

Artificial Intelligence Aided Continuous Glucose Monitoring and its Effectiveness in the Management of Type 2 Diabetes; A Narrative Review

Chaithanya R^{1*} and Sharath Kumar D Shah²

Abstract

This literature review offers a thorough summary of current research on continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) for the treatment of diabetes. Continuous glucose monitoring is a non-invasive technique proven efficient in enhancing diabetes management by reducing HbA_{1c} and achieving better sugar control. Patients who use CGM for managing their diabetes have also experienced decreased fear of hypoglycemia and improved diabetes self-management skills, increasing their confidence to control their blood sugars efficiently. Although data management is challenging, CGM systems offer helpful insights into glucose levels for the management of diabetes. The review covers various CGM-related topics, including accuracy, efficacy, patient outcomes, technological advancements, patient challenges, limitations, and future research recommendations referring to the literature published in the past on the topic. The review also discusses optical signalling, biosensors, and other technologies used in glucose-sensing technology for continuous monitoring.

Keywords: Continuous glucose monitoring; Diabetes; Glycemic control; Blood sugar tools; Artificial intelligence; Glucose level; Type 1 diabetes; Type 2 diabetes.

Introduction

The term "diabetes mellitus" describes a collection of illnesses brought on by abnormalities in the body's glucoregulatory system resulting in Hyperglycemia [1]. Chronic hyperglycemia, due to uncontrolled diabetes is linked to long-term complications

such as organ failure and tissue damage, which can result in decreased life expectancy or even mortality. According to the estimates from the International Diabetes Federation, 537.2 million adults (1 in 10) were breathing with diabetes in 2021. This figure is expected to escalate to 644 million by 2030 and 784 million by 2045. These figures indicate the

¹Final year Postgraduate, Department of General Medicine, Siddartha Medical College, Tumkur, India

²HOD and Professor, Department of General Medicine, Siddartha Medical College, Tumkur, India

*Corresponding Author: Chaithanya R, Final year Postgraduate, Siddartha Medical College, Tumkur, India.

Received Date: 05-08-2023

Accepted Date: 05-19-2023

Published Date: 06-07-2023

Copyright© 2023 by Chaithanya R, et al. All rights reserved. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

increasing demand and place for advances in the treatment of diabetes in healthcare systems [2]. The majority of cases of diabetes can be broken down into three subtypes: type-1 diabetes (T1- D), type-2 diabetes (T2- D), and diabetes caused by pregnancy (GDM). Patients with type 2 diabetes develop resistance to insulin throughout the disease and will also lose the ability to produce sufficient amounts of this hormone at later stages. Early in the illness, hyperglycemia can be controlled by oral hypoglycemic drugs that increase insulin secretion, release or absorption; however, as the disease progresses, patients will ultimately need insulin injections. Patients with diabetes (type-1) have pathology in producing insulin and must rely solely on insulin from an external source to control their blood glucose levels. Insulin must be administered consistently to treat type 1 diabetes which can be done through multiple daily injections (MDIs) or continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (CSII) with a pump. GDM is managed like type 2 diabetes; the condition manifests in pregnant women because of the interactions between insulin and placental hormones [3].

Health education and counselling of patients about self-management, taking the right medications on time, and awareness about early detection of complications can prevent the occurrence of ketoacidosis, nephropathy, retinopathy, cardiovascular disease, diabetic foot, or stroke [4]. In addition to using medications, controlling diabetes requires patients to adhere to a wide variety of self-care patterns for better compliance, which is practically not easy unless they are highly self-motivated. These behaviors include the following:

- Carefully scheduling meal options
- Counting carbohydrates
- Getting enough exercise
- Monitoring blood glucose levels
- Making adjustments to daily activities

Lifestyle changes should be the primary focus, and therapeutic decisions should be specific to the patient considering his medical history and other associated medical conditions [5,6].

