:125–131
69. Fayman M, Galindo RJ, Rubin DJ, et al. A randomized controlled trial on the safety and efficacy of exenatide therapy for the inpatient management of general medicine and surgery patients with type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:450–456
70. Pérez-Belmonte LM, Osuna-Sánchez J, Millán-Gómez M, et al. Glycaemic efficacy and safety of linagliptin for the management of non-cardiac surgery patients with type 2 diabetes in a real-world setting: Lina-Surg study. *Ann Med* 2019;51:252–261
71. Vellanki P, Rasouli N, Baldwin D, et al. Glycaemic efficacy and safety of linagliptin compared to basal-bolus insulin regimen in patients with type 2 diabetes undergoing non-cardiac surgery: a multicenter randomized clinical trial. *Diabetes Obes Metab* 2019;21:837–843
72. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA Drug Safety Communication: FDA adds warnings about heart failure risk to labels of type 2 diabetes medicines containing saxagliptin and alogliptin. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/ucm486096.htm>
73. Akirov A, Grossman A, Shochat T, Shimon I. Mortality among hospitalized patients with hypoglycemia: insulin related and noninsulin related. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2017;102:416–424
74. Amori RE, Pittas AG, Siegel RD, et al. Inpatient medical errors involving glucose-lowering medications and their impact on patients: review of 2,598 incidents from a voluntary electronic error-reporting database. *Endocr Pract* 2008;14:535–542
75. Alwan D, Chipps E, Yen P-Y, Dungan K. Evaluation of the timing and coordination of prandial insulin administration in the hospital. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2017;131:18–32
76. Hung AM, Siew ED, Wilson OD, et al. Risk of hypoglycemia following hospital discharge in patients with diabetes and acute kidney injury. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:503–512
77. Maynard G, Kulasa K, Ramos P, et al. Impact of a hypoglycemia reduction bundle and a systems approach to inpatient glycemic management. *Endocr Pract* 2015;21:355–367
78. Milligan PE, Cox MC, Pratt E, Hoehner CM, Krettek JE, Dunagan WC. Multifaceted approach to reducing occurrence of severe hypoglycemia in a large healthcare system. *Am J Health Syst Pharm* 2015;72:1631–1641
79. Dagogo-Jack S. Hypoglycemia in type 1 diabetes mellitus: pathophysiology and prevention. *Treat Endocrinol* 2004;3:91–103
80. Rickels MR. Hypoglycemia-associated autonomic failure, counterregulatory responses, and therapeutic options in type 1 diabetes. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2019;1454:68–79
81. Dendy JA, Chockalingam V, Tirumalasetty NN, et al. Identifying risk factors for severe

- hypoglycemia in hospitalized patients with diabetes. *Endocr Pract* 2014;20:1051–1056
82. Ulmer BJ, Kara A, Mariash CN. Temporal occurrences and recurrence patterns of hypoglycemia during hospitalization. *Endocr Pract* 2015;21:501–507
83. Shah BR, Walji S, Kiss A, James JE, Lowe JM. Derivation and validation of a risk-prediction tool for hypoglycemia in hospitalized adults with diabetes: the Hypoglycemia During Hospitalization (HyDHo) score. *Can J Diabetes* 2019;43:278–282.e1
84. Mathioudakis NN, Everett E, Routh S, et al. Development and validation of a prediction model for insulin-associated hypoglycemia in non-critically ill hospitalized adults. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res Care* 2018;6:e000499
85. Curll M, Dinardo M, Noschese M, Korytkowski MT. Menu selection, glycaemic control and satisfaction with standard and patient-controlled consistent carbohydrate meal plans in hospitalised patients with diabetes. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2010;19:355–359
86. Korytkowski M, Draznin B, Drincic A. Food, fasting, insulin, and glycemic control in the hospital. In *Managing Diabetes and Hyperglycemia in the Hospital Setting*. Draznin B, Ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2016, pp. 70–83
87. Mabrey ME, Setji TL. Patient self-management of diabetes care in the inpatient setting. *pro. J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2015;9:1152–1154
88. Shah AD, Rushakoff RJ. Patient self-management of diabetes care in the inpatient setting. *con. J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2015;9:1155–1157
89. Umpierrez GE, Klonoff DC. Diabetes technology update: use of insulin pumps and continuous glucose monitoring in the hospital. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1579–1589
90. Houlden RL, Moore S. In-hospital management of adults using insulin pump therapy. *Can J Diabetes* 2014;38:126–133
91. Korytkowski MT, Salata RJ, Koerbel GL, et al. Insulin therapy and glycemic control in hospitalized patients with diabetes during enteral nutrition therapy: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:594–596
92. Hsia E, Seggelke SA, Gibbs J, Rasouli N, Draznin B. Comparison of 70/30 biphasic insulin with glargine/lispro regimen in non-critically ill diabetic patients on continuous enteral nutrition therapy. *Nutr Clin Pract* 2011;26:714–717
93. Drincic AT, Knezevich JT, Akkireddy P. Nutrition and hyperglycemia management in the inpatient setting (meals on demand, parenteral, or enteral nutrition). *Curr Diab Rep* 2017;17:59
94. Low Wang CC, Hawkins RM, Gianchandani R, Dungan K. Glycemic control in the setting of parenteral or enteral nutrition via tube feeding. In *Managing Diabetes and Hyperglycemia in the Hospital Setting*. Draznin B, Ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2016, pp. 84–98
95. Pichardo-Lowden AR, Fan CY, Gabbay RA. Management of hyperglycemia in the non-intensive care patient: featuring subcutaneous insulin protocols. *Endocr Pract* 2011;17:249–260
96. Roberts A, James J; Joint British Diabetes Societies (JBDS) for Inpatient Care. Management of hyperglycaemia and steroid (glucocorticoid) therapy: a guideline from the Joint British Diabetes Societies (JBDS) for Inpatient Care group. *Diabet Med* 2018;35:1011–1017
97. Kwon S, Hermayer KL, Hermayer K. Glucocorticoid-induced hyperglycemia. *Am J Med Sci* 2013;345:274–277
98. Seggelke SA, Gibbs J, Draznin B. Pilot study of using neutral protamine Hagedorn insulin to counteract the effect of methylprednisolone in hospitalized patients with diabetes. *J Hosp Med* 2011;6:175–176
99. Mathioudakis N, Dungan K, Baldwin D, Korytkowski M, Reider J. Steroid-associated hyperglycemia. In *Managing Diabetes and Hyperglycemia in the Hospital Setting*. Draznin B, Ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2016, pp. 99–114
100. Brady V, Thosani S, Zhou S, Bassett R, Busaidy NL, Lavis V. Safe and effective dosing of basal-bolus insulin in patients receiving high-dose steroids for hyper-cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, vincristine, and dexamethasone chemotherapy. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2014;16:874–879
101. Smiley DD, Umpierrez GE. Perioperative glucose control in the diabetic or nondiabetic patient. *South Med J* 2006;99:580–589; quiz 590–591
102. Buchleitner AM, Martínez-Alonso M, Hernández M, Solà I, Mauricio D. Perioperative glycaemic control for diabetic patients undergoing surgery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012;9:CD007315
103. Gianchandani R, Dubois E, Alexanian S, Rushakoff R. Preoperative, intraoperative, and postoperative glucose management. In *Managing Diabetes and Hyperglycemia in the Hospital Setting*. Draznin B, Ed. Alexandria, VA, American Diabetes Association, 2016, pp. 129–144
104. Demma LJ, Carlson KT, Duggan EW, Morrow JG 3rd, Umpierrez G. Effect of basal insulin dosage on blood glucose concentration in ambulatory surgery patients with type 2 diabetes. *J Clin Anesth* 2017;36:184–188
105. Umpierrez GE, Smiley D, Hermayer K, et al. Randomized study comparing a basal-bolus with a basal plus correction insulin regimen for the hospital management of medical and surgical patients with type 2 diabetes: basal plus trial. *Diabetes Care* 2013;36:2169–2174
106. Kitabchi AE, Umpierrez GE, Miles JM, Fisher JN. Hyperglycemic crises in adult patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2009;32:1335–1343
107. Vellanki P, Umpierrez GE. Diabetic ketoacidosis: a common debut of diabetes among African Americans with type 2 diabetes. *Endocr Pract* 2017;23:971–978
108. Harrison VS, Rustico S, Palladino AA, Ferrara C, Hawkes CP. Glargine co-administration with intravenous insulin in pediatric diabetic ketoacidosis is safe and facilitates transition to a subcutaneous regimen. *Pediatr Diabetes* 2017;18:742–748
109. Hsia E, Seggelke S, Gibbs J, et al. Subcutaneous administration of glargine to diabetic patients receiving insulin infusion prevents rebound hyperglycemia. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2012;97:3132–3137
110. Andrade-Castellanos CA, Colunga-Lozano LE, Delgado-Figueroa N, Gonzalez-Padilla DA. Subcutaneous rapid-acting insulin analogues for diabetic ketoacidosis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;1:CD011281
111. Kitabchi AE, Umpierrez GE, Fisher JN, Murphy MB, Stentz FB. Thirty years of personal experience in hyperglycemic crises: diabetic ketoacidosis and hyperglycemic hyperosmolar state. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2008;93:1541–1552
112. Shepperd S, Lannin NA, Clemson LM, McCluskey A, Cameron ID, Barras SL. Discharge planning from hospital to home. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 1996;1:CD000313
113. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Patient Safety Network – Readmissions and adverse events after discharge, 2019. Accessed 17 October 2021. Available from <https://psnet.ahrq.gov/primer/readmissions-and-adverse-events-after-discharge>
114. Rubin DJ. Hospital readmission of patients with diabetes. *Curr Diab Rep* 2015;15:17
115. Gregory NS, Seley JJ, Dargar SK, Galla N, Gerber LM, Lee JI. Strategies to prevent readmission in high-risk patients with diabetes: the importance of an interdisciplinary approach. *Curr Diab Rep* 2018;18:54
116. Jiang HJ, Stryer D, Friedman B, Andrews R. Multiple hospitalizations for patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2003;26:1421–1426
117. Maldonado MR, D’Amico S, Rodriguez L, Iyer D, Balasubramanyam A. Improved outcomes in indigent patients with ketosis-prone diabetes: effect of a dedicated diabetes treatment unit. *Endocr Pract* 2003;9:26–32
118. Wu EQ, Zhou S, Yu A, Lu M, Sharma H, Gill J, et al. Outcomes associated with post-discharge insulin continuity in US patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus initiating insulin in the hospital. *Hosp Pract (1995)* 2012;40:40–48
119. Hirschman KB, Bixby MB. Transitions in care from the hospital to home for patients with diabetes. *Diabetes Spectr* 2014;27:192–195
120. Tuttle KR, Bakris GL, Bilous RW, et al. Diabetic kidney disease: a report from an ADA Consensus Conference. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2864–2883
121. Rubin DJ, Recco D, Turchin A, Zhao H, Golden SH. External validation of the Diabetes Early Re-Admission Risk Indicator (DERRI™). *Endocr Pract* 2018;24:527–541



