IAA Journal of Biological Sciences 13(2):90-94, 2025
©IAAJOURNALS
https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJB/2025/1329094

www.iaajournals.org
ISSN:2636-7254
IAAJB132

Efficacy of Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery Systems Versus Sensor-Augmented Pumps in Adolescents with Type 1 Diabetes: A Comparative Review

Nasira A. Sitar

Department of Pharmacy Kampala International University Uganda
Satar.nasira@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Adolescents with type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) face complex challenges in achieving optimal glycemic control due to physiological fluctuations, behavioral factors, and inconsistent adherence. With the evolution of diabetes technology, two prominent insulin delivery systems have emerged: sensor-augmented pumps (SAPs) and closed-loop insulin delivery systems. SAPs require user-initiated insulin adjustments based on continuous glucose monitoring data, while closed-loop systems employ automated algorithms that adjust insulin delivery in real-time with minimal user input. This comparative review evaluated the efficacy of these two systems in adolescents, focusing on glycemic outcomes, including time in range (TIR), hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), and hypoglycemia, as well as psychosocial parameters like treatment satisfaction and quality of life. The article was developed using a narrative review methodology, synthesizing evidence from randomized controlled trials, prospective cohort studies, and meta-analyses. Findings consistently indicate that closed-loop systems outperform SAPs in improving TIR and HbA1c, while significantly reducing the incidence of hypoglycemia, especially during nocturnal hours. Moreover, adolescents using closed-loop systems report higher satisfaction and reduced diabetes-related distress. However, limitations such as device cost, access disparities, and technology-related fatigue persist. As research and innovation continue, closed-loop systems hold the potential to redefine the standard of care for adolescents with T1DM, particularly when personalized and equitably implemented.

Keywords: Type 1 Diabetes Mellitus, Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery, Sensor-Augmented Pump, Adolescents, Glycemic Control.

INTRODUCTION

Type 1 diabetes mellitus (T1DM) is a chronic autoimmune condition marked by the destruction of pancreatic β-cells, leading to lifelong insulin dependency [1–3]. Adolescents with T1DM face unique challenges in glycemic management due to hormonal fluctuations, psychological factors, and varying adherence to therapy [4]. As suboptimal glycemic control in this age group is linked with both acute complications (such as diabetic ketoacidosis) and long-term microvascular and macrovascular consequences, optimizing insulin delivery systems is of paramount clinical importance. Recent technological advances have ushered in a new era of diabetes care, particularly through the development of advanced insulin delivery systems [5]. Two major modalities have emerged: sensor-augmented pumps (SAPs) and closed-loop insulin delivery systems (also known as artificial pancreas systems). SAPs combine continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion with real-time continuous glucose monitoring (CGM), requiring user input for insulin dose adjustments [6, 7]. In contrast, closed-loop systems automate insulin delivery using sophisticated algorithms that continuously adjust insulin dosing based on CGM data with minimal manual intervention.

This comparative review focuses on evaluating the efficacy of closed-loop insulin delivery systems versus SAPs in adolescents with T1DM. Emphasis is placed on glycemic outcomes, including time in range (TIR), hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), hypoglycemic episodes, and overall metabolic control. Additional attention is given to psychosocial factors such as treatment satisfaction, quality of life, and device adherence, all of which significantly influence therapeutic

success in adolescents. By critically synthesizing evidence from randomized controlled trials, prospective cohort studies, and meta-analyses, this review aims to provide a nuanced understanding of how these systems perform in real-world adolescent populations. Furthermore, it identifies current gaps in knowledge and outlines future directions for research and clinical practice to enhance diabetes management in this high-risk, developmentally unique group.

Overview of Sensor-Augmented Pumps and Closed-Loop Systems

Sensor-augmented pumps represent a significant evolution from traditional insulin pump therapy by integrating CGM technology [8]. The user must interpret sensor readings and manually adjust insulin dosing based on real-time glucose values. While these systems offer more data for informed decision-making, they rely heavily on user engagement and accuracy in interpreting trends, a task that can be especially demanding for adolescents.

Closed-loop insulin delivery systems, often termed hybrid closed-loop systems (as some still require manual mealtime boluses), use algorithms to automatically modulate basal insulin delivery in response to CGM data [9]. These systems aim to mimic the physiological insulin response more closely than SAPs. Modern iterations, such as the Medtronic MiniMed 780G and Tandem Control-IQ, have shown promise in reducing glycemic variability and hypoglycemia.

The primary distinction lies in automation: SAPs provide data to guide insulin delivery, whereas closed-loop systems act on the data with minimal user input. This difference underpins much of the variance in clinical outcomes between the two technologies.

