

Effectiveness of Continuous Glucose Monitoring versus Standard Finger-Prick Testing on Glycemic Control in Adults with Type 2 Diabetes: A Review

Ssenkayi Julius

Department of Pharmacy Kampala International University Uganda
Email:Julius.ssenkayi@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) has revolutionized the management of type 2 diabetes (T2D) by offering real-time, continuous insights into glucose trends, thereby addressing limitations associated with standard finger-prick self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG). This review critically examined the comparative effectiveness of CGM versus SMBG in improving glycemic control among adults with T2D. Using a narrative review methodology, relevant literature including randomized controlled trials, observational studies, and meta-analyses were synthesized to assess outcomes such as HbA1c reduction, time in range (TIR), glycemic variability, and hypoglycemia incidence. Evidence indicates that CGM consistently achieves superior glycemic outcomes, notably greater reductions in HbA1c, increased TIR, and fewer hypo- and hyperglycemic episodes compared to SMBG, particularly among patients on intensive insulin regimens. Additionally, CGM fosters improved patient adherence, satisfaction, and quality of life by reducing the burden of frequent finger pricks and enhancing self-management capabilities. However, operational barriers such as high costs, limited insurance coverage, technological literacy gaps, and data interpretation complexities impede widespread adoption. Economic evaluations suggest CGM can be cost-effective over time by lowering complication-related expenditures. Future directions include expanding CGM use to non-insulin-treated populations and integrating AI-driven predictive analytics. Ultimately, CGM holds substantial promise as a cornerstone of personalized, data-informed T2D care, offering both clinical and psychosocial benefits. **Keywords:** Continuous Glucose Monitoring (CGM), Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose (SMBG), Glycemic Control, Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, Time in Range (TIR).

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes mellitus, particularly type 2 diabetes (T2D), continues to represent a major global health challenge due to its increasing prevalence and association with significant morbidity and mortality [1–3]. Effective glycemic control remains central to mitigating complications such as cardiovascular disease, nephropathy, neuropathy, and retinopathy, which significantly diminish quality of life and increase healthcare burden. Self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) has traditionally been a cornerstone in the management of T2D, enabling patients and clinicians to assess glycemic status and adjust therapeutic interventions accordingly [4]. The conventional method, involving finger-prick capillary blood glucose testing, provides discrete glucose readings but is limited by issues related to patient adherence, inconvenience, and the inability to capture glycemic variability and trends comprehensively. In recent years, continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) technology has emerged as a transformative advancement in diabetes care, offering real-time, dynamic glucose data [5, 6]. CGM devices utilize subcutaneous sensors to measure interstitial glucose levels continuously, providing insights into glucose fluctuations, patterns of hypo- and hyperglycemia, and the impact of lifestyle factors on glucose control. This technological innovation has the potential to overcome many limitations of SMBG by facilitating timely therapeutic adjustments and empowering patients with enhanced self-management capabilities.

Given the critical role of glycemic control in the prognosis of T2D, evaluating the comparative effectiveness of CGM versus standard finger-prick testing is essential to inform clinical decision-making, optimize patient outcomes, and guide resource allocation [7]. This narrative review synthesizes evidence from clinical trials, observational studies, and meta-analyses that assess the impact of CGM relative to SMBG on glycemic parameters, patient adherence, quality of life, and complication prevention in adults with T2D. It further explores operational challenges and future directions to maximize the integration of CGM in routine diabetes care. Ultimately, this review aims to provide a nuanced understanding of the benefits and limitations of these glucose monitoring modalities to support evidence-based practice and policy formulation.

Historical Context and Evolution of Glucose Monitoring

The management of diabetes has been inextricably linked with the capacity to monitor glucose levels effectively. Finger-prick blood glucose testing, introduced in the 1970s, revolutionized self-care by offering patients immediate feedback on their glucose levels outside of clinical settings [8]. Despite its widespread use and utility, SMBG inherently provides episodic data points, which may not reflect glycemic variability or nocturnal hypoglycemia. This gap has implications for both overtreatment and undertreatment, leading to adverse events.

The advent of CGM systems, first developed in the late 1990s, introduced a paradigm shift by enabling near-continuous assessment of glucose concentrations via minimally invasive sensors [9, 10]. Early CGM devices were initially targeted toward type 1 diabetes due to the greater risk of hypoglycemia; however, technological advancements, improved accuracy, and cost reductions have expanded their applicability to T2D management. Modern CGM devices incorporate alarms for hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia, trend arrows, and smartphone connectivity, enhancing usability and patient engagement.

Understanding the progression from SMBG to CGM is vital for contextualizing their comparative effectiveness, especially given differences in cost, user acceptability, and clinical utility.