The subject of artificial intelligence (AI) is advancing at a rapid rate. Intelligent algorithms are used extensively in data-driven systems and can be traced in published research. These methods support advanced exploration and offer individualized medical assistance. Data shows that many healthcare businesses employ artificial intelligence strategies [7,8]. The near-term projections suggest that a significant level of effectiveness in artificial intelligence-incorporated clinical training will be achieved. The primary reasons for this revolution are the meteoric rise in the information and data of patients currently accessible and the efficiency of intelligent methodologies that can handle and process this information. These two factors have contributed to creating applications and tools that can improve the efficiency of treatment of complex illnesses such as diabetes and carcinoma [9].

The management of diabetes has undergone a complete paradigm shift over the last ten years as a direct outcome of incorporating novel tools and technologies, like CGM devices and artificial pancreas (AP). There is a chance of exploitation of data obtained by employing these innovative methods, which should also be kept in check. Because of the exponential growth in the amount of data

that can be obtained electronically from individuals who have diabetes, artificial intelligence (AI) is receiving increasing attention in this field [10]. Regulation of one's blood glucose level is essential to manage diabetes.

Maintaining a glycated haemoglobin (HbA_{1c}) level of less than 7% as well as a preprandial plasma glucose level of 80-130 mg/dL and a postprandial plasma glucose level of less than 180 mg/dL, is the glycemic targets that are recommended for individuals with diabetes by the American Diabetes Association. By providing glucose readings in real-time and empowering people with diabetes to make well-informed decisions regarding their treatment, the technological advancement known as continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) has changed how diabetes is managed.

The first continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) device received approval from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the United States in 2001. This device was called GlucoWatch Biographer [10]. This device collected glucose from the interstitial fluid using reverse iontophoresis and monitored glucose levels every 20 minutes for up to 13 hours. It also collected glucose from the blood. Despite this, the apparatus did not see widespread use because it had a low level of precision and needed to be more reliable. Over the past few years, C.G.M. technology has seen significant advancements, making several devices available for purchase [11]. These devices include, among others, the Dexcom G6, the Freestyle Libre and the Medtronic Guardian Connect. These devices make use of a miniature monitor that is positioned subcutaneously to accomplish the goal of identifying the glucose concentration

that is present in the interstitial fluid. Real-time glucose readings, trend data, and high or low glucose level alerts are presented on a receiver or smartphone software that receives figures from the sensor. The receiver may be a standalone device or integrated into a smartphone. It has been demonstrated that individuals who have diabetes who use CGM technology can improve their glycemic control and can lower the chance of hypoglycemia compared to Non-CGM users

According to the findings of several studies, CGM has also been proven effective in reducing patients' HbA_{1c} levels and increasing their overall quality of life [12,13]. In addition, it has been demonstrated that AI can provide helpful management tools to deal with incremental data repositories through complicated and refined methods. This literature review addresses the advancement in AI-aided glucose monitoring and management.

Methodology

Data collection

The purpose of the literature analysis was to investigate and analyse the function of continuous glucose monitoring that plays a role in efficiently controlling the blood glucose levels in diabetes. Finding, selecting, extracting, and putting together a summary of the data was done systematically. Using search terms like "continuous-glucose monitoring," "diabetes management tools," "CGM," "glycemic control," "Artificial intelligence in diabetes", "diabetes type 1," and "diabetes type 2," a search for pertinent studies was carried out in online databases such as PubMed, Cochrane Library, and

Google Scholar. Only articles that were published between the years 2000 and 2022 were considered for this search.

Data cleaning and pre-processing

The titles and summaries of the studies were reviewed to determine whether or not they were pertinent, and duplicates were eliminated. After that, the relevant studies were examined to decide whether or not they fulfilled the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Studies that examined the influence of continuous-glucose monitoring on glycemic regulation in patients with type 1 or type 2 diabetes, compared CGM with other methods for managing diabetes, and reported on the efficacy and safety of CGM were all included in the current review. Studies not written in English, not peer-reviewed, and not performed on humans were omitted. When applicable, the data were subjected to narrative synthesis, which allowed for both the qualitative and quantitative synthesis of the information.

Evolution of continuous glucose monitoring

Glycemic recognition, a chemical or physical transducer, a wireless transmission element and a receiver are the typical components of a specific CGM system [14].

The glucose recognition element demonstrates a high sensitivity to glucose and is an essential component in the operation of the CGM.