Comparative Efficacy in Glycemic Control

Several randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and meta-analyses have demonstrated superior glycemic outcomes with closed-loop systems in adolescents. Time in range (TIR), a robust metric capturing the percentage of time spent within the glucose range of 70–180 mg/dL, is consistently improved with closed-loop technology [10]. In one multicenter RCT involving adolescents, those using closed-loop systems achieved a 10–15% greater TIR compared to SAP users, translating into several additional hours per day in optimal glucose range.

Similarly, HbA1c reductions are more pronounced in closed-loop users. Average reductions range from 0.3% to 0.5% in favor of closed-loop systems, a clinically meaningful improvement that correlates with reduced risk of complications [11]. Importantly, these benefits are seen without increased hypoglycemia risk; indeed, closed-loop systems often reduce time spent in hypoglycemia due to their capacity to suspend insulin delivery in response to declining glucose levels.

Glycemic variability, another critical factor in diabetes management, is also better mitigated by closed-loop systems [12]. Lower glycemic excursions and more stable glucose profiles contribute not only to improved clinical outcomes but also to reduced diabetes-related distress.

Impact on Hypoglycemia and Safety Outcomes

Hypoglycemia, particularly nocturnal episodes, remains a significant concern in adolescent diabetes care [13, 14]. Closed-loop systems have demonstrated superior performance in minimizing hypoglycemia. Automated insulin suspension or reduction in anticipation of falling glucose levels has been a pivotal advancement.

In comparative studies, adolescents using closed-loop systems experienced fewer episodes of both mild and severe hypoglycemia. These systems are especially effective during the night when the risk of undetected hypoglycemia is higher. Additionally, the algorithms adapt insulin delivery to circadian variations in insulin sensitivity, a feature not available in SAPs.

From a safety perspective, closed-loop systems also minimize user errors related to insulin dosing [15]. By reducing reliance on patient-initiated adjustments, the risk of over- or under-dosing is curtailed. Nevertheless, both systems require regular monitoring and calibration, and closed-loop systems are not entirely immune to technological glitches or sensor inaccuracies.

Adherence, User Satisfaction, and Psychosocial Impact

Adolescents often struggle with consistent diabetes self-management, making device usability and acceptability critical to long-term adherence [16]. Evidence suggests that closed-loop systems, due to reduced user burden, are associated with greater treatment satisfaction and adherence compared to SAPs.

Participants in various trials reported a perceived reduction in cognitive load, as the automation alleviated the constant decision-making associated with diabetes management [17]. This, in turn, led to improved quality of life indicators and reduced diabetes-related anxiety. Families also reported greater peace of mind, particularly regarding nocturnal glucose control.

However, challenges remain. Device wearability, alarm fatigue, and concerns about privacy or social stigma can affect usage in both systems. Adolescents may resist wearing conspicuous devices or responding to frequent alarms.

Therefore, while closed-loop systems generally outperform SAPs in terms of psychosocial impact, individual preferences and experiences vary widely.

Limitations of Current Evidence

Despite the promising data, the current literature has limitations. Many studies have short durations, often 3 to 6 months, limiting the ability to assess long-term efficacy and sustainability. Moreover, the trials frequently involve highly motivated participants with strong family support and access to robust healthcare infrastructure conditions not reflective of all adolescent populations.

Another challenge lies in the rapid evolution of technology. Devices evaluated in earlier studies may no longer be the most current models, potentially underestimating the benefits of newer systems. Furthermore, heterogeneity in study designs, outcome definitions, and baseline characteristics complicates direct comparisons.

Adherence metrics are also variably reported, and many studies lack granular data on device usage patterns [18]. Additionally, psychosocial outcomes, though increasingly recognized, are often secondary endpoints and assessed using non-standardized tools.

Clinical and Practical Implications

From a clinical standpoint, the data support broader adoption of closed-loop systems for adolescents with T1DM, particularly those struggling with glycemic variability or hypoglycemia. Clinicians should prioritize individualized care, considering both clinical parameters and personal preferences when recommending a device [19].

Education and training are paramount. Both patients and families must understand the system's functionalities, limitations, and required maintenance. Importantly, closed-loop systems do not eliminate the need for carbohydrate counting and mealtime insulin boluses, and unrealistic expectations can lead to disappointment or misuse.

Healthcare systems must also address cost and accessibility. Closed-loop systems are often more expensive, and insurance coverage may be limited [20, 21]. Equitable access remains a major barrier to widespread implementation, especially in low-resource settings.

Future Directions

Ongoing innovation is expected to enhance the capabilities of both SAPs and closed-loop systems [22]. Fully automated ("dual-hormone") systems that deliver both insulin and glucagon are under development and may further improve glycemic control with even less user input. Advances in machine learning may allow personalization of algorithms to individual metabolic patterns.