Glycemic Control Outcomes: CGM versus SMBG

Glycemic control in T2D is commonly assessed through parameters such as glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c), time in range (TIR), glycemic variability, and frequency of hypo- and hyperglycemic episodes [11]. Multiple studies have evaluated these outcomes in patients using CGM compared to those relying on standard finger-prick SMBG.

- i. **HbA1c Reduction:** Systematic reviews and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) demonstrate that CGM use results in statistically significant reductions in HbA1c compared to SMBG, with average declines ranging from 0.3% to 0.8% over periods of 3 to 6 months [12]. This effect is particularly pronounced in patients with suboptimal baseline control and those treated with insulin therapy. The ability of CGM to provide real-time feedback facilitates timely lifestyle and medication adjustments, contributing to improved overall glycemic control.
- ii. **Time in Range (TIR) and Glycemic Variability:** CGM uniquely quantifies TIR, defined as the percentage of time glucose values remain within target glucose ranges (usually 70-180 mg/dL). Studies report that CGM users experience increased TIR and reduced glycemic variability relative to SMBG users, metrics linked to decreased risk of diabetes complications. This dynamic data allows clinicians and patients to address fluctuations that are otherwise undetected with periodic SMBG.
- iii. **Hypoglycemia and Hyperglycemia Episodes:** CGM has been shown to decrease both the frequency and severity of hypoglycemic events by alerting users to impending low glucose levels [13]. This is a significant advantage over SMBG, which may miss nocturnal or asymptomatic hypoglycemia. Likewise, hyperglycemia management improves due to early detection of glucose excursions, enabling rapid intervention.

Patient Adherence, Satisfaction, and Quality of Life

Adherence to glucose monitoring regimens critically influences diabetes management success [14]. SMBG is associated with challenges including pain, inconvenience, and stigma, leading to suboptimal testing frequencies [15]. CGM addresses many of these issues by reducing the need for frequent finger pricks and providing seamless, continuous data.

Studies report higher patient satisfaction and quality of life with CGM use. Enhanced glucose awareness fosters empowerment and confidence in self-management decisions. Additionally, CGM data sharing with healthcare providers facilitates more personalized care and improved patient-clinician communication.

However, some patients experience sensor discomfort, device calibration burdens, and alarm fatigue. Cost and insurance coverage also remain barriers to widespread CGM adoption, particularly in low-resource settings. Understanding patient preferences and addressing these barriers is vital to optimize utilization.

Clinical and Economic Considerations

The integration of CGM into T2D care presents several clinical and economic considerations that influence its effectiveness and scalability.

- i. **Clinical Implications:** While CGM improves glycemic control and reduces complications, it is not universally indicated for all T2D patients. Current guidelines recommend CGM particularly for patients on intensive insulin therapy, those with frequent hypoglycemia, or with difficulty achieving glycemic targets [16]. Expanding indications to broader T2D populations remains under investigation.
- ii. **Cost-Effectiveness:** CGM devices and consumables represent a higher upfront cost compared to SMBG. However, cost-effectiveness analyses suggest that improved glycemic outcomes, reduced hypoglycemic events, and decreased diabetes-related complications translate into long-term healthcare savings [17]. These analyses vary by healthcare system and reimbursement structures.
- iii. **Healthcare Provider Training:** Effective use of CGM requires provider expertise to interpret data and translate insights into clinical decisions. Training and decision-support tools are essential components for maximizing CGM benefits.

Operational Challenges and Implementation Strategies

Despite demonstrated advantages, several operational challenges hinder CGM adoption in routine care for T2D:

- i. **Access and Affordability:** Limited insurance coverage and high costs restrict CGM availability for many patients, especially in low- and middle-income countries [18].
- ii. **Technological Literacy:** Patient and provider education is necessary to ensure proper device use and data interpretation.
- iii. **Data Overload:** The volume of CGM data can be overwhelming, necessitating streamlined analytical tools and integration into electronic health records [19].
- iv. **Device Limitations:** Sensor accuracy can be affected by factors such as compression artifacts and lag time between interstitial and blood glucose.

Addressing these challenges requires multifaceted strategies including policy advocacy for reimbursement, community-based training programs, and technological innovations to enhance device usability.

Future Directions

Emerging research focuses on integrating CGM with insulin delivery systems, artificial intelligence (AI)-driven analytics, and personalized diabetes management platforms [20, 21]. The potential for predictive glucose alerts and automated insulin titration holds promise for further improving glycemic control and patient autonomy.

Additionally, expanding CGM indications to non-insulin treated T2D patients, including those on oral agents, may yield benefits in early detection of glycemic excursions and prevention of disease progression.