# 17. Diabetes Advocacy: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

American Diabetes Association  
Professional Practice Committee\*

*Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S254–S255 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-S017>

The American Diabetes Association (ADA) “Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes” includes 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).

Managing the daily health demands of diabetes can be challenging. People living with diabetes should not have to face discrimination due to diabetes. By advocating for the rights of those with diabetes at all levels, the American Diabetes Association (ADA) can help to ensure that they live a healthy and productive life. A strategic goal of the ADA is for more children and adults with diabetes to live free from the burden of discrimination. The ADA is also focused on making sure cost is not a barrier to successful diabetes management.

One tactic for achieving these goals has been to implement the ADA Standards of Care through advocacy-oriented position statements. The ADA publishes evidence-based, peer-reviewed statements on topics such as diabetes and employment, diabetes and driving, insulin access and affordability, and diabetes management in certain settings such as schools, childcare programs, and correctional institutions. In addition to the ADA’s clinical documents, these advocacy statements are important tools in educating schools, employers, licensing agencies, policy makers, and others about the intersection of diabetes medicine and the law and for providing scientifically supported policy recommendations.

## ADVOCACY STATEMENTS

The following is a partial list of advocacy statements ordered by publication date, with the most recent statement appearing first.

### Insulin Access and Affordability

The ADA’s Insulin Access and Affordability Working Group compiled public information and convened a series of meetings with stakeholders throughout the insulin supply chain to learn how each entity affects the cost of insulin for the consumer. Their conclusions and recommendations are published in the following ADA statement: Cefalu WT, Dawes DE, Gavlak G, et al.; Insulin Access and Affordability Working Group. Insulin Access and Affordability Working Group: conclusions and recommendations. *Diabetes*

\*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. 17. Diabetes advocacy: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022. *Diabetes Care* 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S254–S255

© 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>.



Care 2018;41:1299–1311 [published correction appears in Diabetes Care 2018;41:1831]; <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc18-0019> (first publication 2018).

### Diabetes Care in the School Setting

A sizable portion of a child's day is spent in school, so close communication with and cooperation of school personnel are essential to optimize diabetes management, safety, and academic opportunities. See the following ADA position statement for diabetes management information for students with diabetes in the elementary and secondary school settings.

Jackson CC, Albanese-O'Neill A, Butler KL, et al.; American Diabetes Association. Diabetes care in the school setting: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2015; 38:1958–1963; <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc15-1418> (first publication 1998; latest revision 2015).

### Care of Young Children With Diabetes in the Childcare Setting

Very young children (aged <6 years) with diabetes have legal protections and can be safely cared for by childcare providers with appropriate training, access to resources, and a system of communication with parents and the child's diabetes provider. See the following ADA position statement for information on young children aged <6 years in settings such as day care centers, preschools, camps, and other programs.

Siminerio LM, Albanese-O'Neill A, Chiang JL, et al.; American Diabetes Association. Care of young children with diabetes in the childcare setting: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37:2834–2842; <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc14-1676> (first publication 2014).

### Diabetes and Driving

People with diabetes who wish to operate motor vehicles are subject to a great variety of licensing requirements applied by both state and federal jurisdictions. For an overview of existing licensing rules for people with diabetes, factors that impact driving for this population, and general guidelines for assessing driver fitness and determining appropriate licensing restrictions, see the following ADA position statement.

*Editor's note: Federal commercial driving rules for individuals with insulin-treated diabetes changed on 19 November 2018. These changes will be reflected in a future updated ADA statement.*

Lorber D, Anderson J, Arent S, et al.; American Diabetes Association. Diabetes and driving. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37(Suppl. 1):S97–S103; <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc14-S097> (first publication 2012).

### Diabetes and Employment

Any person with diabetes, whether insulin treated or non-insulin treated, should be eligible for any employment for which

he or she is otherwise qualified. Employment decisions should never be based on generalizations or stereotypes regarding the effects of diabetes. For a general set of guidelines for evaluating individuals with diabetes for employment, including how an assessment should be performed and what changes (accommodations) in the workplace may be needed for an individual with diabetes, see the following ADA position statement.

Anderson JE, Greene MA, Griffin JW Jr, et al.; American Diabetes Association. Diabetes and employment. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37(Suppl. 1):S112–S117; <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc14-S112> (first publication 1984; latest revision 2009).

### Diabetes Care in Correctional Institutions

People with diabetes in correctional facilities should receive care that meets national standards. Correctional institutions should have written policies and procedures for the management of diabetes and for the training of medical and correctional staff in diabetes care practices. For a general set of guidelines for diabetes care in correction institutions, see the following ADA position statement.