Future research should prioritize long-term studies in diverse populations to better understand sustained efficacy, adherence, and psychosocial impact. Standardized outcome measures, particularly for quality of life and user satisfaction, are needed to allow meaningful comparisons across studies.

Additionally, real-world implementation research is crucial to identify and overcome barriers to adoption, including socioeconomic factors, healthcare provider training, and user education.

CONCLUSION

In summary, closed-loop insulin delivery systems represent a significant advancement in the management of type 1 diabetes among adolescents, offering superior glycemic control, reduced hypoglycemia, and enhanced treatment satisfaction compared to sensor-augmented pumps. By automating basal insulin adjustments in response to real-time glucose data, closed-loop systems alleviate much of the daily burden of diabetes management, which is particularly beneficial for adolescents navigating the complexities of developmental and psychosocial change. While sensor-augmented pumps have played an important transitional role in diabetes technology, they are increasingly being outperformed by closed-loop systems in key clinical and psychosocial metrics. However, challenges related to cost, access, device wearability, and sustained adherence remain. Ultimately, the choice between these technologies should be tailored to the individual adolescent's needs, preferences, and circumstances. With continued research, innovation, and efforts to improve accessibility, closed-loop systems are poised to become the standard of care in adolescent type 1 diabetes management. Clinicians, researchers, and policymakers must work collaboratively to ensure that the benefits of these technologies are realized equitably across all segments of the adolescent population.

REFERENCES

1. Krishnamoorthy, R., Gatasheh, M.K., Subbarayan, S., Vijayalakshmi, P.: 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. 19, 1934578X241299279 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1177/1934578X241299279
2. Uti, D.E., Atangwho, I.J., Alum, E.U., Egba, S.I., Ugwu, O.P.-C., Ikechukwu, G.C.: Natural Antidiabetic Agents: Current Evidence and Development Pathways from Medicinal Plants to Clinical use. Natural Product Communications. 20, 1934578X251323393 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1177/1934578X251323393

