www.idosr.org Awafung, 2025

©IDOSR PUBLICATIONS

ISSN: 2550-7931

International Digital Organization for Scientific Research
IDOSR JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCES 10(1):5-8, 2025.
https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAS/2025/101.58000

IDOSRJAS101580000

Comparing the Effectiveness of Continuous Glucose Monitoring Versus Traditional Blood Glucose Monitoring in Reducing HbA1c Levels among Adults with Type 2 Diabetes Over Six Months

Awafung Emmanuel Adie

Department of Biomedical Engineering, Kampala International University, Uganda.

ABSTRACT

Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) and traditional blood glucose monitoring (BGM) are pivotal tools in managing Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), with significant implications for glycemic control. This review compared the effectiveness of CGM versus BGM in reducing hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) levels among adults with T2DM over six months. Utilizing a narrative synthesis approach based on existing literature, this article evaluated the mechanisms, impacts, behavioral implications, and challenges associated with each monitoring method. CGM, characterized by its real-time data and trend analysis capabilities, offers superior HbA1c reduction outcomes, especially for individuals with poor baseline control. By providing continuous feedback, CGM facilitates immediate adjustments in lifestyle and medication, empowering proactive diabetes management. Conversely, BGM, reliant on episodic fingerstick testing, is effective but often less impactful due to its intermittent nature and dependence on user adherence. Nevertheless, it remains a cost-effective and accessible option for many. Challenges such as high costs for CGM and adherence barriers for BGM were explored, along with the potential of emerging innovations, including integrated automated insulin delivery systems for CGM and enhanced digital tools for BGM. This review underscores the importance of aligning monitoring strategies with individual patient needs to optimize HbA1c reduction and improve quality of life for adults with T2DM.

Keywords: Continuous Glucose Monitoring (CGM), Traditional Blood Glucose Monitoring (BGM), HbA1c Reduction, Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus (T2DM), Glycemic Control Strategies.

INTRODUCTION

Type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) is a chronic metabolic disorder characterized by insulin resistance and relative insulin deficiency, leading to sustained hyperglycemia [1–3] . Effective management of T2DM is crucial to prevent long-term complications such as cardiovascular diseases, nephropathy, neuropathy, and retinopathy. Glycemic control, often measured by hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c) levels, serves as the gold standard for evaluating the adequacy of diabetes management [4, 5]. Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) and traditional blood glucose monitoring (BGM) using fingerstick testing are two widely used methods for monitoring blood glucose levels in individuals with T2DM. BGM has been the cornerstone of diabetes self-management for decades. This method involves periodic fingerstick tests that provide point-in-time blood glucose readings. While BGM is straightforward and widely accessible, its episodic nature may limit the ability to detect glycemic patterns, particularly fluctuations and nocturnal hypoglycemia [6]. On the other hand, CGM offers real-time glucose readings and trend data, enabling users to make more informed decisions about their dietary, physical activity, and medication regimens. This technology also provides alerts for hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia, which can be particularly beneficial for individuals at risk of severe glucose excursions.

This review examines the comparative effectiveness of CGM versus BGM in reducing HbA1c levels among adults with T2DM over six months. By evaluating their respective benefits, limitations, and implications for diabetes management, this review aims to provide insights that can inform clinical practice and guide individualized patient care.