American Diabetes Association. Diabetes management in correctional institutions. *Diabetes Care* 2014;37(Suppl. 1):S104–S111; <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc14-S104> (first publication 1989; latest revision 2008).



# Disclosures: *Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes—2022*

Diabetes Care 2022;45(Suppl. 1):S256–S258 | <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc22-SDIS>

**Committee members disclosed the following financial or other conflicts of interest (COI) covering the period 12 months before December 2021**

Member	Employment	Research grant	Other research support	Speakers' bureau/honoraria	Ownership interest	Consultant/advisory board	Other
<b>Professional Practice Committee</b>							
Boris Draznin, MD, PhD (Chair)	University of Colorado Denver, School of Medicine	None	None	None	None	None	eDoctate (unpaid professional education)
Vanita R. Aroda, MD	Brigham and Women's Hospital Faculty, Harvard Medical School	Applied Therapeutics#, Eli Lilly#, Fractyl#, Novo Nordisk#	None	None	Janssen (spouse employee benefits)	Applied Therapeutics#, Novo Nordisk*#, Pfizer, Sanofi	Janssen Pharmaceutical Companies of Johnson & Johnson (spouse Sandip Datta, MD, Senior Director, Translational Sciences, Immunology, May 2020 to present) Consultant/Educational Activities: American College of Cardiology, American Diabetes Association, Cardiometabolic Health Congress, Endocrine Society, Hello Diabetes Academia, PeerView, PeerVoice
George Bakris, MD	University of Chicago Medicine	None	None	None	None	Merck, Novo Nordisk, Bayer, KBP Biosciences, Ionis, Alnylam, AstraZeneca, Quantum Genomics, Horizon, DiaMedica Therapeutics	Editor of <i>American Journal of Nephrology</i>
Gretchen Benson, RDN, LD, CDCES	Minneapolis Heart Institute Foundation	None	None	None	None	None	None
Florence M. Brown, MD	Joslin Diabetes Center, Inc.	Dexcom#†	None	None	None	None	None
RaShaye Freeman, DNP, FNP-BC, CDCES, ADM-BC	HCA Healthcare	None	None	None	None	None	None
Jennifer Green, MD	Duke University Medical Center	Boehringer Ingelheim/ Lilly Alliance*#, Merck*#, Sanofi Lexicon*#, Roche*#	None	None	None	AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim/ Lilly Alliance*, Novo Nordisk, Pfizer, Hawthorne Effect/ Omada*, AstraZeneca, Jaeb Center for Health Research, Bayer, Sanofi/Lexicon	None

Continued on p. S257

Member	Employment	Research grant	Other research support	Speakers' bureau/honoraria	Ownership interest	Consultant/advisory board	Other
Elbert Huang, MD, MPH, FACP	University of Chicago	None	None	None	AbbVie* (stockholder)	Twin health, Inc.	Medical Research Analytics and Informatics Alliance—BOD International Geriatric Diabetes Society—BOD
Diana Isaacs, PharmD, BCPS, BC-ADM, CDCES	Cleveland Clinic	None	None	Abbott, Dexcom, Medtronic, Novo Nordisk, Xeris Pharmaceuticals, Bayer	None	Insulet, LifeScan, Sanofi, Lilly, DiabetesWise	None
Scott Kahan, MD, MPH	George Washington University, Milken Institute National Center for Weight and Wellness	None	None	None	None	Vivus, Gelesis, Pfizer, Lilly	(All without compensation) The Obesity Society—BOD Obesity Action Coalition—BOD Endocrine Society—Advocacy and Public Outreach Core Committee
Jose Leon, MD, MPH	National Center for Health in Public Housing	None	None	None	None	None	None
Sarah K. Lyons, MD	Baylor College of Medicine/Texas Children's Hospital	None	None	None	Eli Lilly (parent stockholder)†	None	Unpaid Board Member on Epic's Pediatric Endocrinology Steering Board
Anne L. Peters, MD	Keck School of Medicine of USC	Dexcom#, Insulet#, Donates devices from Abbott Diabetes Care#	None	None	Stock options: Omada Health, Teladoc	Abbott Diabetes Care, Eli Lilly, Medscape*, Novo Nordisk, Zealand, Vertex, AstraZeneca	Special government employee for U.S. Food and Drug Administration
Priya Prahalad, MD, PhD	Stanford Hospital and Clinics Lucile Packard Children's Hospital	None	None	None	None	None	Unpaid Board Member on Epic's Pediatric Endocrinology Steering Board
Jane E.B. Reusch, MD	University of Colorado	None	None	None	None	Medtronic#	None
Deborah Young-Hyman, PhD, CDCES	Behavioral Health & Social Science Research, National Institutes of Health	None	None	None	None	None	None
<b>American College of Cardiology Designated Representatives and Staff (Section 10 "Cardiovascular Disease and Risk Management")</b>							
Sandeep Das, MD, MPH, FACC	University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center	None	None	<i>Circulation</i> (Associate Editor)	None	None	None
Mikhail Kosiborod, MD, FACC	Saint Luke's Mid America Heart Institute	AstraZeneca#, Boehringer Ingelheim#	AstraZeneca#	None	None	Amgen*, Applied Therapeutics#, AstraZeneca*#, Bayer*, Boehringer Ingelheim*, Eli Lilly, Janssen*#, Merck (Diabetes & Cardiovascular)*, Novo Nordisk*#, Sanofi*, Vifor Pharma*#, Esperion Therapeutics	None

Member	Employment	Research grant	Other research support	Speakers' bureau/honoraria	Ownership interest	Consultant/advisory board	Other
<b>American Diabetes Association Staff</b>							
Mindy Saraco, MHA	American Diabetes Association	None	None	None	None	None	None
Malaika I. Hill, MA	American Diabetes Association	None	None	None	None	None	None
Robert A. Gabbay, MD, PhD	American Diabetes Association	None	None	None	None	Onduo*, Lark, Vida Health*	Spouse Christi Gabbay, CHSE, Managing Director, Major Gifts and Philanthropy at American Diabetes Association Endocrinologist, Joslin Diabetes Center (unpaid/volunteer)
Nuha Ali El Sayed, MD, MMSc†	American Diabetes Association	None	None	None	None	Expert, World Health Organization	Endocrinologist, Joslin Diabetes Center (unpaid/volunteer) Chair, Diabetes Education for All (unpaid)

Disclosures may have been identified and/or acquired after the committee members were selected for the Professional Practice Committee. BOD, board of directors. \*≥\$10,000 per year from company to individual. #Grant or contract is to university or other employer. †Disclosure made after committee member began work on the Standards of Care 2022 update. ‡Employed by Joslin Diabetes Center prior to joining the American Diabetes Association in August 2021.



