*Egészségtudományi Közlemények, 14. kötet, 1. szám (2024), pp. 11–18.*
https://doi.org/10.32967/etk.2024.024

# CONTINUOUS GLUCOSE MONITORING (CGM): TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT IN DIABETES MANAGEMENT

ANDREA LUKÁCS
*Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Miskolc*
*E-mail: andrea.lukacs@uni-miskolc.hu*

**Summary:** Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) represents a major breakthrough in diabetes management, offering real-time insights into glucose levels that help optimize glycaemic control. This review discusses the expanding role of CGM, its advantages, challenges, and future directions. Traditional methods, such as self-monitoring blood glucose (SMBG), provide only periodic glucose data, which can miss critical fluctuations and result in less effective diabetes management. In contrast, CGM delivers constant feedback, allowing timely interventions and a deeper understanding of glucose patterns. CGM systems typically comprise a sensor, transmitter, and receiver. These devices measure glucose levels in the interstitial fluid and send data to receivers or smartphones, with some systems even syncing with insulin pumps for automatic adjustments. Both real-time (rtCGM) and intermittently scanned (isCGM) systems have demonstrated benefits, including reduced HbA1c levels, increased time in range (TIR), and a lower risk of hypoglycemia for people with both type 1 and type 2 diabetes. Despite these benefits, CGM adoption faces barriers like cost, accessibility, and data overload. Additionally, occasional discrepancies between CGM readings and actual blood glucose levels highlight the need for user education and further refinement of CGM accuracy.

Advances in CGM technology, including longer sensor life, improved accuracy, and integration with artificial intelligence (AI), are propelling diabetes care forward. AI features hold promise for predictive glucose management, while integration with closed-loop (artificial pancreas) systems may transform insulin delivery. As CGM technology progresses, it is positioned to play a crucial role in managing not only diabetes but also other metabolic conditions. For CGM to achieve its full potential, issues surrounding affordability and accessibility must be addressed to ensure broad access to this life-enhancing technology.

***Keywords:*** *Continuous Glucose Monitoring (CGM), Diabetes Management, Glycemic Control, Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare, Real-time Glucose Monitoring*

## INTRODUCTION

Effective diabetes management hinges on precise blood sugar control. Diabetes mellitus, defined by chronic high blood sugar due to compromised insulin function, is one of today's most significant health challenges. The International Diabetes Federation (IDF) estimates that 537 million adults (ages 20–79) lived with diabetes in 2021, a figure that could reach 783 million by 2045 [1]. Poor glucose regulation in diabetes can lead to severe health complications, such as retinopathy, nephropathy, cardiovascular disease, and neuropathy [2, 3]. Accurate glucose monitoring is therefore essential for maintaining blood sugar within safe limits.

The traditional method of self-monitoring blood glucose (SMBG) through fingerstick tests has long been the mainstay for tracking daily glucose levels. However, SMBG has notable limitations; it provides only sporadic data and can miss unnoticed hypoglycemic or hyperglycemic events. Moreover, frequent finger pricks can be uncomfortable, adding to the burden of diabetes care [4]. Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM), however, has transformed diabetes care by offering real-time glucose data that supports more accurate insulin dosing and improved blood sugar control. Unlike SMBG, which only captures isolated data points, CGM gives a continuous view of glucose trends throughout the day and night. Although primarily used for type 1 diabetes, CGM has also shown significant benefits for type 2 diabetes patients, especially those who use insulin [5, 6].

## THE BASICS OF CONTINUOUS GLUCOSE MONITORING (CGM)

A CGM system generally comprises three parts: a sensor, a transmitter, and a receiver.

Sensor: A tiny, flexible filament inserted just under the skin, usually in the abdomen or arm, which continuously measures glucose in the fluid surrounding cells. Depending on the model, the sensor requires replacement every 7 to 14 days.

Transmitter: Attached to the sensor, this small device sends glucose readings from the sensor to the receiver wirelessly. It converts measurements to digital data, typically updating every few minutes. Transmitters are usually reusable but may need occasional recharging or replacement.

Receiver: The receiver displays glucose data for the user, which may be a dedicated device or, in many modern systems, a smartphone app. It shows real-time glucose readings, trend graphs, and alerts for high or low glucose levels. Certain receivers also link with insulin pumps for automatic insulin adjustments.

By combining these components, CGM provides users with round-the-clock glucose monitoring, helping to avoid dangerous fluctuations and manage their diabetes more effectively.

Two main types of CGM are available today: real-time CGM (rtCGM) and intermittently scanned CGM (isCGM). Both provide ongoing glucose data but differ in how this information is accessed and used.

Real-time CGM (rtCGM): These systems measure glucose continuously, sending data to a receiver or app in real time. This allows users to track their glucose trends throughout the day without needing additional steps, and rtCGM devices often feature customizable alerts for high or low glucose, facilitating immediate action.