3. Roep, B.O., Thomaidou, S., van Tienhoven, R., Zaldumbide, A.: Type 1 diabetes mellitus as a disease of the β-cell (do not blame the immune system?). Nat Rev Endocrinol. 17, 150–161 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41574-020-00443-4
4. Bombaci, B., Torre, A., Longo, A., Pecoraro, M., Papa, M., Sorrenti, L., La Rocca, M., Lombardo, F., Salzano, G.: Psychological and Clinical Challenges in the Management of Type 1 Diabetes during Adolescence: A Narrative Review. Children. 11, 1085 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/children11091085
5. Ghosh, N., and Verma, S.: Technological advancements in glucose monitoring and artificial pancreas systems for shaping diabetes care. Current Medical Research and Opinion. 40, 2095–2107 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1080/03007995.2024.2422005
6. Peters, A.L., Ahmann, A.J., Battelino, T., Evert, A., Hirsch, I.B., Murad, M.H., Winter, W.E., Wolpert, H.: Diabetes Technology—Continuous Subcutaneous Insulin Infusion Therapy and Continuous Glucose Monitoring in Adults: An Endocrine Society Clinical Practice Guideline. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 101, 3922–3937 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2016-2534
7. O'Meara, M., Acuña, J.C.M., Uribe, A.: Long-Term Benefits of an Integrated Continuous Glucose Monitoring and Insulin Pump System for Emergency Admissions, Hospitalization, and Metabolic Control in a Cohort of People With Diabetes: Retrospective Cohort Study. JMIR Diabetes. 8, e46880 (2023). https://doi.org/10.2196/46880
8. Natale, P., Chen, S., Chow, C.K., Cheung, N.W., Martinez-Martin, D., Caillaud, C., Scholes-Robertson, N., Kelly, A., Craig, J.C., Strippoli, G., Jaure, A.: Patient experiences of continuous glucose monitoring and sensor-augmented insulin pump therapy for diabetes: A systematic review of qualitative studies. Journal of Diabetes. 15, 1048–1069 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1111/1753-0407.13454
9. Templer, S.: Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery Systems: Past, Present, and Future Directions. Front. Endocrinol. 13, (2022). https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2022.919942
10. Schoelwer, M.J., Kanapka, L.G., Wadwa, R.P., Breton, M.D., Ruedy, K.J., Ekhlaspour, L., Forlenza, G.P., Cobry, E.C., Messer, L.H., Cengiz, E., Jost, E., Carria, L., Emory, E., Hsu, L.J., Weinzimer, S.A., Buckingham, B.A., Lal, R.A., Oliveri, M.C., Kollman, C.C., Dokken, B.B., Cherñavvsky, D.R., Beck, R.W., DeBoer, M.D., for the iDCL Trial Research Group: Predictors of Time-in-Range (70–180 mg/dL) Achieved Using a Closed-Loop Control System. Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics. 23, 475–481 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2020.0646
11. Carlson, A.L., Sherr, J.L., Shulman, D.I., Garg, S.K., Pop-Busui, R., Bode, B.W., Lilenquist, D.R., Brazg, R.L., Kaiserman, K.B., Kipnes, M.S., Thrasher, J.R., Reed, J.H.C., Slover, R.H., Philis-Tsimikas, A., Christiansen, M., Grosman, B., Roy, A., Vella, M., Jonkers, R.A.M., Chen, X., Shin, J., Cordero, T.L., Lee, S.W., Rhinehart, A.S., Vigersky, R.A., for the MiniMed™ AHCL Study Group: Safety and Glycemic Outcomes During the MiniMed™ Advanced Hybrid Closed-Loop System Pivotal Trial in Adolescents and Adults with Type 1 Diabetes. Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics. 24, 178–189 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2021.0319
12. Beato-Víbora, P.I., Gallego-Gamero, F., Lázaro-Martín, L., Romero-Pérez, M. del M., Arroyo-Díez, F.J.: Prospective Analysis of the Impact of Commercialized Hybrid Closed-Loop System on Glycemic Control, Glycemic Variability, and Patient-Related Outcomes in Children and Adults: A Focus on Superiority Over Predictive Low-Glucose Suspend Technology. Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics. 22, 912–919 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1089/dia.2019.0400
13. Ugwu, O.P.-C., Alum, E.U., Okon, M.B., Aja, P.M., Obeagu, E.I., Onyeneke, E.C.: Ethanol root extract and fractions of *Sphenocentrum jollyanum* abrogate hyperglycaemia and low body weight in streptozotocin-induced diabetic Wistar albino rats. RPS Pharmacy and Pharmacology Reports. 2, rqad010 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1093/rpsppr/rqad010
14. 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
15. Thabit, H., Hovorka, R.: Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery in Type 1 Diabetes. Endocrinology and Metabolism Clinics. 41, 105–117 (2012). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecl.2011.12.003
16. van Viegen, B.: Can mHealth, when monitored by a primary care provider, maintain hemoglobin A1c values in target range with adolescents between the ages of 10-19 diagnosed with type 1 diabetes mellitus?, https://arcabc.ca/islandora/object/unbc:59072, (2020)
17. Taylor, R.A., Sangal, R.B., Smith, M.E., Haimovich, A.D., Rodman, A., Iscoe, M.S., Pavuluri, S.K., Rose, C., Janke, A.T., Wright, D.S., Socrates, V., Declan, A.: Leveraging artificial intelligence to reduce diagnostic errors in emergency medicine: Challenges, opportunities, and future directions. Academic Emergency Medicine. 32, 327–339 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.15066

18. Xu, Y., Zheng, X., Li, Y., Ye, X., Cheng, H., Wang, H., Lyu, J.: Exploring patient medication adherence and data mining methods in clinical big data: A contemporary review. Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine. 16, 342–375 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1111/jebm.12548
19. Taksler, G.B., Hu, B., DeGrandis, F., Jr, Montori, V.M., Fagerlin, A., Nagykaldi, Z., Rothberg, M.B.: Effect of Individualized Preventive Care Recommendations vs Usual Care on Patient Interest and Use of Recommendations: A Pilot Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Network Open. 4, e2131455 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.31455
20. Lawton, J., Kimbell, B., Rankin, D., Ashcroft, N.L., Varghese, L., Allen, J.M., Boughton, C.K., Campbell, F., Randell, T., Besser, R.E.J., Trevelyan, N., Hovorka, R., Consortium, the Clo.: Health professionals' views about who would benefit from using a closed-loop system: a qualitative study. Diabetic Medicine. 37, 1030–1037 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1111/dme.14252
21. Dangi, S., Orsborn, A.L., Moorman, H.G., Carmena, J.M.: Design and Analysis of Closed-Loop Decoder Adaptation Algorithms for Brain-Machine Interfaces. Neural Computation. 25, 1693–1731 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1162/NECO_a_00460
22. Rimon, M.T.I., Hasan, M.W., Hassan, M.F., Cesmeci, S.: Advancements in Insulin Pumps: A Comprehensive Exploration of Insulin Pump Systems, Technologies, and Future Directions. Pharmaceutics. 16, 944 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics16070944

CITE AS: Nasira A. Sitar (2025). Efficacy of Closed-Loop Insulin Delivery Systems Versus Sensor-Augmented Pumps in Adolescents with Type 1 Diabetes: A Comparative Review. IAA Journal of Biological Sciences 13(2):90-94. https://doi.org/10.59298/IAAJB/2025/1329094