## Index

- A1C, S4, **S18–S19**  
 advantages of, S18  
 and cardiovascular disease outcomes, S88–S89  
 confirming diagnosis with, S19  
 correlation with BGM, S84  
 in diagnosis of adults, S18–S19  
 in diagnosis of children, S18–S19  
 differences in children, S84–S85  
 hemoglobinopathies and, S19  
 limitations, S84  
 other conditions affecting, S19  
 point-of-care assays, S4, S18  
 in prediabetes, S23  
 in pregnancy, S235  
 race/ethnicity and, S19, S84–S85  
 recommendations, S19  
 setting and modifying goals for, S89–S90
- acarbose, S121, S137  
 access to care, S10–S11  
 access, to insulin, S254–S255  
 ACCORD study, S54, S87–S88, S91, S146, S147, S148, S154, S178, S179, S197  
 ACE inhibitors, S6, S7, S51, S148, S149, S150, S158, S176, S178, S181, S182, S209, S216, S218, S222, S233, S239  
 acute kidney injury, S150, S178  
 ADA consensus report, S1–S2  
 ADA evidence-grading system, S2  
 ADA Professional Practice Committee, S1, **S3**  
 ADA statements, S1  
 ADAG study, S84–S85, S90, S91  
 Addison disease, S53  
 adolescents. *see* children and adolescents.  
 adrenal insufficiency, primary, S53  
 adult-onset diabetes. *see* Type 2 diabetes.  
 adults, prediabetes and diabetes screening in, S22, S25–S26  
 ADVANCE trial, S87–S88, S91, S146, S147  
 advocacy statements, S7, **S254–S255**  
 care of young children with diabetes in the childcare setting, S255  
 diabetes and driving, S255  
 diabetes and employment, S255  
 diabetes care in correctional institutions, S255  
 diabetes care in the school setting, S255  
 insulin access and affordability, S254–S255
- affordability, of insulin, S254–S255  
 African Americans, S11, S20, S21, S22, S25, S68, S91  
 A1C variability in, S19, S23, S84–S85  
 BMI cut point in, S26
- age  
 effect on A1C, S19–S20  
 risk factor for diabetes, S25  
 statin treatment and, S151
- agricultural workers, migrant, S12  
 AIM-HIGH trial, S154–S155  
 albiglutide, S165, S166, S167  
 albuminuria, S66, S70, S91, S133, S145, S147, S149, S150, S156, S167, **S176**, S177, S178, S179, S180, S181, S182, S215, S217, S218  
 alcohol intake, S67  
 alirocumab, S153
- alogliptin, S133, S137, S159, S167, S247  
 alpha-glucosidase inhibitors, S137  
 ambulatory glucose profile (AGP), S85, S86, S87  
 amputation, foot, S190, S191  
 analogs. *see* insulin analogs.  
 angiotensin receptor blockers (ARBs), S6, S149, S150, S158, S178, S180, S181, S182, S209, S210  
 anti-VEGF agents, S187–S188  
 antibiotics, S192  
 antiplatelet agents, S155–S157  
 antipsychotics, atypical, S26, S74  
 antiretroviral therapies, S26  
 anxiety disorders, S72  
 ARRIVE trial, S156  
 ASCEND trial, S66, S156, S157  
 Asian Americans, S22, S25–S26, S119, S120  
 aspart, S27, S126, S138, S201  
 aspirin therapy, S155, S156, S239  
 ASPREE trial, S156  
 atenolol, S190  
 atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease (ASCVD), **S144–S174**  
 atorvastatin, S152  
 atypical antipsychotics, S26, S74  
 autoimmune diseases, **S53, S215**  
 automated insulin delivery (AID) systems, S5, S98, S104–S105, S126, S213  
 autonomic neuropathy, S70  
 autonomic neuropathy, diabetic, S188
- balloons, implanted gastric, S119  
 bariatric surgery. *see* metabolic surgery.  
 basal insulin, S99, S126, S139  
 bedtime dosing, of antihypertensives, S150  
 behavior changes, S5, S10, **S60–S82**  
 diabetes self-management education and support, **S60–S62**  
 medical nutrition therapy, **S62–S67**  
 physical activity, **S67–S70**  
 in pregnancy, S236  
 psychosocial issues, **S70–S75**  
 smoking cessation, **S70**  
 for weight loss, S114–S115
- bempedoic acid, S153–S154  
 beta-cell replacement therapy, S130–S131  
 biguanides, S137  
 bladder dysfunction, S189  
 Blood Glucose Awareness Training, S5, S72, S92  
 blood glucose monitoring (BGM), S5, S83, S84, S85, S89, S90, S92, S129, S221  
 bedside, in hospitalized patients, **S246**  
 correlation with A1C, S84  
 devices for, **S98–S100**  
 in hypoglycemia, S90–S92  
 in intensive insulin regimens, S99  
 during pregnancy, S235
- blood pressure control. *see also* hypertension., **S145–S150**, S181  
 body mass index (BMI), S5, S18, S22, S25–S26, S114, S115, S116, S119, S120, S219, S221, S222, S237, S239  
 bone mineral density (BMD), S55  
 bromocriptine, S137
- calcium channel blockers, S149, S150  
 canagliflozin, S133, S137, S162, S164, S167, S180, S181, S616  
 cancer, risk in diabetes, S53  
 CANVAS study, S162, S163, S164, S180, S181  
 capsaicin, topical, S190  
 carbamazepine, S190  
 carbohydrate intake, S4, S5, S65–S66  
 cardiac autonomic neuropathy, diabetic, S188–S189  
 cardiac function testing, S223  
 cardiovascular disease, S6, **S144–S174**  
 A1C and outcomes of, S88–S89  
 antiplatelet agents, **S155–S157**  
 cardiac testing, S159  
 hypertension/blood pressure control, **S145–S150**  
 lifestyle and pharmacologic interventions, **S159–S169**  
 lipid management, **S151–S155**  
 prevention of, in prediabetes, **S42–S43**, S223  
 screening, S157–S159
- cardiovascular risk  
 in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S216  
 risk calculator, **S145**
- care delivery systems, S9–S11  
 access to care and quality improvement, S10–S11  
 behaviors and well-being, S10  
 care teams, S10  
 chronic care model, S9  
 medication cost considerations, S10  
 six core elements, S9  
 system-level improvement strategies, S9–S10
- care teams, S10  
 CARMELINA trial, S159, S167  
 CAROLINA trial, S159, S161  
 celiac disease, S53  
 in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S209, S215–S216  
 Charcot neuropathy, S69, S70, S190, S191  
 childcare, S212, S255  
 children and adolescents, S7, **S208–S231**  
 A1C in, S19–S20, S84–S85  
 asymptomatic, risk-based screening in, S23  
 cystic fibrosis-related diabetes in, **S27**  
 diabetes care in childcare settings, S212, S255  
 diabetes care in school setting, S98, S212, S254–S255  
 insulin pumps in, S104  
 maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY), S17, **S28–S29**  
 monogenic diabetes syndromes, S17, S28–S30  
 neonatal diabetes, S17, S28–S29  
 physical activity in, S68, S69  
 recommendations for screening and treatment, S209–S210  
 screening for prediabetes and type 2, S26  
 transition from pediatric to adult care, **S224**  
 type 1 diabetes in, **S211–S218**  
 type 2 diabetes in, **S218–S224**