MECHANISMS OF ACTION: CGM AND BGM

The fundamental difference between CGM and BGM lies in the frequency and depth of glucose data collection [7]. BGM provides a snapshot of blood glucose levels at specific time points. This method requires individuals to perform fingerstick tests multiple times daily, typically before meals, after meals, and at bedtime. The collected data are often recorded manually and used retrospectively to make adjustments to treatment plans. While effective for detecting gross glycemic abnormalities, BGM lacks the granularity to reveal trends or fluctuations in glucose levels. CGM, in contrast, uses a sensor inserted subcutaneously to measure interstitial glucose levels continuously [8]. These readings are transmitted wirelessly to a receiver or smartphone app, providing users with near real-time glucose data and trends. CGM devices often include features such as alarms for hypo- or hyperglycemia, trend arrows indicating the direction of glucose changes, and time-in-range metrics, which have emerged as complementary measures to HbA1c. By offering a more comprehensive glucose profile, CGM empowers users to identify patterns, understand the impact of lifestyle factors, and take proactive steps to optimize glycemic control. The mechanisms of both CGM and BGM influence their respective utility in diabetes management. While CGM's continuous data stream supports dynamic adjustments and enhances self-management, its reliance on interstitial fluid rather than blood can introduce a time lag during rapid glucose changes. Conversely, BGM provides immediate and accurate blood glucose readings but is limited by its intermittent nature and reliance on user adherence to frequent testing. Understanding these mechanisms is critical to appreciating the comparative effectiveness of these technologies.

IMPACT ON HBA1C REDUCTION

HbA1c reflects average blood glucose levels over the past two to three months, making it a reliable marker for assessing long-term glycemic control. Multiple studies have evaluated the impact of CGM and BGM on HbA1c reduction in individuals with T2DM, yielding insights into their effectiveness and relative advantages [9]. CGM has consistently demonstrated superior outcomes in HbA1c reduction compared to BGM, particularly in individuals with poor baseline glycemic control [10]. By providing real-time feedback, CGM enables users to make immediate behavioral or therapeutic adjustments, such as modifying insulin dosages or carbohydrate intake. This level of personalization often translates to improved HbA1c outcomes. Additionally, the ability to monitor glucose trends facilitates the identification of previously undetected patterns, such as postprandial hyperglycemia or nocturnal hypoglycemia, which can be addressed to further optimize glycemic control. BGM, while effective, often falls short of CGM in terms of reducing HbA1c levels. Its reliance on episodic testing means that important glycemic excursions may go unnoticed, limiting opportunities for timely intervention. However, BGM remains a valuable tool for individuals who are unable to access CGM due to cost or technological barriers. Moreover, some studies suggest that highly motivated individuals who use BGM intensively and consistently can achieve HbA1c reductions comparable to those seen with CGM, underscoring the importance of patient engagement and education.

BEHAVIORAL AND LIFESTYLE IMPLICATIONS

The behavioral implications of CGM and BGM extend beyond their impact on HbA1c [11]. By offering continuous data, CGM fosters a deeper understanding of the relationship between lifestyle factors and glycemic control. For instance, users can observe the immediate effects of specific foods, physical activities, or stressors on their glucose levels, enabling them to make more informed choices. This feedback loop can promote sustained behavioral changes, such as healthier dietary habits and increased physical activity, which are essential for long-term diabetes management. BGM, in contrast, provides less frequent feedback, which may limit its ability to influence behavior. Without the continuous reinforcement provided by CGM, users may find it more challenging to establish the connections between their actions and glucose outcomes. However, for individuals who are diligent about recording and analyzing their BGM data, this method can still support meaningful behavioral changes. Structured BGM protocols, which include testing at specific times and under specific conditions, can enhance its utility in guiding lifestyle modifications. Both CGM and BGM have the potential to improve adherence to diabetes treatment regimens [12, 13]. CGM's ease of use and real-time feedback may increase adherence by reducing the burden of frequent fingersticks and providing immediate reinforcement for healthy behaviors. Conversely, the manual nature of BGM can foster a sense of accountability and engagement, particularly in individuals who are motivated to actively participate in their care.