The part that performs the role of the transducer is responsible for converting the glycemic concentration into a quantifiable analytical signal. In an ideal scenario, the

indicator would be wirelessly transmitted to a handset, a mobile application or a specialized handheld device that incorporates definite algorithms to monitor glucose amounts or even an insulin drive [15].

CGM can be placed into two categories, namely optical and electrochemical sensors, depending on the transducer element it utilizes. In the last few decades, many attempts have been made to investigate the new technologies that will improve the conduction of CGM.

The first report of continuous monitoring of plasma glucose levels in human patients was made by Weller, et al., [16] in the 1960s. CGM is the result of a significant amount of work that has been put forth, much of which was motivated by the search for a mechanical pancreas. For instance, in 1963, Kadish utilised continuous real-time glycemic monitoring as the primary strategy to test closed-loop glycemic control [17,18].

Glycemic sensing expertise for continuous monitoring

Technology for the electrochemical detection of glucose

Electrochemical enzymatic interactions of glucose with glucose dehydrogenase or glucose oxidase (GOx) are the basis for most commercially available blood glucose assays [19]. The first generation of electrical glucose biosensors were manufactured based on the principle of enzyme-catalyzed O₂-oxidation. These biosensors were sensitive enough to detect glucose levels in the blood. However, the first-generation glucose biosensor faced significant challenges in its development [20,21]. The higher operational potential is

needed for detecting hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂), which oxidizes and generates high current densities. The other challenge is that in the absence of a redox mediator, the speed of the direct electron transportation from the FADH₂ centre of glucose oxidase (GOx) to the surface of the working electrode must be increased to have the desired impact on time. To solve the earlier problems, the second-generation glycemic biosensor implements a redox mediator, lessening the device's reliance on oxygen in the surrounding environment [22].

Consequently, the assessment can be performed at a reduced applied potentiality to sidestep the result of biological interferences [23]. Many publications have described how electrochemical detection technology can be used in CGM applications. For instance, microneedle-based CGM biosensors attract more attention because they cause less discomfort and less damage to the surrounding tissue [24-29]. In addition, devices built on electrochemical microneedles have the potential to perform glucose monitoring and therapy at the same time [30]. The nonenzymatic glycemic sensors have several benefits, including resistance to the effects of changes in their surrounding environment, ease and copiability of fabrication, cheaper cost and freedom from the constraints of oxygen (O₂) availability [25,31]. A study, for instance, described a nonenzymatic glycemic sensor based on nanoporous platinum as the catalytic substance and a wireless unit for continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) [32,33].

Technology for the optical detection of glucose

Instead of detecting changes in electrons, optical tracking technology relies on detecting changes in photons in the light [34], so it is a good scheme for continuous glucose monitoring as it permits faster and constant monitoring [35]. Surface plasmon resonance (SPR), Fluorescence, Near-infrared, Raman, Optical coherence tomography, and Fourier transforms near-infrared are some types of optical biosensors that can be classified based on the transducer systems that they use.

For instance, research introduced a fluorescence affinity hollow fibre sensor for transdermal fluorescence-based glycemic monitoring, the sensor contains dyed globules and concanavalin A. With response times ranging from 5 to 7 minutes, the fictitious sensor can monitor glycemic levels within the physiological series [36,37]. The Senseonics CGM sensor is a fluorescence-based glycemic sensing system that is intended for use in commercial applications. This system comprises an implantable glycemic sensor and a wearable transmitter that measures glucose levels in the interstitial fluid (ISF) [37]. Recent research by Sawayama and colleagues has resulted in the development of an implantable CGM that uses Fluorescence and contains a glycemic-responsive fluorescence pigment to continuously monitor blood glycemic concentrations for up to 45 days [38]. Because of its ease of use and relatively low price, SPR has garnered much attention in developing biosensors in recent years. The SPR-detecting technology operates based on variations in the refractive index brought about by interactions between glucose molecules and a surface plasmon wave. This is the core concept behind the technology [39,40].