- China Da Qing Diabetes Prevention Outcome Study, S42–S43
- CHIPS trial, S148
- cholesterol lowering, S151
- chronic care model, S9
- chronic kidney disease, diabetic, S6–S7, **S175–S184**
- acute kidney injury, S178
  - assessing albuminuria and GFR, S176–S177
  - diagnosis, S177
  - interventions for, S179–S182
  - referral to nephrologist, S182
  - risk of progression, S177
  - screening recommendations, S175
  - staging, S177–S178
  - surveillance, S178–S179
  - treatment recommendations, S175–S176
- classification, S4, **S17–S18**
- clonidine, S190
- clopidogrel, S155, S157
- closed-loop systems
- do-it-yourself, S105
  - hybrid, S126
- coaching, online, S105
- cognitive capacity/impairment, S5, S53–S54, S74–S75
- colesevelam, S137
- collaborative care, **S46–S48**
- collagen vascular diseases, S53
- community health workers, S4
- community screening, S26
- community support, S13
- comorbidities, assessment of, **S46–S59**
- autoimmune diseases, **S53**
  - cancer, **S53**
  - cognitive impairment/dementia, **S53–S54**
  - fractures, **S55**
  - hepatitis C infection, **S54–S55**
  - low testosterone in men, **S55–S56**
  - nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, **S54, S55, S56**
  - obstructive sleep apnea, **S56**
  - pancreatitis, **S55**
  - periodontal disease, **S56**
  - sensory impairment, **S55**
- COMPASS trial, S157
- CONCEPTT study, S235–S236
- connected insulin pens, S5, S102–S103
- continuous glucose monitoring (CGM), S5, **S85–S87**
- ambulatory glucose profile in, S85, S86, S87
  - devices for, **S100–S102**
  - in hospitalized patients, S246
  - in hypoglycemia, S92
  - in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S214
  - in pregnancy, S235–S236
  - recommendations, S85, S100–S101
  - standardized metrics for, S85
- continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (CSII), S98, S125–S126
- coronary artery disease, S69, S149, S150, S157, S158
- correctional institutions, diabetes care in, S255
- cost considerations, S4, S10, S135, S137, S254–S255
- COVID-19 vaccines, **S51–S52**
- CREDESCENCE study, S162, S163, S164, S167, S180, S181
- cystic fibrosis-related diabetes, S17, **S27**
- DAMOCLES study, S192
- DAPA-CKD study, S6, S164, S180
- DAPA-HF study, S6, S164
- dapagliflozin, S133, S137, S162, S164, S166, S167, S180, S181
- DASH diet, S148, S151
- DECLARE-TIMI 58 study, S164
- degludec, S126, S138, S139, S140, S201
- delay, of type 2 diabetes, S4–S5, **S39–S45**
- lifestyle behavior change, **S40–S42**
  - patient-centered care goals, **S43**
  - pharmacologic interventions, **S42**
  - prevention of vascular disease and mortality, **S42–S43**
- dementia, in diabetics, S53–S54
- hyperglycemia and, S54
  - hypoglycemia and, S54
  - nutrition and, S54
  - statins and, S54
- dental practices, screening in, S26
- depression, S72–S73
- detemir, S128, S138, S139, S201
- devices. *see* technology.
- Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT), S19, S87, S88, S89, S90, S91, S105, S125, S126, S214, S218
- Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications (DCCT/EDIC), S55, S88, S89, S91, S179
- diabetes distress, S71–S72
- diabetes medical management plan (DMMP), for students, S98
- Diabetes Prevention Impact Tool Kit, S41
- Diabetes Prevention Program (DPP), S23, **S40**
- delivery and dissemination of, S41–S42
- Diabetes Prevention Recognition Program (DPRP), S42
- diabetes self-management education and support (DSMES), S5, S10, S13, **S60–S62, S63, S71, S73, S136, S211**
- diabetes technology. *see* technology, diabetes.
- diabetic ketoacidosis, S17–S18, S249–S250
- diabetic kidney disease. *see* chronic kidney disease.
- Diabetic Retinopathy Study (DRS), S187
- diagnosis, S4, **S18–S26**
- confirmation of, S20
  - of diabetic kidney disease, S177
  - of diabetic neuropathy, S188–S189
  - diagnostic tests, S18–S20
  - type 1 diabetes, S20–S22
  - of type 1 vs type 2 in pediatric patients, S219
  - type 2 diabetes, S23–S25
- diagnostic tests, S18–S20
- A1C, S19–S20
  - age, S19–S20
  - confirmation of, S20
  - criteria for, S19
  - ethnicity, S20
  - fasting and 2-hr plasma glucose, S19
  - hemoglobinopathies, S20
  - prediabetes, S22–S23
  - race, S20
- diet
- for hypertension control, S148
  - for weight loss, S114–S115
- Dietary Reference Intakes, S236
- digital health technology, S105
- dipeptidyl peptidase 4 (DPP4) inhibitors, S28, S116, S133, S134, S135, S137, S159, S161, S166, S190, S200, S247
- disordered eating behavior, S73–S74
- do-it-yourself systems, S105
- domperidone, S190
- Dose Adjusted for Normal Eating (DAFNE), S5, S92
- DRCR Retina Network, S187
- driving, and diabetes, S255
- droxidopa, S190
- dulaglutide, S133, S137, S160, S165, S166, S167, S181
- duloxetine, S189
- dyslipidemia, S209, S210, S216–S217, S223
- e-cigarettes, S70, S217
- eating disorders, S73–S74
- eating patterns, S74–S75
- education, on device use, S98
- electrical stimulation, gastric, S190
- ELIXA trial, S160–S161
- EMPA-REG OUTCOME trial, S133, S161, S162, S163, S167, S180
- empagliflozin, S133, S137, S161, S164, S166, S167, S168, S180, S181
- EMPEROR-Reduced trial, S133, S162, S163, S164, S167
- employment, diabetes and, S255
- enalapril, S190
- end-of-life care, S204
- enteral/parenteral feedings, S248–S249
- erectile dysfunction, S56, S190
- ertugliflozin, S133, S137, S162, S164–S165, S247
- Ertugliflozin Efficacy and Safety Cardiovascular Outcomes Trial (VERTIS CV), S6, S164–S165
- erythromycin, S190
- erythropoietin therapy, A1C and, S19
- estimated average glucose (eAG), S84
- ETDRS study, S187
- ethnicity
- effect on A1C, S20, S84–S85
  - in screening asymptomatic adults, S25–S26
  - in screening asymptomatic children/adolescents, S23
- evidence-grading system, S2
- evolocumab, S6, S153
- EXAMINE trial, S159, S167
- exenatide, S133, S137, S160, S166, S167, S221
- exercise. *see* physical activity.
- exocrine pancreas diseases, S17, **S30**
- EXSCEL trial, S133, S160–S161, S166
- eye exam, comprehensive, S186, S187, S218, S223
- ezetimibe, S6, S151, S152, S153, S155, S156
- family history, in screening children/adolescents, S23
- fasting plasma glucose (FPG) test, S18, S19, S20, S23, S26, S136
- fats, dietary, S66–S67
- FDA standards, for glucose meters, S99
- fenofibrate, S154
- fibrate + statin therapy, S154
- FLOW trial, S181
- fluvastatin, S152
- food insecurity, S11–S12
- foot care, S7, **S190–S192**
- footwear, S191
- FOURIER trial, S153
- fractures, **S55**