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Despite their benefits, both CGM and BGM face challenges that can influence their effectiveness in reducing HbA1c levels. Cost remains a significant barrier to CGM adoption, as the technology is often more expensive than BGM and may not be covered by all insurance plans [14]. This financial barrier can limit access, particularly in low-resource settings or among underserved populations. Technical issues, such as sensor inaccuracies and device malfunctions, can also undermine the reliability of CGM data [15]. For example, the time lag between interstitial glucose and blood glucose readings can lead to discrepancies during periods of rapid glucose change. Additionally, the need for regular sensor replacement and device calibration can be burdensome for some users. BGM, while more affordable and widely accessible, requires consistent user adherence to be effective. The inconvenience and discomfort associated with frequent fingersticks can deter individuals from testing as often as recommended, leading to incomplete or inaccurate data. Furthermore, BGM's reliance on user initiative means that individuals who are less engaged in their care may struggle to achieve optimal outcomes. Both methods also face broader challenges related to patient education and healthcare system support. Ensuring that individuals understand how to interpret and act on their glucose data is critical to maximizing the benefits of both CGM and BGM. Similarly, healthcare providers must be equipped to integrate these technologies into clinical practice and provide the necessary guidance and support.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND INNOVATIONS

Advancements in technology and healthcare delivery hold promise for addressing the limitations of CGM and BGM and enhancing their impact on glycemic control [16, 17]. For CGM, ongoing developments aim to improve sensor accuracy, extend device lifespan, and reduce costs. Integrating CGM with automated insulin delivery systems, such as closed-loop or hybrid closed-loop systems, represents a particularly exciting frontier. These systems use CGM data to automatically adjust insulin delivery, offering the potential for even greater improvements in HbA1c and overall glycemic control. For BGM, innovations focus on enhancing user convenience and engagement. For example, blood glucose meters with Bluetooth connectivity can sync data to smartphone apps, enabling users to track trends and share information with their healthcare providers. Structured BGM protocols, supported by digital tools, can also help users derive greater value from their testing. Beyond technological innovations, efforts to improve access and equity are essential. Expanding insurance coverage for CGM, reducing device costs, and providing subsidies for low-income populations can help bridge the gap between technological advancements and real-world accessibility. Additionally, integrating CGM and BGM into comprehensive diabetes education programs can ensure that users are equipped to utilize these tools effectively.

CONCLUSION

Comparing CGM and BGM reveals distinct advantages and limitations for each method in reducing HbA1c levels among adults with T2DM over six months. CGM's continuous data and real-time feedback make it particularly effective for individuals seeking dynamic and proactive diabetes management. In contrast, BGM remains a valuable option for those who cannot access CGM or prefer a simpler approach. Both methods underscore the importance of individualized care, where the choice of monitoring tool aligns with the patient's needs, preferences, and circumstances. Addressing the challenges associated with cost, accessibility, and education is critical to optimizing the impact of these technologies. By advancing innovations and fostering equitable access, healthcare systems can empower individuals with T2DM to achieve better glycemic control and improve their overall quality of life.

REFERENCES

1. Alum, E. U., Ugwu, O. P. C., Obeagu, E. I., Uti, D. E., Egba, S. I., & Alum, B. N. (2024). Managing the Dual Burden: Addressing Mental Health in Diabetes Care. *Elite Journal of Medical Sciences*, *2*(6), 1-9.
2. Alum, E. U., Ugwu, O. P. C., Obeagu, E. I., Aja, P. M., Ugwu, C. N., Okon, M.B. Nutritional Care in Diabetes Mellitus: A Comprehensive Guide**.** *International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research.* 2023; 11(12):16-25. Article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.58538/IJIAR/2057
3. Galicia-Garcia, U., Benito-Vicente, A., Jebari, S., Larrea-Sebal, A., Siddiqi, H., Uribe, K.B., Ostolaza, H., Martín, C.: Pathophysiology of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 21, 6275 (2020). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms21176275
4. Lundholm, M.D., Emanuele, M.A., Ashraf, A., Nadeem, S.: Applications and pitfalls of hemoglobin A1C and alternative methods of glycemic monitoring. Journal of Diabetes and its Complications. 34, 107585 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdiacomp.2020.107585
5. Obeagu, E., P.C., U., Alum, E., Extension, K.P.: Poor Glycaemic Control among Diabetic Patients: A Review on Associated Factors. 3, 30–33 (2023)
6. Shang, T., Zhang, J.Y., Bequette, B.W., Raymond, J.K., Coté, G., Sherr, J.L., Castle, J., Pickup, J., Pavlovic, Y., Espinoza, J., Messer, L.H., Heise, T., Mendez, C.E., Kim, S., Ginsberg, B.H., Masharani, U., Galindo, R.J., Klonoff, D.C.: Diabetes Technology Meeting 2020. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 15, 916–960 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1177/19322968211016480
7. Rebec, M., Cai, K., Dutt-Ballerstadt, R., Anderson, E.: A Prospective Multicenter Clinical Performance Evaluation of the C-CGM System. J Diabetes Sci Technol. 16, 390–