Challenges: Most optical devices today are expensive and challenging to miniaturize. In addition, optical glycemic sensing knowledge has weak signal-to-noise ratios and typically requires invasive depth calibration to be accurate. The non-invasive optical glucose sensing technology does not have a charted algorithm model that satisfies the clinical requirements. This is because individual disparities such as skin thickness, fat, and blood volume come into play [15].

Patient perspectives on continuous glucose monitoring

Self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) is important to strategize the diet plan, exercise, and treatment [42,43]. Self-monitoring of blood glucose is reportedly done by approximately 75 per cent of individuals with type 2 diabetes [44]. According to grade E-level experts, the American Diabetes Association suggests that SMBG "may be highly beneficial when altering diet, physical exercise, and medications" [45]. Patients who participated in qualitative research reported that using SMBG helps them manage their diabetes because it enables them to construct mental models and make decisions regarding self-management [46,47]. In contrast, few studies show no enhanced patient satisfaction, lifestyle and well-being with SMBG [48].

PROs and QoL measures have been evaluated in several studies employing validated questionnaires [49-52]. These questionnaires include the Diabetes Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire (DTSQ), the Diabetes Class of Life Clinical Trial Questionnaire, and the Hypoglycemia Fear Survey (HFS). Patients who used CGM reported a better quality of

life and were more satisfied with their medication than those who used conservative self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG). Patients who used CGM in a study by Jendle and colleagues experienced significantly fewer indications of hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia, which improved their well-being and quality of life (QoL) [53,54]. In a study conducted by the Continuous Glucose Monitoring Study Group of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, adults diagnosed with type 1 diabetes who used CGM experienced an improvement in their quality of life and treatment satisfaction, in addition to a decrease in diabetes-related distress. Patients who used CGM have also reported a reduced fear of hypoglycemia and increased skills in diabetes self-management to regulate blood glucose in a better way [55]. However, some studies have documented difficulties associated with CGM, such as skin irritation, discomfort, and disruption of regular activities [56,57].

Some patients may oppose CGM due to the stigma affiliated with having to wear a medical device. According to the findings of research conducted by Tanenbaum, et al., a few patients reported feeling self-conscious about wearing a CGM device, which impacted their use. Some patients, on the other hand, may experience a sense of empowerment and report a feeling of more authority in diabetes management as a result of using CGM. In addition to the attitude of patients, there are also obstacles to CGM adoption that are practical. For instance, patients might need help accessing the technology, or it might not be readily available in their region, or their insurance might not support it. The technical elements of CGM, such as the interpretation of data and troubleshooting, can also be

challenging for patients. Healthcare providers can play an essential role in addressing these concerns and barriers through patient education about CGM. Providers can collaborate with clients to develop tactics to overcome practical obstacles, such as negotiating health insurance or troubleshooting technical problems. These strategies can be acquired through a collaborative effort between patients and providers [58].

Limitations and future directions for continuous glucose monitoring

Various PH and temperature factors affect the equilibrium proportion of different molecular conformations. The slow interconversion between different molecular morphologies of the glucose molecules may be very important for detecting glucose in other body secretions, such as sweat. Temperature swings can sometimes lead to circumstances that are out of equilibrium. Because enzymes are used in the process, the test strips can only be used once or for a limited time before they become useless. This results in accumulated costs and trash as people with diabetes use multiple strips daily. These constraints can be overcome by developing new methods for detecting glucose that should focus on the molecule's physical properties rather than chemical properties.

Research being done in this area is centered on figuring out how to identify glucose through the skin or body fluids such as mucus, saliva and tears [15]. New technologies with improved sensitivity and dependability in detection are required to accomplish this goal. A paradigm shift in glucose monitoring would be possible with the development of

non-invasive techniques for glucose detection. This would substantially improve the quality of life for diabetic patients [59-62]. Continuous glucose monitors are also highly beneficial to dieticians in determining specific responses to food, which can be quite variable as individual responses can differ significantly [63].