- gastroectomy, vertical sleeve, S119–S120
- gastric aspiration therapy, S119
- gastric bypass, Roux-en-Y gastric, S119–S120
- gastric electrical stimulation, S190
- gastrointestinal neuropathies, S189
- gastroparesis, S189, S190
- gemfibrozil, S154
- genetic testing, S4, S28, S29
- genitourinary disturbances, S189
- gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM), S4, S17, S22, S23, S25, **S30–S33**, S41, S42, S232, S235, S236, S237, **S239–S240**
- definition, S30–S31
  - initial testing, S239
  - insulin, S237
  - management of, **S236–S237**
  - medical nutrition therapy, S236–S237
  - metformin, S237
  - one-step strategy, S32
  - physical activity, S237
  - postpartum care, S239–S240
  - recommendations, S30
  - screening and diagnosis, S31–S33
  - sulfonylureas, S237
  - two-step strategy, S32–S33
- glargine, S126, S128, S138, S139, S140, S201
- glimepiride, S133, S137, S159, S161, S200
- glipizide, S133, S137, S200
- glomerular filtration rate, S176
- glucagon, S90, S91–S92
- glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists (GLP-1 RA), S118, S130, S135, S136, S137, S139–S140, S168, S179, S180, S181, S186, S190
- glucocorticoid therapy, S26, S249
- glucose, for hypoglycemia, S90, S91
- glucose meters
- counterfeit strips, S99
  - inaccuracy, S100
  - interfering substances, S100
  - oxygen, S100
  - standards, S99
  - temperature, S100
- glucose monitoring. *see* blood glucose monitoring.
- glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency, A1C and, S19, S20
- glucose-lowering therapy, S116, S127, S131
- in chronic kidney disease, S179–S182
  - in hospitalized patients, **S246–S247**
- glulisine, S138, S201
- glyburide, S134, S137, S200, S236, S237
- glycemic control
- assessment of, **S83–S90**
  - physical activity and, S69
- glycemic goals. *see also* glycemic targets., **S87–S90**
- glycemic targets, S5, **S83–S96**
- A1c and BGM correlation, S84
  - A1C and cardiovascular disease outcomes, S87
  - A1c differences in ethnic groups and children, S84–S85
  - A1c limitations, S84
  - continuous glucose monitoring, **S85–S87**
  - in diabetic kidney disease, S179
  - goals, **S87–S90**
  - in hospitalized patients, **S245–S246**
  - hypoglycemia, **S90–S92**
  - individualization of, S89
  - intercurrent illness, **S92**
  - in older adults, S197–S198
- in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S213–S215
  - in pediatric type 2 diabetes, S219–S220
  - recommendations, S83
  - setting and modifying A1C goals, S89–S90
- glycemic treatment, S6, **S125–S143**
- guanfacine, S190
- health literacy, S12–S13
- health numeracy, S4, S12–S13
- hearing impairment, S55
- heart failure, S144–S145, S166
- hemodialysis, A1C and, S20
- hemoglobinopathies, A1C on, S20
- hepatitis B vaccines, **S51**
- hepatitis C infection, S54–S55
- hepatitis, autoimmune, S53
- hip fractures, S55
- homelessness, S12
- hospital care, S7, S92, S106, **S244–S253**
- bedside glucose monitoring, **S246**
  - care delivery standards, **S245–S246**
  - glucose-lowering treatment in, **S246–S247**
  - glycemic targets in, **S245–S246**
  - hypoglycemia, **S247–S248**
  - medical nutrition therapy in, **S248**
  - medication reconciliation, S250
  - perioperative care, S249
  - preventing admissions and readmissions, **S250–S251**
  - self-management in, **S248**
  - standards for special situations, **S248–S250**
  - structured discharge communication, S250
  - transition to ambulatory setting, **S250**
- HOT trial, S146, S147
- housing insecurity, S12
- HPS2-THRIVE trial, S155
- human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), S20, S22, S26
- human papilloma virus (HPV) vaccine, S52
- human regular insulin, S138, S139, S249, S250
- hybrid closed-loop systems, S126
- Hydrogel, oral, S119
- hyperbaric oxygen therapy, S192
- hyperglycemia, S54
- Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome (HAPO) study, S31
- hyperosmolar hyperglycemic state, S249–S250
- hypertension, **S145–S150**
- in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S209, S216
  - in pediatric type 2 diabetes, S210, S223
- hypertriglyceridemia, S154
- hypoglycemia, S5, S54, **S90–S92**
- classification, S91
  - in hospitalized patients, **S247–S248**
  - in older adults, S196–S197
  - prevention, S92
  - recommendations, S901
  - treatment, S91–S92
- hypoglycemia risk, S51
- hypoglycemia, postparturient, S120–S121
- hypogonadism, S55
- hypokalemia, S150
- icosapent ethyl, S154
- idiopathic type 1 diabetes, S21
- Illness, intercurrent, glycemic targets in, **S92**
- immune checkpoint inhibitors, S4
- immune-mediated diabetes, S21
- impaired fasting glucose (IFG), S18, S22, S23
- impaired glucose tolerance (IGT), S18, S19, S22, S23, S27, S32
- incretin-based therapies, S200
- Indian Diabetes Prevention Program (IDPP-1), S42
- infections, diabetic foot, S191–S192
- influenza, S5
- influenza vaccines, S5, **S48, S50–S54**
- inhaled insulin, S103, S126, S127, S138, S139
- injection techniques, S127
- insulin analogs, in type 1 diabetes, S127–S130
- insulin delivery, **S102–S106**
- automated systems, S104–105
  - do-it-yourself closed-loop systems, S105
  - injection techniques, S127
  - in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S213–S215
  - pens and syringes, S5, S102–103
  - pumps, S103–S104
- insulin pump therapy, S99, S214
- insulin resistance, S17, S18, S22, S23, S24, S25, S26, S27, S68, S139, S224, S234, S235, S236, S237, S238, S239
- insulin secretagogues, S200
- insulin therapy, S28
- access and affordability, S254–S255
  - in adults with type 1 diabetes, **S125–S130**
  - in adults with type 2 diabetes, **S131–S141**, S140–S141
  - basal, S99, S126, S139
  - combination injectable, S139–S140
  - concentrated insulins, S139
  - in hospitalized patients, S246
  - inhaled insulin, S103, S126, S127, S138, S139
  - monitoring for intensive regimens, S99
  - in older adults, S201
  - prandial, S126–S127, S139
- insulin:carbohydrate ratio (ICR), S128–S129
- integrated CGM devices, S101–S102
- intensification, of therapy, S136
- intermittently scanned CGM devices, S101–S102
- International Association of the Diabetes and Pregnancy Study Groups (IADPSG), S31, S32
- International Diabetes Closed Loop (IDCL) trial, S126
- islet autotransplantation, S30, S55, S130–S131
- isradipine, S190
- juvenile-onset diabetes. *see* immune-mediated diabetes.
- KDIGO study, S177
- kidney disease. *see* chronic kidney disease
- Kumamoto study, S88
- language barriers, S12
- latent autoimmune diabetes in adults (LADA), S18
- LEADER trial, S160–S161, S165, S180
- lifestyle behavior changes
- for diabetes prevention, **S40–S42**
  - for hypertension, S148
  - for lipid management, S151
  - in older adults, S198–S199

- in pediatric type 2 diabetes, S219
  - in pregnancy, S236
  - to reduce ASCVD risk factors, S151
- linagliptin, S133, S137, S159, S161, S167
- lipase inhibitors, S117
- lipid management, **S151–S155**
- lipid profiles, S151
- liraglutide, S42, S54, S116, S118, S133, S137, S140, S160, S165, S166, S167, S180, S181, S221, S222
- lispro, S138, S139, S201
- lixisenatide, S133, S137, S138, S140, S160, S166, S167
- long-acting insulin analog, in type 1 diabetics, S126, S128–S130, S135, S138, S139, S201, S202, S212, S214, S249
- Look AHEAD trial, S116
- loss of protective sensation, S188, S191
- lovastatin, S152
  
- macular edema, diabetic, S186
- maternal history, in screening children/adolescents, S23
- maturity-onset diabetes of the young (MODY), S18, **S28–S29**, S208, S219
- meal planning, S74–S75
- medical devices, for weight loss, S119
- medical evaluation, S5, **S46–S59**
  - autoimmune diseases, **S53**
  - cancer, **S53**
  - cognitive impairment/dementia, **S53–S54**
  - comprehensive, **S48–S51**
  - fractures, **S55**
  - hepatitis C infection, **S54–S55**
  - immunizations, **S48, S50–S54**
  - low testosterone in men, **S55–S56**
  - nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, **S54, S55, S56**
  - obstructive sleep apnea, **S56**
  - pancreatitis, **S55**
  - periodontal disease, **S56**
  - recommendations, S48
- medical nutrition therapy, **S62–S67**
  - alcohol, **S67**
  - carbohydrates, **S65–S66**
  - eating patterns and meal planning, **S64–S65**
  - fats, **S66–S67**
  - goals of, **S64**
  - in hospitalized patients, **S248**
  - micronutrients and supplements, **S67**
  - protein, **S66**
  - recommendations, S63
  - sodium, **S67**
  - weight management, **S64**
- medications
  - considerations in pregnancy, S239–S240
  - cost considerations, S4, S10
  - in diabetes screening, S26
  - glucose-lowering, impact on weight, S116
  - for weight loss, S116–S119
- Mediterranean diet, S151
- meglitinides, S51, S137
- mental health referrals, S72, S73
- mental illness, serious, S74
- metabolic surgery, S119–S121, S221–S222
- metformin, S5, S6, S7, S28, S30, S42, S67, S88, S89, S116, S130, S131, S132, S133, S135, S137, S139, S140, S158, S159, S160, S162, S165, S166, S168, S179, S180, S196, **S200**, S201, S210, S220, S221, S223, S236, **S237**, S238, S239, S249
- metoclopramide, S190
- metoprolol, S190
- micronutrients, S67
- microvascular complications, S69–S70
  - A1C and, S87–S88
  - in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S217–S218
- midodrine, S190
- miglitol, S137
- migrant farmworkers, S12
- mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist therapy, S150–S151, S181
- monogenic diabetes syndromes, S17, **S28–S30**
- multiple daily injections (MDI), S99
- myasthenia gravis, S53
  