Intermittently Scanned CGM (isCGM): isCGM systems require users to scan the sensor periodically to view glucose data. Although the sensor continuously measures glucose, data is only accessible upon scanning. While it doesn't offer real-time alerts, isCGM provides flexibility by allowing glucose checks only when needed, offering a discreet and cost-effective option for many people with diabetes [7].

A systematic review by Zhou et al. and randomised controlled trial by Visser et al indicate that rtCGM can increase TIR and improve both hypo- and hyperglycaemia management, making it a particularly valuable tool for glucose control [8, 9].

### ADVANCEMENTS IN CGM TECHNOLOGY

CGM technology has advanced significantly, enhancing accuracy, convenience, and ease of use. Improvements in sensor technology have produced devices that are smaller, more comfortable, and longer-lasting. Certain CGM sensors can now be used for up to two weeks, reducing the need for frequent replacements. Many newer models also eliminate the need for calibration through fingerstick tests, which was once a limitation [10].

Smartphone and wearable integration has expanded the accessibility of CGM systems, enabling users to view their data instantly through apps. Trend analysis tools within these apps help patients identify patterns and adjust their lifestyle or medication accordingly [11]. Additionally, innovations in AI and machine learning are enriching CGM capabilities, with predictive algorithms that anticipate glucose trends and deliver personalized recommendations expected to enhance CGM in the future [12].

### BENEFITS OF CONTINUOUS GLUCOSE MONITORING

CGM's capacity to provide a constant flow of glucose data offers a level of insight that SMBG cannot. Research has shown that CGM use leads to reductions in HbA1c, an important marker for long-term glucose control. Real-time data enables both patients and healthcare providers to make well-informed decisions regarding diet, physical activity, and medication, including insulin adjustments [13, 14].

CGM is particularly valuable in preventing hypoglycemia. Low blood sugar episodes can be dangerous, especially nocturnal hypoglycemia, which may go unnoticed. CGM alerts for falling glucose levels allow users to take corrective measures early, offering peace of mind and reducing anxiety related to hypoglycaemia [15].

In addition to improving glycemic control, CGM has led to the development of new clinical parameters that offer a more comprehensive picture of glucose management. Time in range (TIR), time above range (TAR), and time below range (TBR) are now considered valuable metrics for evaluating how well a patient is managing their blood sugar levels. These parameters provide a clearer understanding of glycemic control than HbA1c alone, offering insights into glucose variability and the frequency of hyperglycemic or hypoglycemic events.

TIR reflects the percentage of time a person's glucose levels remain within the target range (usually 70–180 mg/dL), and is increasingly recognized as an important indicator of overall glucose stability. Clinical studies suggest that higher TIR is associated with a lower risk of developing diabetes-related complications such as retinopathy and cardiovascular issues [16, 17]. TAR and TBR provide additional insights into the frequency and severity of hyperglycemic and hypoglycemic events, respectively. Together, these metrics allow for more individualized and precise management strategies, offering real-time feedback that helps optimize treatment and lifestyle interventions [18, 19].

## IMPACT OF CGM TECHNOLOGIES ON USERS' LIVES

### Differences between rtCGM and isCGM

Between real-time CGM (rtCGM) and intermittently scanned CGM (isCGM), it is essential to consider how these differences affect users' daily life and overall quality of life. For example, rtCGM offers continuous, real-time glucose data that alerts you to hypo- or hyperglycemia. This capability is particularly beneficial for individuals who experience frequent episodes of hypoglycemia, as it facilitates timely intervention and potentially reduces anxiety related to glucose variability [19, 20]. In contrast, the isCGM requires users to scan the sensor to access glucose data, making it a simpler and more cost-effective solution for individuals who may not need continuous monitoring or are looking for a more discreet method of glucose management [21].

The strengths of each technology serve different patient populations. For example, the tighter glucose monitoring of rtCGM may benefit those who require tight glycemic control, such as those with type 1 diabetes or those prone to severe hypoglycemia. In contrast, isCGM's ease of use and affordability may appeal to patients who require less intensive monitoring, such as certain type 2 diabetics, or those who prefer convenience and lower costs.

### Age-specific needs and unique aspects

For children and adolescents, rtCGM has proven to be particularly beneficial. Studies like those conducted by Forlenza et al. (2019) show that caregivers rely heavily on rtCGM's real-time alert systems to prevent nocturnal hypoglycemia, which is a critical safety concern for this demographic [22]. Additionally, the ability to monitor glucose remotely via linked apps offers parents or guardians peace of mind.

## CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Despite its advantages, CGM adoption faces obstacles. One of the primary barriers is cost. CGM devices and sensors require regular replacement, and expenses can be prohibitive, especially for individuals without comprehensive insurance. Accuracy can also vary, with occasional discrepancies between CGM and blood glucose readings, particularly during rapid glucose changes. While calibration needs have decreased with newer models, some systems still recommend occasional fingerstick testing [19].

The volume of data generated by CGM can also be overwhelming. Proper training is crucial for users to interpret the data accurately and avoid over-correction or unnecessary responses to glucose fluctuations [18].

## CONCLUSION

Continuous glucose monitoring has transformed diabetes management by providing timely data that allows for more precise insulin dosing, reduced hypoglycemic episodes, and increased time spent in target glucose ranges. However, challenges related to cost, access, and data interpretation must be overcome to maximize CGM's benefits. As technology evolves, CGM is poised to play an even greater role in diabetes care, especially as AI-driven features become more integrated.

## REFERENCES

[1] Saeedi, P., Petersohn, I., Salpea, P., Malanda, B., Karuranga, S., Unwin, N., Colagiuri, S., Guariguata, L., Motala, A. A., Ogurtsova, K., Shaw, J. E., Bright, D., Williams, R. (2019). IDF Diabetes Atlas Committee. Global and regional diabetes prevalence estimates for 2019 and projections for 2030 and 2045: Results from the International Diabetes Federation Diabetes Atlas, 9th edition. *Diabetes Res. Clin. Pract.* Nov., 157, 107843. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diabres.2019.107843 Epub 2019 Sep 10. PMID: 31518657

[2] Zaccardi, F., Webb, D. R., Yates, T., Davies, M. J. (2016). Pathophysiology of type 1 and type 2 diabetes mellitus: a 90-year perspective. *Postgrad. Med. J.* Feb., 92 (1084), 63–69. https://doi.org/10.1136/postgradmedj-2015-133281 Epub 2015 Nov 30. PMID: 26621825.

[3] Alqahtani, A. A., Alzidany, A. M., Alenazi, S. M., Alotaibi, T. D. B., Bakhsh, A. J., Bin, Shalhoub, N. M., Alsawas, A. T. U., Charbatje, L. A., Alshareef, H. A. S., Bawazeer, M. O., Almutairi, N. S., Alharbi, W. A., Buqurayn, M. H. (2020). Long term complication of poor glycemic control in diabetic patients. *EC Microbiol.* 16 (2), 1–7. Retrieved from https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:214139694 (12th September 2024).

[4] Serrano-Ríos, M., Suárez, E. (2020). Self-monitoring of blood glucose in diabetes: Limitations and challenges. *Avances en Diabetología* 28 (3), 64–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1134-5934(12)70021-8

[5] Lin, R., Brown, F., James, S., Jones, J., Ekinci, E. (2021). Continuous glucose monitoring: A review of the evidence in type 1 and 2 diabetes mellitus. *Diabet Med.* May, 38 (5), e14528. https://doi/org/10.1111/dme.14528

[6] Jancev, M., Vissers, T. A. C. M., Visseren, F. L. J. et al. (2024). Continuous glucose monitoring in adults with type 2 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Diabetologia* 67 (5), 798–810. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-024-06107-6

[7] Edelman, S. V., Argento, N. B., Pettus, J., Hirsch, I. B. (2018). Clinical implications of real-time and intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring. *Diabetes Care* Nov., 41 (11), 2265–2274. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc18-1150, PMID: 30348844

[8] Zhou, Y., Sardana, D., Kuroko, S., Haszard, J. J., de Block, M. I., Wenig, J., Jefferies, C., Wheeler, B. J. (2024). Comparing the glycaemic outcomes between real-time continuous glucose monitoring (rt-CGM) and intermittently scanned continuous glucose monitoring (isCGM) among adults and children with type 1 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Diabet. Med*. March, 41 (3), e15280. https://doi.org/10.1111/dme.15280

[9] Visser, M. M., Charleer, S., Fieuws, S., De Block, C., Hilbrands, R., Van Huffel, L., Maes, T., Vanhaverbeke, G., Dirinck, E., Myngheer, N., Vercammen, C., Nobels, F., Keymeulen, B., Mathieu, C., Gillard, P. (2021). 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* June 12, 397 (10291), 2275–2283. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00789-3 Epub 2021 Jun 2. PMID: 34089660

[10] Almurashi, A. M., Rodriguez, E., Garg, S. K. (2023). Emerging Diabetes Technologies: Continuous Glucose Monitors/Artificial Pancreases. *J. Indian Inst. Sci.* March 28, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41745-022-00348-3 Epub ahead of print. PMID: 37362851; PMCID: PMC10043869

[11] Chmayssem, A., Nadolska, M., Tubbs, E., Sadowska, K., Vadgma, P., Shitanda, I., Tsujimura, S., Lattach, Y., Peacock, M., Tingry, S., Marinesco, S., Mailley, P., Lablanche, S., Benhamou, P. Y., Zebda, A. (2023). Insight into continuous glucose monitoring: from medical basics to commercialized devices. *Mikrochim. Acta* Apr. 6, 190 (5), 177. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00604-023-05743-w, PMID: 37022500.