Bruen, et al., examined the most recent developments in glucose monitors for various body fluids and summarized the findings [64]. Recent developments in electrochemical sensing were reviewed and discussed by Wang, et al., and Lin, et al., [65]. They focused on critical challenges and recent advancements in the field [66]. McCaul, et al., conducted a comprehensive review of various technological developments and the associated challenges and possibilities, particularly emphasizing sweat analysis [67]. Kim, et al., researched the most recent developments in non-invasive technologies that use interstitial fluid and sweat [68]. Oliver, et al., examined and explained the history of the technologies utilized for glucose sensing [69].

Recommendations for future work

Future research and clinical applications for continuous glucose monitoring can focus on various fields, such as creating CGM devices that are more precise and easily dependable. This involves advancements in the sensor's stability, longevity, and precision. Developing non-invasive or slightly invasive C.G.M. devices would also help patients adhere to their treatment plans and experience less discomfort from the existing devices [70,71]. More research should be done on applying CGM in particular patient groups. This

encompasses people with type 2 diabetes who are insulin-dependent, type 1 diabetic children, and diabetic pregnant women. Customizing treatment plans and enhancing clinical outcomes will be more if one knows advantages and restrictions in these groups [72]. Thirdly, it's essential to investigate how CGM can work with machine learning and artificial intelligence (AI) systems. This trend could result in more accurate predictions of glucose trends and patterns and personalized treatment strategies based on data specific to each patient [41].

Conclusion

The area of continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) is rapidly developing, and innovations are constantly being made. Future studies should concentrate on a few crucial areas to increase its efficacy and clinical utility. CGM has much promise to enhance diabetes management and clinical outcomes, yet issues must be resolved to broaden the adoption and increase access. Healthcare providers can provide better care and support their diabetic patients by keeping an update on recent research and CGM developments.

References

1. Association AD. Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Care*. 2009;32(Suppl 1):S62-7. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
2. Federation ID. IDF Diabetes Atlas 8th edition. International Diabetes Federation. 2017:905-11.
3. Atlas ID. 2017. IDF Diabetes Atlas 8th Edition. 2019.
4. Kavakiotis I, Tsave O, Salifoglou A, Maglavera S N, Vlahavas I, Chouvarda I. Machine Learning and Data Mining Methods in Diabetes Research. *Comput Struct Biotechnol J*. 2017;15:104-16. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
5. Rigla M, García-Sáez G, Pons B, Hernando ME. Artificial Intelligence Methodologies and their Application to Diabetes. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2018;12(2):303-10. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
6. Odedra D, Samanta S, Vidyarthi AS. Computational Intelligence in Early Diabetes Diagnosis: A Review. *Rev Diabet Stud RDS*. 2010;7(4):252. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
7. Nilsson NJ. Artificial intelligence: A New Synthesis. 1998.
8. American Diabetes Association. Glycemic Targets: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes. 2021;44(Supplement_1):S73-84. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
9. Bothe MK, Dickens L, Reichel K, Tellmann A, Ellger B, Westphal M, et al. The Use of Reinforcement Learning Algorithms to Meet the Challenges of an Artificial Pancreas. *Expert Rev Med Devices*. 2013;10(5):661-73. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
10. Klonoff DC. Continuous Glucose Monitoring: Roadmap for 21st Century Diabetes Therapy. *Diabetes Care*. 2005;28(5):1231-9. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
11. Riveline J-P, Schaepelynck P, Chaillous L, Renard E, Sola-Gazagnes A, Penfornis A, et al. Assessment of Patient-Led or Physician-Driven Continuous Glucose Monitoring in Patients with Poorly Controlled Type 1 Diabetes Using Basal-Bolus Insulin Regimens: A One Year Multicenter Study. *Diabetes Care*. 2012;35(5):965-71. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
12. Aleppo G, Ruedy KJ, Riddlesworth TD, Kruger DF, Peters AL, Hirsch I, et al. 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(4):538-45. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
13. Park C, Le QA. The Effectiveness of Continuous Glucose Monitoring in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes: A Systematic Review of Literature and Meta-Analysis. *Diabetes Technol Ther*. 2018;20(9):613-21. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
14. Ray PP. Continuous Glucose Monitoring: A Systematic Review of Sensor Systems and Prospects. *Sensor Review*. 2018;38(4):420-37.