396 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1177/1932296820964574

8. Huang, X., Yao, C., Huang, S., Zheng, S., Liu, Z., Liu, J., Wang, J., Chen, H., Xie, X.: Technological Advances of Wearable Device for Continuous Monitoring of In Vivo Glucose. ACS Sens. 9, 1065–1088 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1021/acssensors.3c01947
9. Kesavadev, J., Sadikot, S., Wangnoo, S., Kannampilly, J., Saboo, B., Aravind, S.R., Kalra, S., Makkar, B.M., Maji, D., Saikia, M., Anjana, R.M., Rajput, R., Singh, S.K., Shah, S., Dhruv, U., Vishwanathan, V.: Consensus guidelines for glycemic monitoring in type 1/type 2 & GDM. Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews. 8, 187–195 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsx.2014.04.030
10. Freeman, J.: Management of hypoglycemia in older adults with type 2 diabetes. Postgraduate Medicine. 131, 241–250 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1080/00325481.2019.1578590
11. Commissariat, P.V., DiMeglio, L.A., Kanapka, L.G., Laffel, L.M., Miller, K.M., Anderson, B.J., Hilliard, M.E., Group, the S. to E.N.C.U. in E.C. (SENCE) S.: Twelve-month psychosocial outcomes of continuous glucose monitoring with behavioural support in parents of young children with type 1 diabetes. Diabetic Medicine. 40, e15120 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1111/dme.15120
12. Lind, N., Christensen, M.B., Nørgaard, K.: A combined diabetes and continuous glucose monitoring education program for adults with type 2 diabetes. PEC Innovation. 5, 100324 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecinn.2024.100324
13. Kesavadev, J., Sadikot, S., Wangnoo, S., Kannampilly, J., Saboo, B., Aravind, S.R., Kalra, S., Makkar, B.M., Maji, D., Saikia, M., Anjana, R.M., Rajput, R., Singh, S.K., Shah, S., Dhruv, U., Vishwanathan, V.: Consensus guidelines for glycemic monitoring in type 1/type 2 & GDM. Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews. 8, 187–195 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsx.2014.04.030
14. Tanenbaum, M.L., Commissariat, P.V.: Barriers and Facilitators to Diabetes Device Adoption for People with Type 1 Diabetes. Curr Diab Rep. 22, 291–299 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11892-022-01469-w
15. Huzooree, G., Khedo, K.K., Joonas, N.: Data Reliability and Quality in Body Area Networks for Diabetes Monitoring. In: Maheswar, R., Kanagachidambaresan, G.R., Jayaparvathy, R., and Thampi, S.M. (eds.) Body Area Network Challenges and Solutions. pp. 55–86. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2019)
16. Lee, I., Probst, D., Klonoff, D., Sode, K.: Continuous glucose monitoring systems - Current status and future perspectives of the flagship technologies in biosensor research -. Biosensors and Bioelectronics. 181, 113054 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2021.113054
17. Thayer, S.M., Williams, K.J., Lawlor, M.L.: The role of technology in the care of diabetes mellitus in pregnancy: an expert review. AJOG Global Reports. 3, 100245 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xagr.2023.100245

CITE AS: Awafung Emmanuel Adie (2025). Comparing the Effectiveness of Continuous Glucose Monitoring Versus Traditional Blood Glucose Monitoring in Reducing HbA1c Levels among Adults with Type 2 Diabetes Over Six Months. IDOSR JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCES 10(1):5-8. https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAS/2025/101.58000