[12] Vettoretti, M., Cappon, G., Facchinetti, A., Sparacino, G. (2020). Advanced Diabetes Management Using Artificial Intelligence and Continuous Glucose Monitoring Sensors. *Sensors (Basel)* July 10, 20 (14), 3870. https://doi.org/10.3390/s20143870 PMID: 32664432; PMCID: PMC7412387

[13] Cho, S. H., Kim, S., Lee, Y. B., Jin, S. M., Hur, K. Y., Kim, G., Kim, J. H. (2023). Impact of continuous glucose monitoring on glycemic control and its derived metrics in type 1 diabetes: a longitudinal study. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)* May 15, 14, 1165471. https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2023.1165471 PMID: 37255973; PMCID: PMC10225713

[14] Dorando, E., Haak, T., Pieper, D. (2022). Continuous glucose monitoring for glycemic control in children and adolescents diagnosed with diabetes type 1: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Exp. Clin. Endocrinol. Diabetes* Jan., 130 (1), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1268-0967

[15] Šoupal, J., Petruželková, L., Grunberger, G. et al. (2020). 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. *Diab. Care* 43 (1), 37–43. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc19-0888

[16] Aleppo, G. (2021). Clinical application of time in range and other metrics. *Diabetes Spectr*. May, 34 (2), 109–118. https://doi.org/10.2337/ds20-0093 Epub 2021 May 25. PMID: 34149251; PMCID: PMC8178724

[17] Wright, E. E. Jr, Morgan, K., Fu, D. K., Wilkins, N., Guffey, W. J. (2020). Time in range: How to measure it, how to report it, and its practical application in clinical decision-making. *Clin. Diabetes* Dec., 38 (5), 439–448. https://doi.org/10.2337/cd20-0042, PMID: 33384469; PMCID: PMC7755049

[18] Battelino, T., Danne, T., Bergenstal, R. M., Amiel, S. A., Beck, R., Biester, T., Bosi, E., Buckingham, B. A., Cefalu, W. T., Close, K. L., Cobelli, C., Dassau, E., DeVries, J. H., Donaghue, K. C., Dovc, K., Doyle, F. J. III, Garg, S., Grunberger, G., Heller, S., Heinemann, L., Hirsch, I. B., Hovorka, R., Jia, W., Kordonouri, O., Kovatchev, B., Kowalski, A., Laffel, L., Levine, B., Mayorov, A., Mathieu, C., Murphy, H. R., Nimri, R., Nørgaard, K., Parkin, C. G., Renard, E., Rodbard, D., Saboo, B., Schatz, D., Stoner, K., Urakami, T., Weinzimer, S. A., Phillip, M. (2019). Clinical targets for continuous glucose monitoring data interpretation: Recommendations from the international consensus on time in range. *Diabetes Care* Aug., 42 (8), 1593–1603. https://doi.org/10.2337/dci19-0028 Epub 2019 Jun 8. PMID: 31177185; PMCID: PMC6973648

[19] Quah, P. L., Chai, S. M. H., Tan, K. H. (2024). Differences in glucose readings between the continuous glucose monitoring calibration free interstitial sensors versus capillary blood glucose monitoring by glucometer: An analysis of two cases. *Metabol. Open* Apr. 18, 22, 100282. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metop.2024.100282 PMID: 38690155; PMCID: PMC11059339.

[20] Beck, R. W., Riddlesworth, T., Ruedy, K., Ahmann, A., Bergenstal, R., Haller, S., Kollman, C., Kruger, D., McGill, J. B., Polonsky, W., Toschi, E., Wolpert, H., Price, D. (2017). 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* Jan. 24, 317 (4), 371–378. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2016.19975, PMID: 28118453

[21] Haak, T., Hanaire, H., Ajjan, R., Hermanns, N., Riveline, J. P., Rayman, G. (2017). 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*. Feb., 8 (1), 55–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13300-016-0223-6
Epub 2016 Dec 20. PMID: 28000140; PMCID: PMC5306122

[22] Forlenza, G. P., Li, Z., Buckingham, B. A., Pinsker, J. E., Cengiz, E., Wadwa, R. P., Ekhlaspour, L., Church, M. M., Weinzimer, S. A., Jost, E., Marcal, T., Andre, C., Carria, L., Swanson, V., Lum, J. W., Kollman, C., Woodall, W., Beck, R. W. (2018). 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* Oct., 41 (10), 2155–2161. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc18-0771
Epub 2018 Aug 8. PMID: 30089663