15. Van Enter BJ, Von Hauff E. Challenges and Perspectives in Continuous Glucose Monitoring. *Chem Commun.* 2018;54(40):5032-45. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
16. Weller C, Linder M, Macaulay A, Ferrari A, Kessler G. Continuous in Vivo Determination of Blood Glucose in Human Subjects. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 1960;87(2):658-68. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
17. Kadish AH. Automation Control of Blood Sugar A Servomechanism for Glucose Monitoring and Control. *Trans Am Soc Artif Intern Organs.* 1963;9(1):363-7. [PubMed](#)
18. Clemens A, Chang P, Myers R. The Development of Biostator, A Glucose Controlled Insulin Infusion System (GCIIS). *Horm Metab Res.* 1977;23-33. [PubMed](#)
19. Gough DA, Bremer T. Analysis: Immobilized Glucose Oxidase in Implantable Glucose Sensor Technology. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 2000;2(3):377-80. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
20. Jin X, Cai A, Xu T, Zhang X. Artificial Intelligence Biosensors for Continuous Glucose Monitoring. *Interdiscip Mater.* 2023;2(2):290-307.
21. Kluemper JR, Smith A, Wobeter B. Diabetes: The Role of Continuous Glucose Monitoring. *Drugs in Context.* 2022;11. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
22. Chen C, Xie Q, Yang D, Xiao H, Fu Y, Tan Y, et al. Recent Advances in Electrochemical Glucose Biosensors: A Review. *Rsc Advances.* 2013;3(14):4473-91.
23. Vadgama P. Monitoring with In Vivo Electrochemical Sensors: Navigating the Complexities of Blood and Tissue Reactivity. *Sensors.* 2020;20(11):3149. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
24. Heller A, Feldman B. Electrochemical Glucose Sensors and Their Applications in Diabetes Management. *Chem Rev.* 2008;108(7):2482-505. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
25. Wang G, He X, Wang L, Gu A, Huang Y, Fang B, et al. Non-Enzymatic Electrochemical Sensing of Glucose. *Microchimica Acta.* 2013;180:161-86.
26. Scognamiglio V. Nanotechnology in Glucose Monitoring: Advances and Challenges in the Last 10 Years. *Biosens Bioelectron.* 2013;47:12-25. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
27. Gao J, Huang W, Chen Z, Yi C, Jiang L. Simultaneous Detection of Glucose, Uric Acid and Cholesterol Using Flexible Microneedle Electrode Array-Based Biosensor and Multi-Channel Portable Electrochemical Analyzer. *Sensors and Actuators B Chemical.* 2019;287:102-10.
28. Tasca F, Tortolini C, Bollella P, Antiochia R. Microneedle-Based Electrochemical Devices for Transdermal Biosensing: A Review. *Curr Opin Electrochem.* 2019;16:42-9.
29. Sharma S, Huang Z, Rogers M, Boutelle M, Cass AE. Evaluation of a Minimally Invasive Glucose Biosensor for Continuous Tissue Monitoring. *Anal Bioanal Chem.* 2016;408:8427-35. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
30. Lee H, Choi TK, Lee YB, Cho HR, Ghaffari R, Wang L, et al., A Graphene-Based Electrochemical Device with Thermoresponsive Microneedles for Diabetes Monitoring and Therapy. *Nat Nanotechnol.* 2016;11(6):566-72. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
31. Hwang DW, Lee S, Seo M, Chung TD. Recent Advances in Electrochemical Non-Enzymatic Glucose Sensors—A Review. *Anal Chim Acta.* 2018;1033:1-34. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
32. Yoon H, Xuan X, Jeong S, Park JY. Wearable, Robust, Non-Enzymatic Continuous Glucose Monitoring System and Its In Vivo Investigation. *Biosens Bioelectron.* 2018;117:267-75. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
33. Moore S, You BH, Kim N, Park T, Song IH. Non-Enzymatic Continuous Glucose Monitoring System. *Micro Nano Lett.* 2018;13(8):1079-84.
34. Steiner MS, Duerkop A, Wolfbeis OS. Optical Methods for Sensing Glucose. *Chem Soc Rev.* 2011;40(9):4805-39. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
35. Garzón V, Pinacho DG, Bustos RH, Garzón G, Bustamante S. Optical Biosensors for Therapeutic Drug Monitoring. *Biosensors.* 2019;9(4):132. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
36. Ballerstadt R, Schultz JS. A Fluorescence Affinity Hollow Fiber Sensor for Continuous Transdermal Glucose Monitoring. *Anal Chem.* 2000;72(17):4185-92. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
37. Mortellaro M, DeHennis A. Performance Characterization of An Abiotic and Fluorescent-Based Continuous Glucose Monitoring System in Patients with Type 1 Diabetes. *Biosens Bioelectron.* 2014;61:227-31. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
38. Sawayama J, Takeuchi S. Long-Term Continuous Glucose Monitoring Using a Fluorescence-Based Biocompatible Hydrogel Glucose Sensor. *Adv Healthc Mater.* 2021;10(3):2001286. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)