- naltrexone/bupropion ER, S116, S117
- nateglinide, S42, S137
- National Diabetes Data Group, S33
- National Diabetes Prevention Program, S41
- National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), S9, S19, S55, S219
- neonatal diabetes, S17, **S28**
- nephrologist, referral to, S182
- nephropathy
  - in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S209, S217
  - in pediatric type 2 diabetes, S210, S222
- neurocognitive function, S196
- neuropathy, S7, S70, **S188–S190**
  - in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S209, S218
  - in pediatric type 2 diabetes, S210, S223
- new-onset diabetes after transplantation (NODAT), S27
- niacin + statin therapy, S154–S155
- nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), S5, S54, S55, S56
  - in pediatric type 2 diabetes, S210, S223
- nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH), S5, S54
- noninsulin treatments
  - in type 1 diabetes, S127, S130
- noninsulin-dependent diabetes. *see* type 2 diabetes.
- nonnutritive sweeteners, S67
- NPH insulin, S126, S127, S128–S130, S133, S135, S138, S139, S140, S201, S247, S249
- nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors
  - A1C and, S20
- nursing homes, S203–S204
- nutrition therapy
  - and dementia, **S54**
  - for diabetes prevention, **S40–S41**
  - with diabetic kidney disease, S179
  - in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S211
  
- obesity, S5, **S113–S124**
  - assessment, S113–S114
  - diet, physical activity, and behavioral therapy, **S114–S119**
  - medical devices for weight loss, **S119**
  - metabolic surgery, **S119–S121**
  - pharmacotherapy, **S116–S119**
  - screening asymptomatic children/adolescents, S23
- obstructive sleep apnea, S56
  - in pediatric type 2 diabetes, S210
- ODYSSEY OUTCOMES trial, S153
- older adults, S7, **S195–S207**
  - end-of-life care, S204
  - hypoglycemia, S196–S197
  - lifestyle management, S198–S199
  - neurocognitive function, S196
  - pharmacologic therapy, S199–S203
  - in skilled nursing facilities and nursing homes, S203–S204
  - treatment goals, S197–S198
  - with type 1 diabetes, S203
- one-step strategy, for GDM, S32
- opioid antagonist/antidepressant combination, S117
- ophthalmologist, referral to, S186, S218, S224, S234
- oral agents, BGM for patients using, S99
- oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT), S18, S19, S23, S26, S27, S28, S29, S31, S32, S33, S236
- organ transplantation, posttransplantation diabetes mellitus, S17, **S27–S28**
- orlistat, S116, S117
- orthostatic hypotension, S190
- overweight, screening asymptomatic children/adolescents, S23
- oxygen, glucose monitors and, S100
  
- P2Y12 receptor antagonists, S155, S157
- palliative care, S204
- pancreas transplantation, S130–S131
- pancreatectomy, S30
- pancreatic diabetes, S17, **S30**
- pancreatitis, **S55**
- pancreoprivic diabetes, S30
- patient-centered care goals, **S43**
- patient-centered collaborative care, **S46–S48**
- pens, insulin, S102–S103
- periodontal disease, S26, S56
- perioperative care, S249
- peripheral arterial disease, S191
- peripheral neuropathy, S70
- peripheral neuropathy, diabetic, S188
- pernicious anemia, S53
- pharmacologic approaches. *see also* specific medications, medication classes., S6, **S125–S143**
  - for adults with type 1 diabetes, **S125–S130**
  - for adults with type 2 diabetes, **S131–S141**
  - for hypertension, S149–S151
  - in older adults, S199–S203
  - for pediatric type 2 diabetes, S220–S221
  - in prediabetes, **S42**
  - for weight loss, **S116–S119**
- phentermine, S116, S117
- phentermine/topiramate ER, S116, S117
- phosphodiesterase type 5 inhibitors, S190
- photocoagulation surgery, S187
- physical activity, **S41, S67–S70**
  - for diabetes prevention, **S41**, S114–S115
  - for diabetes treatment, S114–S115
  - frequency and type, **S67–S68**
  - glycemic control and, **S68**
  - with microvascular complications, **S68–S70**
  - in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S211
  - pre-exercise evaluation, **S68**
- pioglitazone, S55, S133, S137, S154
- PIONEER-6 trial, S160–S161, S165
- pitavastatin, S152
- Plenity, S119
- pneumococcal pneumonia vaccines, **S51**, S52
- polycystic ovarian syndrome, S210
- population health, S4, **S8–S16**