Ongoing large-scale trials and real-world evidence will be critical to refine clinical guidelines and implementation frameworks for CGM in diverse T2D populations.

CONCLUSION

Continuous glucose monitoring represents a significant advancement in the management of type 2 diabetes by offering comprehensive, real-time glucose data that surpasses the capabilities of standard finger-prick testing. Evidence consistently supports CGM's superiority in improving glycemic control, increasing time in range, and reducing hypoglycemic episodes among adults with T2D, particularly those requiring insulin therapy. Beyond clinical outcomes, CGM enhances patient adherence, satisfaction, and quality of life, empowering more effective self-management. Nevertheless, challenges related to cost, access, and data interpretation must be addressed to realize the full potential of CGM technologies. Strategic investments in education, healthcare infrastructure, and policy reforms are essential to broaden CGM accessibility and optimize its integration into routine diabetes care. While SMBG remains a valuable tool in certain clinical scenarios, CGM's dynamic insights and continuous feedback provide a transformative opportunity to improve diabetes outcomes. As technological innovations continue to evolve, CGM is poised to become a cornerstone of personalized diabetes management, ultimately contributing to reduced complications, healthcare costs, and enhanced patient well-being.

REFERENCES

1. Ugwu, O.P.C., Alum, E.U, Okon, M., Aja, P.M.: Ethanol root extract and fractions of *Sphenocentrum jollyanum* abrogate hyperglycemia and low body weight in Streptozotocin-induced diabetic Wistar albino Rats. (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1093/rpsppr/rqad010/7099615>
2. Uti, D., Oju Igile, G., Nta Obeten, U., Uti, D.E., Igile, G.O., Omang, W.A., Umoru, G.U., Udeozor, P.A., Obeten, U.N., Ogbonna, O.N., Ibiam, U.A., Ohunene, R., Joseph Chukwufumnanya, M., Oplekwu, R.I.: Anti-

- Diabetic Potentials of Vernonioid E Saponin; A Biochemical Study. *Natural Volatiles and Essential Oils*. 2021; 8(4): 14234–14254.
3. Alum, E.U. Optimizing patient education for sustainable self-management in type 2 diabetes. *Discov Public Health* **22**, 44 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12982-025-00445-5>
 4. Pleus, S., Freckmann, G., Schauer, S., Heinemann, L., Ziegler, R., Ji, L., Mohan, V., Calliari, L.E., Hinzmann, R.: Self-Monitoring of Blood Glucose as an Integral Part in the Management of People with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus. *Diabetes Therapy*. 13, 829–846 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S13300-022-01254-8/TABLES/3>
 5. Ghosh, N., Verma, S.: Technological advancements in glucose monitoring and artificial pancreas systems for shaping diabetes care. *Curr Med Res Opin.* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03007995.2024.2422005>
 6. Liu, X., Zhang, J.: Continuous Glucose Monitoring: A Transformative Approach to the Detection of Prediabetes. *J Multidiscip Healthc.* 17, 5513–5519 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDHS493128;REQUESTEDJOURNAL:JOURNAL:DJMD20;PAGE:STRING:ARTICLE/CHAPTER>
 7. Reddy, M., Oliver, N.: The role of real-time continuous glucose monitoring in diabetes management and how it should link to integrated personalized diabetes management. *Diabetes Obes Metab.* 26, 46–56 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1111/DOM.15504;JOURNAL:JOURNAL:14631326;WEBSITE:WEBSITE:DOM-PUBS;WGROU:STRING:PUBLICATION>
 8. Ghosh, N., Verma, S.: Technological advancements in glucose monitoring and artificial pancreas systems for shaping diabetes care. *Curr Med Res Opin.* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03007995.2024.2422005>
 9. Shang, T., Zhang, J.Y., Thomas, A., Arnold, M.A., Vetter, B.N., Heinemann, L., Klonoff, D.C.: Products for Monitoring Glucose Levels in the Human Body With Noninvasive Optical, Noninvasive Fluid Sampling, or Minimally Invasive Technologies. *J Diabetes Sci Technol.* 16, 168–214 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1177/19322968211007212/ASSET/75E2BAD6-E8F2-42D7-8EB2-4CDBC74E9C22/ASSETS/IMAGES/10.1177_19322968211007212-IMG28.PNG
 10. Forlenza, G.P., Buckingham, B., Maahs, D.M.: Progress in Diabetes Technology: Developments in Insulin Pumps, Continuous Glucose Monitors, and Progress towards the Artificial Pancreas. *J Pediatr.* 169, 13–20 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JPEDI.2015.10.015>
 11. Alum, E.U., Ikpozu, E.N., Offor, C.E., et al. RNA-based diagnostic innovations: A new frontier in diabetes diagnosis and management. *Diabetes & Vascular Disease Research.* 2025;22(2). doi:10.1177/14791641251334726
 12. Maiorino, M.I., Signoriello, S., Maio, A., Chiodini, P., Bellastella, G., Scappaticcio, L., Longo, M., Giugliano, D., Esposito, K.: Effects of Continuous Glucose Monitoring on Metrics of Glycemic Control in Diabetes: A Systematic Review With Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Diabetes Care.* 43, 1146–1156 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.2337/DC19-1459>
 13. Lin, Y.K., Groat, D., Chan, O., Hung, M., Sharma, A., Varner, M.W., Gouripeddi, R., Facelli, J.C., Fisher, S.J.: Associations between the Time in Hypoglycemia and Hypoglycemia Awareness Status in Type 1 Diabetes Patients Using Continuous Glucose Monitoring Systems. *Diabetes Technol Ther.* 22, 787–793 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1089/DIA.2020.0016;WEBSITE:WEBSITE:MAL-SITE>
 14. Alum, E. U., Krishnamoorthy, R., Gatasheh, M. K., Subbarayan, S., Vijayalakshmi, P., Uti, D. E. Protective Role of Jimson Weed in Mitigating Dyslipidemia, Cardiovascular, and Renal Dysfunction in Diabetic Rat Models: In Vivo and in Silico Evidence. *Natural Product Communications.* 2024;19(12). doi:10.1177/1934578X241299279
 15. Ong, W.M., Chua, S.S., Ng, C.J.: Barriers and facilitators to self-monitoring of blood glucose in people with type 2 diabetes using insulin: A qualitative study. *Patient Prefer Adherence.* 8, 237–246 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S57567>
 16. Committee, A.D.A.P.P., ElSayed, N.A., Aleppo, G., Bannuru, R.R., Bruemmer, D., Collins, B.S., Ekhlaspour, L., Hilliard, M.E., Johnson, E.L., Khunti, K., Lingvay, I., Matfin, G., McCoy, R.G., Perry, M. Lou, Pilla, S.J., Polsky, S., Prahalad, P., Pratley, R.E., Segal, A.R., Seley, J.J., Selvin, E., Stanton, R.C., Gabbay, R.A.: 6. Glycemic Goals and Hypoglycemia: Standards of Care in Diabetes—2024. *Diabetes Care.* 47, S111–S125 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.2337/DC24-S006>