39. Chen C, Wang J. Optical biosensors: An Exhaustive and Comprehensive Review. *Analyst*. 2020;145(5):1605-28. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
40. Kumar S, Singh R. Recent Optical Sensing Technologies for the Detection of Various Biomolecules. *Opt Laser Technol*. 2021;134:106620.
41. Van Doorn WP, Foreman YD, Schaper NC, Savelberg HH, Koster A, van der Kallen CJ, et al., Machine Learning-Based Glucose Prediction with Use of Continuous Glucose and Physical Activity Monitoring Data: The Maastricht Study. *PloS One*. 2021;16(6). [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
42. Herman WH, Ye W, Griffin SJ, Simmons RK, Davies MJ, Khunti K, 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(8):1449-55. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
43. Stolar M. Glycemic Control and Complications in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Am J Med*. 2010;123(3):S3-11. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
44. Wang J, Zgibor J, Matthews JT, Charron-Prochownik D, Sereika SM, Siminerio L. Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose is Associated with Problem-Solving Skills in Hyperglycemia and Hypoglycemia. *Diabetes Educ*. 2012;38(2):207-18. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
45. American Diabetes Association. Diabetes Technology: Standards of Medical Care in Diabetes- *Diabetes Care*. 2020;43(suppl 1):S77-88. *Diabetes Care*. 1981;43(8). [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
46. Havele SA, Pfoh ER, Yan C, Misra-Hebert AD, Le P, Rothberg MB. Physicians' Views of Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Not on Insulin. *Ann Fam Med*. 2018;16(4):349-52. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
47. Despins LA, Wakefield BJ. Making Sense of Blood Glucose Data and Self-Management in Individuals with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Qualitative Study. *J Clin Nurs*. 2020;29(13-14):2572-88. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
48. Young LA, Buse JB, Weaver MA, Vu MB, Mitchell CM, Blakeney T, 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(7):920-9. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
49. McMillan CV, Bradley C, Woodcock A, Razvi S, Weaver JU. Design of New Questionnaires to Measure Quality of Life and Treatment Satisfaction in Hypothyroidism. *Thyroid*. 2004;14(11):916-25. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
50. Bradley C, Gilbride CJ. Improving Treatment Satisfaction and Other Patient-Reported Outcomes in People with Type 2 Diabetes: The Role of Once-Daily Insulin Glargine. *Diabetes Obes Metab*. 2008;10:50-65. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
51. Davies M, Speight J. Patient-Reported Outcomes in Trials of Incretin-Based Therapies in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Obes Metab*. 2012;14(10):882-92. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
52. Bott U, Ebrahim S, Hirschberger S, Skovlund SE. Effect of the Rapid-Acting Insulin Analogue Insulin Aspart on Quality of Life and Treatment Satisfaction in Patients with Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabet Med*. 2003;20(8):626-34. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
53. Bradley C, De Pablos-Velasco P, Parhofer KG, Eschwège E, Gönder-Frederick L, Simon D. PANORAMA: A European Study to Evaluate Quality of Life and Treatment Satisfaction in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus—Study Design. *Prim Care Diabetes*. 2011;5(4):231-9. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
54. Best JH, Boye KS, Rubin RR, Cao D, Kim TH, Peyrot M. Improved Treatment Satisfaction and Weight-Related Quality of Life with Exenatide Once Weekly or Twice Daily. *Diabet Med*. 2009;26(7):722-8. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
55. Adu MD, Malabu UH, Malau-Aduli AE, Malau-Aduli BS. Enablers and Barriers to Effective Diabetes Self-Management: A Multi-National Investigation. *PloS One*. 2019;14(6). [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
56. Messer LH, Johnson R, Driscoll KA, Jones J. Best Friend or Spy: A Qualitative Meta-Synthesis on the Impact of Continuous Glucose Monitoring on Life with Type 1 Diabetes. *Diabet Med*. 2018;35(4):409-18. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
57. Secher AL, Madsen AB, Ringholm L, Barfred C, Stage E, Andersen HU, et al., Patient Satisfaction and Barriers to Initiating Real-Time Continuous Glucose Monitoring in Early Pregnancy in Women with Diabetes. *Diabet Med*. 2012;29(2):272-7. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
58. Hewa JM. Health in Action: A Culture-Centered Approach to Discourses and Identity with Type 1 Diabetics. Washington State University. 2019.
59. Chen C, Zhao XL, Li ZH, Zhu ZG, Qian SH, Flewitt AJ. Current and Emerging Technology for Continuous Glucose Monitoring. *Sensors*. 2017;17(1):182. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)