- care delivery systems, S9–S11  
 recommendations, S8  
 social context, S11–S13
- postbariatric hypoglycemia, S120–S121
- postpancreatitis diabetes mellitus (PPDM), S30
- postpartum care, in diabetic women, S239–S240
- postpartum state, A1C in, S20
- posttransplantation diabetes mellitus, S17, **S27–S28**
- pramlintide, S127, S130, S137, S190
- prandial insulin, S126–S127, S139
- pravastatin, S152
- pre-eclampsia, in pregnant women with diabetes, S239
- prediabetes  
 criteria defining, S23  
 diagnosis, S23  
 prevention of vascular disease and mortality, **S42–S43**  
 screening, S4, S22–S23
- pregabalin, S116, S189
- pregnancy, S7, **S232–S243**  
 A1C and, S20, S235  
 continuous glucose monitoring in, S235–S236  
 diabetes in, S232  
 drug considerations in, **S238–S239**  
 eye exams during, S186  
 gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM), S4, S17, S22, S23, S25, **S30–S33**, S41, S42, S232, S235, S236, S237, **S239–S240**  
 glucose monitoring in, S235  
 glycemic targets in, **S234–S236**  
 insulin in, S237  
 metformin in, S237  
 pharmacologic therapy, S237  
 physical activity in, S237  
 postpartum care, **S239–S240**  
 pre-existing type 1 and 2 diabetes in, 240, **S237–S238**  
 preconception counseling, **S233–S234**  
 preeclampsia and aspirin, **S238**  
 real-time CGM device use in, S102  
 retinopathy during, S187  
 sulfonyleureas, S237
- prevention, type 2 diabetes, S4–S5, **S39–S45**  
 lifestyle behavior change, **S40–S42**  
 patient-centered care goals, **S43**  
 pharmacologic interventions, **S42**  
 recommendations, S39, S40, S42, S43  
 of vascular disease and mortality, **S42–S43**
- proliferative diabetic retinopathy, S186
- proprotein convertase subtilisin/kexin type 9 (PCSK9) inhibitors, S151, S153, S155
- protease inhibitors, A1C and, S20
- protein intake, S66
- psychosocial issues, **S70–S75**  
 anxiety disorders, S71  
 cognitive capacity/impairment, S74–S75  
 depression, S71–S72  
 diabetes distress, S70–S71  
 disordered eating behavior, S73–S74  
 in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S212–S213  
 in pediatric type 2 diabetes, S224  
 referral to mental health specialist, S72, S73  
 serious mental illness, S74
- pumps, insulin, S99, S103–S104
- quality improvement, S10–S11
- race  
 effect on A1C, S20  
 in screening asymptomatic children/adolescents, S23
- rapid-acting insulin analog, S103, S105, S125, S127–S130, S138, S139, S201, S212, S235, S248, S249, S250
- real-time CGM devices, S101, S213, S214
- REDUCE-IT trial, S154
- referrals, S5  
 to behavioral health provider, S196  
 for comprehensive eye exam, S186, S218, S224, S234  
 for DSME, S196  
 to gastroenterologist, S223  
 to nephrologist, S182, S223  
 to neurologist, S188  
 to pediatric sleep specialist, S223  
 to registered dietitian, S233, S235, S250
- reimbursement, for DSMES, S62
- repaglinide, S137
- retinopathy, diabetic, S6, S7, S25, S51, S68, S69, S70, S87, S104, S147, S177, S181 **S185–S188**, S190, S209, S210, S215, S218, S223, S233, S234, S238  
 in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S209, S218  
 in pediatric type 2 diabetes, S210, S223
- REWIND trial, S160–S161, S165
- risk calculator, for ASCVD, S145
- risk management  
 cardiovascular disease, S6, **S144–S174**  
 chronic kidney disease, S6–S7, **S175–S184**
- risk, determination of, S24
- rivaroxaban, S155, S157
- rosiglitazone, S133, S137
- rotuvastatin, S152
- Roux-en-Y gastric bypass, S119–S120
- SAVOR-TIMI trial, S159, S167
- saxagliptin, S133, S137, S159, S167, S247
- schizophrenia, S74
- schools  
 device use in, S98  
 diabetes care in, S255  
 pediatric type 1 diabetes and, S212
- screening  
 for cardiovascular disease, **S157–S158**  
 in children/adolescents, S26  
 community, S26  
 in dental practices, S26  
 for gestational diabetes mellitus, **S30–S33**  
 HIV, S26  
 medications, S26  
 for neuropathy, S188  
 for prediabetes and type 2 diabetes, S22–S26  
 testing interval, S26  
 for type 1 diabetes, S20–S22
- seasonal farmworkers, S12
- self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG). *see* blood glucose monitoring (BGM)
- semaglutide, S5–S6, S54, S55, S116, S118, S133, S137, S160, S161, S165, S167, S180, S181, S200
- sensor-augmented pumps, S104–S105
- sensory impairment, S55
- setmelanotide, S116
- sexual dysfunction, S189
- sickle cell disease, A1C and, S20
- simvastatin, S152
- sitagliptin, S133, S137, S159, S167
- skilled nursing facilities, S203–S204
- smart pens. *see* connected insulin pens
- smoking cessation, **S70**, S218
- social capital, S13
- social context, S11–S13
- social determinants of health (SDOH), S9, S11–S13
- sodium intake, S67
- sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 (SGLT2) inhibitors, S6, S7, S88, S89, S130, S133, S135, S137, S140, S145, S161, S162, S163, S165, S166, S167, S168, S178, S179, S180, S181, S197, S200, S247, S249
- SOLOIST-WHF trial, S167
- sotagliflozin, S167
- SPRINT trial, S146, S147
- staging  
 of diabetic kidney disease, S177–S178  
 of type 1 diabetes, S18
- statin treatment, S151–S155
- statins, S54
- sulfonyleureas, S12, S28, S29, S85, S133, S137, S140, S200, S237
- supplements, S67
- surveillance, of chronic kidney disease, S178–S179
- SUSTAIN-6 trial, A160–S161, S180
- sweeteners, nonnutritive, S67
- sympathomimetic amine anorectic/antiepileptic combination, S117
- sympathomimetic amine anorectics, S117
- syringes, insulin, S102–S103
- tapentadol, S189–S190
- technology, diabetes, S5, **S97–S112**  
 blood glucose monitoring, **S98–S100**  
 continuous glucose monitoring devices, **S100–S102**  
 general device principles, **S97–S98**  
 insulin delivery, **S102–S106**
- TECOS trial, S159, S167
- TEDDY study, S22
- telemedicine, S10
- temperature, of glucose monitor, S100
- testing interval, S26
- testosterone, low, in men, **S55–S56**
- tetanus, diphtheria, pertussis (TDAP) vaccine, S52
- thiazide-like diuretics, S26, S150, S182
- thiazolidinediones, S28, S42, S55, S116, S133, S137, S166, **S200**
- thyroid disease, autoimmune, S53  
 in pediatric type 1 diabetes, S209, S215
- tobacco, S70
- training, on device use, S98
- transfusion, A1C and, S20
- transition  
 from hospital to ambulatory setting, S250  
 from pediatric to adult care, S224
- transplantation  
 islet, S91, S130–S131  
 organ, post-transplant diabetes mellitus after, S17, S27, S28  
 pancreas, S130–S131  
 simultaneous renal, S130, S131, S165, S167, S177, S180

- tricyclic antidepressants, S190  
TWILIGHT trial, S157  
two-hour plasma glucose (2-h PG) test, S18, S19  
two-step strategy, for GDM, S32–S33  
type 1 diabetes, S4  
    A1C and cardiovascular disease outcomes in, S88  
    beta-cell replacement therapy, S130–S131  
    in children/adolescents, **S211–S218**  
    classification, **S17–S18**  
    diagnosis, S4, **S20–S22**  
    examples of subcutaneous insulin regimens, S128–S130  
    idiopathic, 21  
    immune-mediated, 21  
    insulin therapy in hospitalized patients, S247  
    noninsulin treatments, S127, S130  
    in older adults, S203  
    pharmacologic treatment in adults, **S125–S130**  
    pregnancy in women with preexisting, S239  
    retinopathy in, S186  
    screening, S4, S21–S22  
    staging, S18  
    surgical treatment, **S130–S131**
- type 2 diabetes, S4  
    A1C and cardiovascular disease outcomes in, S88–S89  
    in children/adolescents, **S218–S224**  
    classification, S4, **S17–S18**  
    combination therapy, S132, S135  
    drug-specific and patient factors to consider, S133  
    initial therapy, S132  
    insulin pump use in, S105  
    obesity and weight management, S5, **S113–S124**  
    pharmacologic treatment in adults, **S131–S141**  
    pregnancy in women with preexisting, S238  
    prevention or delay, S4–S5, **S39–S45**  
    retinopathy in, S186–S187  
    risk test for, S24  
    screening in asymptomatic adults, S4, S25–S26  
    screening in children/adolescents, S4, S26
- type 3c diabetes, S30
- UK Prospective Diabetes Study (UKPDS), S87, S88, S89, S90, S158
- ulcers, foot, S190, S191, S192  
ultra-rapid-acting insulin analogs, S127–S130, S249
- vagus nerve stimulator, S119  
vascular disease, prevention of, in prediabetes, **S42–S43**  
venlafaxine, S190  
VERIFY trial, S135  
vertical sleeve gastrectomy, S119–S120  
Veterans Affairs Diabetes Trial (VADT), S87–S88, S179  
vildagliptin, S135  
vitamin D supplementation, S5  
VOYAGER-PAD trial, S157
- weight loss surgery. *see* metabolic surgery.  
weight loss/management  
    in diabetes prevention, S40, S41, S42, S43, **S113–S124**  
    in type 2 diabetes, S5, S64, **S113–S124**  
well-being, S5, S10, **S60–S82**  
whites, non-Hispanic, A1C differences in, S84–S84  
zoster vaccine, S53



# Join ADA Today!

Find the Most Current Research on Diabetes Treatment and Care. **We are in this together.**

Join thousands of professionals like you, who are part of a global community working to find a cure for diabetes. Professional membership provides up-to-date information on quality patient care information and access to the latest advancements in diabetes research, treatment and education for students, early-career and long-standing professionals.

## Benefits include:

- The latest COVID-19 information to help you provide the best care for your patients
- FREE member-only webinars on topics that matter viewed live or on demand
- The most recent guidelines for diabetes care
- Subscription to Diabetes or Diabetes Care
- Discounts to Scientific Sessions registration
- Access to Member Forum and Interest Groups
- Continuing education and more!



Phone: 703.549.1500, ext. 5023 | Fax: 703.637.0004 | Online: [professional.diabetes.org/join](https://professional.diabetes.org/join)