17. Siegel, K.R., Ali, M.K., Zhou, X., Ng, B.P., Jawanda, S., Proia, K., Zhang, X., Gregg, E.W., Albright, A.L., Zhang, P.: Cost-effectiveness of Interventions to Manage Diabetes: Has the Evidence Changed Since 2008? *Diabetes Care*. 43, 1557–1592 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.2337/DCI20-0017>
18. Ewen, M., Lepeska, M., Abdraimova, A., Besançon, S., Thi, N., Cham, P., Dunganova, A., Nguemeni, M., Oldfield, L., Tenorio-Mucha, J., Ramadaniati, H.U., Vetter, B., Beran, D.: Availability, prices and affordability of self-monitoring blood glucose devices: surveys in six low-income and middle-income countries. *BMJ Public Health*. 3, e001128 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJPH-2024-001128>
19. Espinoza, J., Xu, N.Y., Nguyen, K.T., Klonoff, D.C.: The Need for Data Standards and Implementation Policies to Integrate CGM Data into the Electronic Health Record. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 17, 495–502 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1177/19322968211058148/ASSET/0022414F-E61A-496E-AD5A-68B19AEFEE23/ASSETS/IMAGES/LARGE/10.1177_19322968211058148-FIG3.JPG
20. Zhang, K., Qi, Y., Wang, W., Tian, X., Wang, J., Xu, L., Zhai, X.: Future horizons in diabetes: integrating AI and personalized care. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)*. 16, 1583227 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.3389/FENDO.2025.1583227/BIBTEX>
21. Thomas, A., Gopi, V.P., Francis, B.: Artificial intelligence in diabetes management. *Advances in Artificial Intelligence: Biomedical Engineering Applications in Signals and Imaging*. 397–436 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-443-19073-5.00002-1>

CITE AS: Ssenkayi Julius (2025). Effectiveness of Continuous Glucose Monitoring versus Standard Finger-Prick Testing on Glycemic Control in Adults with Type 2 Diabetes: A Review. IAA Journal of Biological Sciences 13(2):170-174. <https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJB/2025/132170174>