60. Cappon G, Acciaroli G, Vettoretti M, Facchinetti A, Sparacino G. Wearable Continuous Glucose Monitoring Sensors: A Revolution in Diabetes Treatment. *Electronics*. 2017;6(3):65.
61. Badugu R, Lakowicz JR, Geddes CD. Ophthalmic Glucose Monitoring Using Disposable Contact Lenses—A Review. *J Fluoresc*. 2004;14:617-33. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
62. Matsumoto A, Tanaka M, Matsumoto H, Ochi K, Moro-Oka Y, Kuwata H, et al. Synthetic “Smart Gel” Provides Glucose-Responsive Insulin Delivery in Diabetic Mice. *Sci Adv*. 2017;3(11):eaq0723. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
63. Zeevi D, Korem T, Zmora N, Israeli D, Rothschild D, Weinberger A, et al., Personalized Nutrition by Prediction of Glycemic Responses. *Cell*. 2015;163(5):1079-94. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
64. Bruen D, Delaney C, Florea L, Diamond D. Glucose Sensing for Diabetes Monitoring: Recent Developments. *Sensors*. 2017;17(8):1866. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
65. Wang HC, Lee AR. Recent Developments in Blood Glucose Sensors. *J Food Drug Anal*. 2015;23(2):191-200. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
66. Lin T, Gal A, Mayzel Y, Horman K, Bahartan K. Non-Invasive Glucose Monitoring: A Review of Challenges and Recent Advances. *Curr Trends Biomed Eng Biosci*. 2017;6(5):1-8.
67. McCaul M, Glennon T, Diamond D. Challenges and Opportunities in Wearable Technology for Biochemical Analysis in Sweat. *Curr Opin Electrochem*. 2017;3(1):46-50.
68. Kim J, Campbell AS, Wang J. Wearable Non-Invasive Epidermal Glucose Sensors: A Review. *Talanta*. 2018;177:163-70. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
69. Oliver NS, Toumazou C, Cass AE, Johnston DG. Glucose Sensors: A Review of Current and Emerging Technology. *Diabet Med*. 2009;26(3):197-210. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)
70. Jin T. Eat smart. A Nutrition Management System Design. 2017
71. Sonner ZC. Continuous Physiological Monitoring Enabled by Novel Sweat Stimulation, Collection and Sweat Rate Correlations: University of Cincinnati. 2017.
72. Pickup JC, Freeman SC, Sutton AJ. Glycaemic Control in Type 1 Diabetes During Real Time Continuous Glucose Monitoring Compared with Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose: Meta-Analysis of Randomised Controlled Trials Using Individual Patient Data. *BMJ*. 2011;343. [PubMed](#) | [CrossRef](#)